



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 2005

No. 74

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 7, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God, infinite and almighty, as Eternal Being You have no beginning, no end. In You there is no past or future; You are simply present.

Without a future, as a people we are doomed, depressed, and limited in creative imagining. Without a past, we are bereft of history, inexperienced and lost forever between success and failure.

Be as present to this Nation today as You were to our Founders. As the Creator and Providential Lord, guide the Members of the House of Representatives and all their efforts to uphold the Constitution and have it interface with present realities until true priorities arise as the Nation's agenda.

Stir within all Americans a solidarity that will always unite and never divide us. Renew in us a spirit that will enable this country to be a righteous leader into a bold future, shaping a new culture of collaboration and understanding for the 21st century.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 27, 2005.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 27, 2005 at 12:26 pm:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1760

That the Senate insists on amendment, agrees to conference H.R. 3

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 167

Appointments: Chair of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance Board of Director of the Office of Compliance.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

SUMMER AGENDA

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House.)

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, this week the House will begin its summer session by hitting the ground running.

Between now and the August recess, the House will take up several major pieces of legislation that will touch every piece of our national agenda.

We will consider bills that will help us continue to fight and win the war on terror.

Among these security proposals will be a bill to reform the institution and the programs of the United Nations, to help begin to make it possible for this vital international organization to meet its global responsibilities.

We will also reauthorize the PATRIOT Act, the anti-terrorism legislation passed after 9/11 that has provided our law enforcement community with the tools they need to combat the unique threats presented by international terror.

We also hope to take up the final conference report on the long-overdue national energy policy that President Bush and the American people have been calling and waiting for since 2000.

By reducing our dependence on foreign oil, the energy bill will provide the United States greater flexibility in dealing with the tumultuous Middle East region, and it is a huge jobs-creation bill.

The energy bill will also empower our national economy, creating jobs and, over the long run, lowering gas prices for American consumers.

The long-awaited conference report on the highway funding bill, which we also hope to take up before the August recess, will improve our national infrastructure, provide greater mobility for the American people, and create millions of new jobs across our country.

Just as important to our economy as our infrastructure is international trade, which will be greatly enhanced in every region of our Nation and every sector of our economy by passage of the Central American Free Trade

□ 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.

H4145

Agreement, another item we hope to have on our summer agenda.

CAFTA will lower prices for American consumers while opening vast new markets for American businesses, which in turn will create jobs, good high-paying jobs, here at home.

Finally, while we improve our security and bolster our economy, we will serve the pressing interests of individual families by moving a broad agenda to reform our health care system. And all the while, we will continue our work on the President's call to strengthen and improve retirement security for all Americans and complete our work before the Fourth of July on funding the Federal Government within the limits of our budget.

All in all, a busy summer of heavy lifting awaits, Madam Speaker, but the American people demand and deserve nothing less.

DEFEAT CAFTA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, we just returned from 10 days in our district, and we found the opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement is even greater than before we left. People at home in our districts recognize our trade policy is not working.

Just look at this chart. The first year I ran for Congress, our trade deficit was \$38 billion. Today after NAFTA and PNTR and a series of trade agreements, our trade deficit is \$618 billion.

These trade agreements cost jobs. They hurt our families. They hurt our communities. They hurt our schools.

Madam Speaker, we should renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement; defeat this bill when it comes to Congress; renegotiate a new Central American Free Trade Agreement, one that lifts up workers in all seven countries.

RX FOR AMERICAN COMPANIES

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, American businesses are faced with increasing pressure from foreign competitors and skyrocketing health care costs. But they are also faced with the weight placed on them not by the marketplace or their competitors, but by the government itself. Burdensome, duplicative, and outdated regulations cost American businesses literally billions of dollars annually and stifle new job creation.

Many of these regulations do little to improve workplace safety, protect our environment or improve the safety of our workers, but are simply on the books because no one has bothered to review their effectiveness.

Common sense by the government must come into play to help relieve

this burden and to improve the environment for job creation. We must do more to make American companies more competitive in the global marketplace and to give our job providers and our workers much needed relief. We must and we will do more.

BAKASSI PENINSULA BELONGS TO CAMEROON

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Nigeria is deservedly working hard to secure a permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations. But in the meantime, Nigeria is holding territory known as the Bakassi Peninsula, which rightfully belongs to the Republic of Cameroon.

The International Court of Justice, in settling a dispute between Nigeria and Cameroon, there is a decree that the territory belongs to Cameroon. Cameroon is a developing democracy which is achieving economic success for its people.

President Obasanjo of Nigeria in his effort to secure a permanent seat on the Security Council should set an example for the international community. I urge President Obasanjo, in the interest of regional harmony for mutual benefit, to remove troops and government personnel from the Bakassi Peninsula and to pursue positive relations with his neighbors, especially the dynamic Republic of Cameroon.

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

MEDICAL LIABILITY INSURANCE CRISIS

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, the smallest State in the Union has now replaced the biggest State in the Union as one of those States in a crisis state in its medical liability insurance. Okay, there may be those in this body who would argue that Texas is no longer the largest State in the Union; but, Madam Speaker, the good news is that 2 years ago Texas faced up to the challenge of medical liability reform and passed a law on the State level, affirmed it with a constitutional amendment that put a cap on non-economic damages and medical liability lawsuits. This allowed more insurance to come to the State, and, more importantly, Texas Medical Liability Trust, the largest medical liability writer in the State of Texas, has reduced liability fees by 17 percent.

But in the State of Rhode Island, which recently joined the other States in the Union that are in crisis, doctors there are experiencing liability insurance premium increases from 175 to 200

percent since 2002 and fully one-half of their physicians, 48 percent, responded to a recent survey saying they were thinking about doing something else.

Madam Speaker, we passed a good bill in this House 2 years ago that nationwide put a cap on non-economic damages of medical liability lawsuits. I urge this body to take it up, and I urge the other body to pass it as well.

HONORING CHERI REZAK

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

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of a constituent who looked at tragedy and saw an opportunity to improve lives.

In the wake of last December's tsunami in southeast Asia, Cheri Rezak and a group of like-minded Minnesotans volunteered their time and resources to travel between Sri Lanka and the United States every 6 to 8 weeks to provide medical care, food, and encouragement to affected communities.

Under the name HelpSriLanka.US, these individuals have already helped the men and women of Sri Lanka to build houses and establish and operate a soup kitchen which feeds nearly 500 people each day. They are also purchasing boats, taxis, and sewing machines to re-establish fishing, transportation and garment industries. Their goal is to repeat this community revitalization in villages throughout Sri Lanka.

In addition, Cheri has personally dedicated herself to providing a temporary home, and much needed respite, to children directly affected by the tsunami. Thanks to her diligence in securing temporary visas, the first of her charges is currently living with her family in Minnesota.

Cheri and her fellow volunteers rose above this disaster to help create a better life for the people of Sri Lanka. I commend them for their work and wish them much continued success.

UNFRIENDLY SKIES

(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. Madam Speaker, the airline pension crisis has proven that the skies are not so friendly for many airline employees getting ready to retire.

Retirement plans that included dreams prepared for over a lifetime are now replaced with just trying to make ends meet. An airline dumping their pension plan is not a solution. This jeopardizes the retirement for thousands and maybe millions of hard-working Americans and increases the burden on our government and taxpayers.

Over the past 2 years, the PBGC and the American taxpayers have assumed

close to \$10 billion in unfunded pension liabilities, \$10 billion.

Is this a winning formula? I do not think so. Just ask over 100,000 United employees having to plan for a future that looks much cloudier today.

H.R. 2106 allows airline carriers to adopt new funding rules for their defined pension benefit systems. This plan, a solution, requires airline carriers to meet their obligations and decreases the need for a taxpayer bailout.

Madam Speaker, this is a solution that could not come at a better time. This legislation is a win-win solution, for the airlines, for airline employees, and most importantly, for the American taxpayer.

□ 1415

JOINT REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), amended by Public Law 108-329, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces on behalf of the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate their joint reappointment on May 26, 2005, of the following individuals to a 5-year term to the board of directors of the Office of Compliance:

Ms. Barbara L. Camens, Washington, D.C.

Ms. Roberta L. Holzwarth, Rockford, Illinois

And, in addition, their joint redesignation of Ms. Susan Robfogel, Rochester, New York, Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

AUTHORIZING NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY TO AWARD DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN JOINT CAMPAIGN PLANNING AND STRATEGY

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1490) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the National Defense University to award the degree of Master of Science in Joint Campaign Planning and Strategy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1490

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY AWARD OF DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN JOINT CAMPAIGN PLANNING AND STRATEGY.

(a) JOINT FORCES STAFF COLLEGE PROGRAM.—Section 2163 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2163. National defense university: master of science degrees

“(a) AUTHORITY TO AWARD SPECIFIED DEGREES.—The President of the National Defense University, upon the recommendation of the faculty of the respective college or other school within the University, may confer the master of science degrees specified in subsection (b).

“(b) AUTHORIZED DEGREES.—The following degrees may be awarded under subsection (a):

“(1) MASTER OF SCIENCE IN NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY.—The degree of master of science in national security strategy, to graduates of the University who fulfill the requirements of the program of the National War College.

“(2) MASTER OF SCIENCE IN NATIONAL RESOURCE STRATEGY.—The degree of master of science in national resource strategy, to graduates of the University who fulfill the requirements of the program of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

“(3) MASTER OF SCIENCE IN JOINT CAMPAIGN PLANNING AND STRATEGY.—The degree of master of science in joint campaign planning and strategy, to graduates of the University who fulfill the requirements of the program of the Joint Advanced Warfighting School at the Joint Forces Staff College.

“(c) REGULATIONS.—The authority provided by this section shall be exercised under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 2163 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 108 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“2163. National Defense University: master of science degrees.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (3) of section 2163(b) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), shall take effect for degrees awarded after May 2005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1490, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1490, offered today by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Armed Services

and a long-time advocate of the necessity for joint professional military education for Armed Forces personnel.

Today, America's Armed Forces successfully operate together, and with allies, across the globe in incredibly complex wartime undertakings that would not have been possible if it were not for an underlying system to educate military officers and other national security leaders in joint, multinational and interagency operational-level planning and warfighting.

For nearly 60 years, the Joint Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Virginia, which I proudly represent, has been a critically important part of that joint professional military educational system. This week, the Joint Forces Staff College achieves another educational milestone with the graduation of the first class to complete the requirements for the Master of Science Degree in Joint Campaign Planning and Strategy.

These graduates of the Joint Advanced Warfighting School will be assigned to critical roles on the Joint Staff and in the joint warfighting commands. These graduates will bring with them a high degree of skill in joint planning, as well as capability for critical analysis that will allow them to be effective, creative, conceptual and innovative planners and commanders.

This bill, H.R. 1490, provides the statutory authorization to the Department of Defense to award these and future graduates of the Joint Advanced Warfighting School their masters-level degrees. It is a milestone not only for these first graduates but also for the Nation. These officers and those who follow are certain to be our future senior military leaders. Their success will be America's success.

I thank the Member from Missouri for his enduring commitment to the education of America's military leaders and urge all my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 1490.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I thank the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) for her support for this very, very important bill and thank her for her keen interest in professional military education.

I rise today to support H.R. 1490, which would award a masters of science degree to the officers who complete the Joint Advanced Warfighting School at the Joint Forces Staff College. As the gentlewoman from Virginia noted, this bill will give the Department of Defense the authority to award graduates of the Joint Advanced Warfighting School their masters-level degrees. I also urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bill.

It is important that Congress pass the bill and the President sign it so that we can present those men and women with the accolades that they have earned when the first class of that program graduates this coming Thursday at 9 o'clock in the morning.

Madam Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have spent a great deal of my career promoting the need for a rigorous program of joint professional education. We have two missions as I see it: to fight the war that we are fighting today and to prepare for the next. It was the professional military education system that sustained the warfighting competency during the lean years between the First World War and Second World War. Men like General Troy Middleton, who went on to command an Army corps during the Battle of the Bulge, spent years and years in the school system studying the art and science of war. Warfare is becoming more complex at lower and lower levels, and our professional military education system must continue to evolve to develop the thinking warriors the future will require.

The Joint Advanced Warfighting School, or JAWS as it is called, at the Joint Forces Staff College is a wonderful example of how joint professional military education has grown to meet the new and unique challenges military professionals face. This first class of JAWS has given its graduates the tools to be able to create campaign-quality concepts, employ all elements of national power, and succeed as joint force operational and strategic level planners as well as commanders. These graduates will populate the Joint Staff and Combatant commands with officers expert in the joint planning processes and capable of critical analysis in the application of all aspects of national power across the full range of military operations.

The student of the JAWS program have spent the past year immersed in a rigorous course of study. They have completed a curriculum focused on "high end" operational art consisting of courses such as Foundations in Theory of War, Strategic Foundations, and Operational Art and Campaigning, all of which blend theory foundations and historical evidence to provide them with a developmental framework. They have honed their decision-making, problem-solving, and planning skills using seminar exercises, war games, as well as simulations.

Additionally, the JAWS course included several field research trips. The students participated in a comprehensive historical staff ride to Gettysburg, for example. They also traveled here to Washington and spent a week with senior military and governmental policy-makers as well as practitioners.

Madam Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will agree that joint professional military education is so very important. Sir William Francis Butler put it very well when he said, years and years ago, "The Nation that will insist on drawing a broad line of demarcation between the fighting man and the thinking man is liable to find its fighting done by fools and its thinking done by cowards."

That is why I believe, Madam Speaker, that Congress should vote to sup-

port H.R. 1490 so we may recognize the students of the Joint Advanced Warfighting School with a degree they have properly earned.

Madam Speaker, having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1490, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF SUN SAFETY

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 169) recognizing the importance of sun safety, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 169

Whereas Americans of all ages cherish the pleasures of outdoor activities, and too few recognize that overexposure to the sun and its ultraviolet radiation, classified by the Department of Health and Human Services as a known carcinogen, is the leading cause of skin cancer;

Whereas it is critically important to be safe in the sun because skin cancer is the fastest growing cancer in our country today, affecting 1 in 5 Americans during their lifetimes and killing 1 person every hour of every day;

Whereas more than 1,000,000 new cases of skin cancer will be diagnosed in the United States this year, accounting for nearly half of all new cases of cancer and exceeding the incidence of breast, prostate, lung, and colon cancer combined;

Whereas most people receive approximately 80 percent of their lifetime sun exposure by age 18, setting the stage for skin cancer later in life;

Whereas skin cancer is highly preventable by taking simple precautions when engaged in outdoor activities;

Whereas research demonstrates that practicing good sun safety has the potential to significantly reduce the risk of skin cancer;

Whereas the Sun Safety Alliance and its members have dedicated themselves to promoting sun safety, eliminating skin cancer from excessive sun exposure, and encouraging sun protection practices, especially among children; and

Whereas the Sun Safety Alliance has designated the week of June 5, 2005, to June 11, 2005, as National Sun Safety Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

- (1) recognizes the importance of sun safety;
- (2) encourages all Americans to protect themselves and their children from the dangers of excessive sun exposure;
- (3) congratulates organizations like the Sun Safety Alliance for their efforts to promote sun safety and prevent skin cancer; and
- (4) supports the goals and ideals of National Sun Safety Week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam 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. 169.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, today the House is considering H. Res. 169, a resolution that I have introduced with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), our colleague, to encourage sun safety. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHAY), who also have cosponsored this resolution.

H. Res. 169 is a straightforward resolution which encourages all Americans to protect themselves and their children from the dangers of excessive sun exposure. Most of us, especially those of us from the Sunshine State, enjoy the outdoors, though too few of us protect ourselves and our children from the sun's harmful ultraviolet rays when engaged in outdoor activities.

Skin cancer, Madam Speaker, is the fastest-growing cancer in our country today. One in five Americans will get some form of skin cancer during their lifetimes. More than one million new cases of skin cancer will be diagnosed in the United States this year, accounting for nearly half of all new cancer cases and exceeding the combined number of breast, prostate, lung and colon cancers that will be diagnosed in the coming year.

Many people are surprised to learn that most of us receive nearly 80 percent of our lifetime sun exposure by age 18, exposure which sets the stage for cancer later in life; and I would like to repeat that, Madam Speaker. Many people are surprised to learn that most of us receive nearly 80 percent of our lifetime sun exposure by age 18, exposure which sets the stage for cancer later in life. Therefore, it is critically important that we teach our children that sunburns are more than just the painful remnants of staying in the sun too long. They are potential killers that can cut short promising lives.

The good news is that skin cancer is highly preventable by practicing good sun safety. Good sun safety means using sunscreen, wearing protective clothing and limiting sun exposure, especially during the hottest times when the sun's rays are at their most dangerous. Failing to do so, as we have

heard, can have serious and deadly consequences, especially for children.

I hope and believe that passage of this resolution will raise awareness about sun safety, encourage people to protect themselves and their children from excessive sun exposure, help reduce health care costs and save lives.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the Committee on Energy and Commerce chairman, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), the Subcommittee on Health chairman, for moving this resolution expeditiously through our committee and to the House floor. I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), ranking member of the full committee, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Subcommittee on Health's ranking member, for their support of this measure. I encourage all of our colleagues to join us in approving this simple but important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), my friend from the Sunshine State, and encourage people to travel to my State more often perhaps.

As we head into summer months, it is crucial that Americans be aware of the risks involved in seemingly everyday activities: a day at the beach, a jog in the park, an afternoon out working in the yard.

Overexposure to the sun's dangerous ultraviolet rays is a major risk and, largely because of increasing ozone depletion brought on in part by global warming, a bigger threat than ever to the public health. Every year in the United States there are nearly 60,000 new cases of melanoma, the most serious form of skin cancer. Nearly 8,000 die every year from this disease.

□ 1430

When it comes to risk factors for skin cancer, and I quote from the American Cancer Society's list, "unprotected and/or excessive exposure to ultraviolet radiation" is at the top of that list. The sun's UV rays have been officially classified as a carcinogen by the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

Yet a national survey released yesterday shows that the number of people using sunscreen declined by over 10 percent last year even as skin cancer diagnoses continue to rise. In light of these troubling statistics, I am happy to support this resolution introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO). The resolution supports outreach and education efforts like National Sun Safety Week and the groups like the Sun Safety Alliance which work to keep the public informed of the risks of UV exposure.

Sun Safety Alliance teams up health care professionals, educators, and cor-

porate partners to focus on conveying this risk. When it comes to something as basic as being out in the sun, effective public awareness strategies are critical. One of the alliance's priorities is outreach to the youngest Americans. Children are at the highest risk of overexposure to UV rays. Most people receive some 80 percent of their lifetime sun exposure before their 18th birthday. It is essential that we shape and reinforce the right habits early.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is an important step toward stopping an entirely preventable killer. Thousands of lives can be saved with the right understanding of what that prevention entails. I am pleased to support my colleagues and this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, kill, or however else we may want to look at it.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) supporting this legislation. We worked together for a number of years when I chaired that particular subcommittee; and there were times when we disagreed, but I enjoyed working with the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman always being helpful and courteous and open-minded most of the time, not always open-minded, but most of the time. I appreciate the gentleman supporting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, we have a lot of legislation on this floor, I suppose some Members would say much more impacting than this legislation is. Certainly a lot more high profile, if you will, and that sort of thing. But, honestly, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) agreed with me, what this can do to our children and grandchildren. My daughter-in-law has four sons, and she takes my four grandchildren to the beach a lot. They like the beach, and I caution them and remind her about the fact that 80 percent of these skin cancers are really developed before one reaches age 18 and the potential hazards of sun exposure.

It is critical that the American people will be listening to us through this legislation, if you will, on the significance of being just as careful as we possibly can be regarding this disease. I have had two or three skin cancers, if you will, taken off my face over the years. I suppose many of us have. It is critical that we remember that and we educate the American people on this particular issue.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for the good years when we were colleagues on the Subcommittee on Health when he was the chairman and I was the ranking member and the good work we were able to do on most days.

This resolution, as the gentleman points out, is not as important as some

things. I would like to go a little further and talk about what all of this means in terms of global warming and some issues like that. I understand today is not the day to do that on this resolution.

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

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 169, "Recognizing the importance of sun safety." As incidences of skin cancer continue to rise, now affecting one out of every five people in the United States, sun safety is increasingly important to keeping Americans healthy.

I would like to applaud the Sun Safety Alliance for its efforts to enhance national awareness of the importance of sun safety and the need for early childhood protection. I support the efforts by the Sun Safety Alliance to motivate the public to take necessary and appropriate actions to protect themselves and members of their family, especially young children from the dangers of developing skin cancer from over exposure to the sun's UV radiation.

I hope that the designation of the week of June 5–11, 2005, to National Sun Safety Week will remind Americans of the dangers of over exposure to the sun and to encourage safe sun practice. Skin cancer can be a preventable disease if sun safety precautions are followed.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support for H. Res. 169, which recognizes the importance of sun safety and encourages all of us to protect ourselves and our children from the dangers of excessive sun exposure.

As kids growing up in Hawaii, many of our best memories are tied to our world-renowned oceans and beaches and other outdoor environments: from catching waves to having potluck dinners or enjoying concerts or hiking. Given what we now know about the dangers of overexposure to ultraviolet radiation and its link to skin cancer, I believe that it is imperative that we stress sun safety as we continue to enjoy these outdoor activities with our families and friends.

I have included an op-ed from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, written by my wife, Audrey, also a Hawaii native, which details the importance of early detection of preventable skin cancers—specifically skin cancers. Her thoughts say what we all need to know.

Mahalo (thank you) for this opportunity to express support for H. Res. 169.

[From the Honolulu Star Bulletin, May 23, 2005]

PROTECT YOUR SKIN EARLY AND OFTEN WITH SUNSCREEN

(By Audrey Case)

Hawaii is a special place, where we spend time with family and friends or just by ourselves enjoying wonderful outdoor activities so much a part of our islands and culture.

My earliest childhood memories are of Sundays after my dad, an Episcopal minister, and my mom were pau with their duties and would take all five of us kids to the beach for a swim and a picnic dinner. We'd all come home sunburned and happily tired. And my teen years with my friends were beach years as well.

We know so much more now about the sun's power than we did even a decade ago. We know, for example, that the sunburns of our childhood can lead to the skin cancer of

our adulthood. We also know that all ethnicities can be affected by skin cancer, not just fair-skinned people like my husband Ed! Our family has seen some brushes with skin cancer and gets checked by a doctor regularly, including Ed and me.

May is Melanoma/Skin Cancer Detection and Prevention Month. As a member of Congressional Families Action for Cancer Awareness, I have joined with the spouses of other members of the U.S. House of Representatives to spread the message of early detection of preventable cancers—specifically skin cancers.

Today, skin cancer is the most common and fastest-growing form of cancer in the United States, affecting more than 1 million people each year. One person dies every hour from melanoma, the deadliest form of the disease. The American Cancer Society estimates that in Hawaii there will be 150 new cases of melanoma of the skin this year. And, the fact is, many of these cancers could be prevented.

Of course, we know now that we should protect our skin by using sunscreen—SPF 15 or higher—and wearing protective clothing. Don't forget your hat, lip protection and sunglasses! And, we need to protect our skin in all weather—not just the summer.

Perhaps our greatest opportunity for changing skin cancer statistics rests with our children. Although most skin cancers are diagnosed when people are older than 50, the damage that causes skin cancer is done at an early age. Just one blistering sunburn can double a child's lifetime risk of developing skin cancer. If you are a parent, grandparent, aunt, uncle, caregiver or friend, make sure the kids in your life are protected.

Help your teenagers understand the dangers of tanning beds, which are at least as dangerous as the sun, and some studies suggest they are more damaging. There are safer alternatives—such as sunless tanning products and bronzers—if your teen insists on being tanned for prom night.

Encourage your children's schools, health teachers and school nurses to allow students to apply sunscreen before recess. Encourage sports programs and coaches to have kids apply sunscreen before practice and games.

Examine your skin and your loved ones' skin monthly. Look for: brown or black irregularly pigmented spots with uneven margins; a slow-growing, raised, translucent, pearly nodule that may crust, ulcerate or bleed; a change in sensation, itchiness, tenderness or pain from a mole; a small, smooth, shiny, pale or waxy lump on the skin; and any new mole.

And remember the ABCD rule: Asymmetry, Border irregularly, Color that is not uniform and Diameter greater than 6 millimeters—about the size of a pencil eraser.

If you discover a suspicious growth while conducting your monthly self-examination, have it checked by your doctor. Because your risk of developing skin cancer increases as you age, annual clinical exams are even more important after you reach age 50.

So by all means enjoy the sun and outdoors, but have a healthy regard for the sun's strength and protect yourself and those you love. Sun safety should not be neglected by anyone. If we all take responsibility for ourselves and our children, we can change skin cancer from being the fastest-growing cancer to one that is rare in future generations.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) who is usually much more verbose in subcommittee than here today. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 169, 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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEXICAN HOLIDAY OF CINCO DE MAYO

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES 44

Whereas May 5, or Cinco de Mayo in Spanish, is celebrated each year as a date of great importance by the Mexican and Mexican-American communities;

Whereas the Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates May 5, 1862, the date on which the Battle of Puebla was fought by Mexicans who were struggling for their independence and freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo has become one of Mexico's most famous national holidays and is celebrated annually by nearly all Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, north and south of the United States-Mexico border;

Whereas the Battle of Puebla was but one of the many battles that the courageous Mexican people won in their long and brave struggle for independence and freedom;

Whereas the French, confident that their battle-seasoned troops were far superior to the almost amateurish Mexican forces, expected little or no opposition from the Mexican army;

Whereas the French army, which had not experienced defeat against any of Europe's finest troops in over half a century, sustained a disastrous loss at the hands of an outnumbered, ill-equipped, and ragged, but highly spirited and courageous, Mexican force;

Whereas after three bloody assaults upon Puebla in which over a thousand gallant Frenchmen lost their lives, the French troops were finally defeated and driven back by the outnumbered Mexican troops;

Whereas the courageous and heroic spirit that Mexican General Zaragoza and his men displayed during this historic battle can never be forgotten;

Whereas many brave Mexicans willingly gave their lives for the causes of justice and freedom in the Battle of Puebla on Cinco de Mayo;

Whereas the sacrifice of the Mexican fighters was instrumental in keeping Mexico from falling under European domination;

Whereas the Cinco de Mayo holiday is not only the commemoration of the rout of the French troops at the town of Puebla in Mexico, but is also a celebration of the virtues of individual courage and patriotism of all Mexicans and Mexican-Americans who have fought for freedom and independence against foreign aggressors;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder that the foundation of the United States is built by people from many nations and diverse cultures who are willing to fight and die for freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo also serves as a reminder of the close spiritual and economic ties between the people of Mexico and the people of the United States, and is especially important for the people of the southwestern States where millions of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans make their homes;

Whereas in a larger sense Cinco de Mayo symbolizes the right of a free people to self-determination, just as Benito Juarez once said, "El respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz" ("The respect of other people's rights is peace"); and

Whereas many people celebrate during the entire week in which Cinco de Mayo falls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That Congress recognizes the historical struggle for independence and freedom of the Mexican people and requests the President to issue a proclamation recognizing that struggle and calling upon the people of the United States to observe Cinco de Mayo with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam 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 gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN)?

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), and I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for helping to bring this measure to the floor of the House today.

The Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates May 5, 1862, the date on which the battle of Puebla was fought by the Mexicans against an invasion of their country by France. Led by Mexican General Ignacio Zaragoza Seguín, a lightly armed group of Mexican patriots, estimated at 4,500 men, was able to stop and defeat a well-outfitted French army of 6,500 soldiers. Although President Abraham Lincoln was sympathetic to Mexico's cause, the U.S. was fighting our Civil War and was unable to provide any direct assistance. After the Civil War ended, however, the U.S. began to provide more political and military assistance to Mexico, which finally succeeded in expelling the French in 1867.

Celebrating Cinco de Mayo has become increasingly popular along the Mexico-U.S. border and in parts of the U.S. where Americans of Mexican heritage live. This holiday is a celebration

of Mexican culture, food, music, and customs unique to Mexico.

Increasingly, people across our country are joining our countrymen of Mexican descent in celebrating Cinco de Mayo. Not unlike St. Patrick's Day, which has become a popular celebration of Irish heritage, Cinco de Mayo is a day in which we can all join in celebrating Mexican heritage.

It is very fitting that Congress here in the United States should approve this measure. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution which recognizes the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and first want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), my good friend and colleague, and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for expediting the consideration of this resolution both through the committee and onto the floor of the House. I also applaud the author of the resolution, my neighbor, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) who is the first vice chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, for his leadership on issues which affect our friends and neighbors of Hispanic descent.

Madam Speaker, the Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates the May 5, 1862, victory of an ill-equipped and vastly outnumbered Mexican army under the command of General Ignacio Zaragoza over Napoleon III's regiments at the Battle of Puebla. Although Napoleon III eventually installed Archduke Maximilian of Austria as a puppet regent over Mexico, the triumph of the Mexican people over the French in this battle has come to symbolize the fight for freedom and justice, not only in Mexico, but throughout the entire western hemisphere.

To many of us, and particularly along the border with Mexico, this holiday is mostly expressed through the enjoyment of Mexican and Mexican-American culture, music, food, and customs.

Cinco de Mayo celebrations are also well-deserved tributes to the many contributions that Mexicans and Mexican-Americans have made and continue to make in the world and across our Nation.

It is a time to take pride in these significant achievements as well as the continuing dedication to the patria of thousands of Hispanic men and women in uniform.

Finally, Madam Speaker, Cinco de Mayo reminds us that our Mexican-American neighbors strive, as we all do, to live a life filled with faith, family, and the hope of sharing in a stronger America and a freer world.

Madam Speaker, as we commemorate the defeat of French colonial oppres-

sion by an unrelenting, passionate, and brave band of brothers some 150 years ago, our resolve to stand shoulder to shoulder with the fighters for democracy today around the globe must never waiver.

In our own hemisphere, our dedication to democratic institutions and processes as well as the rule of law is being challenged from the streets of Ecuador to the hills of Bolivia to the presidential palace of Venezuela. We must not, we cannot, fail to take up the banner of freedom against the increasingly authoritarian regimes.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 44.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I certainly would like to extend my appreciation and gratitude to our senior ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for allowing me this opportunity to share some thoughts concerning this important resolution. I certainly also want to thank our chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for his support and leadership and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her management of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 44, recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday well known as Cinco de Mayo. I commend my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), for introducing this legislation certainly as a tribute in his capacity as vice chairman of the Hispanic Congressional Caucus.

This resolution recognizes the significance of Cinco de Mayo, as it truly does serve as a reminder that the United States is a country built by people of many nations and diverse cultures who are willing to fight and die for freedom. To truly appreciate the importance of this holiday to the good people of Mexico, we can compare it to the level of importance we place when our own Nation was divided on the issue of slavery, hence the Civil War. In the same way, Cinco de Mayo commemorates the Battle of Puebla on May 5, 1862, fought by the Mexican people against a transferred ruler by the name of Maximilian from Austria.

Madam Speaker, I want to especially share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives the life and history of a leader who, in my humble opinion, is the greatest hero in Mexico's history, a true statesman, whose name is inextricably linked with the name Cinco de Mayo.

□ 1445

His name is Don Benito Juarez, president of Mexico from 1861 to 1863 and

1867 to 1872. President Juarez led the Mexican people in their fight for independence during this crucial period of their history.

Unbeknownst to many of our fellow Americans, President Juarez was the first Mexican president of indigenous Indian descent. His parents were members of the Zapotec tribe prevalent in the province or state of Oaxaca in Mexico. When he went to Oaxaca City at the age of 13, he could not read, write or speak Spanish. He was adopted by lay members of the Franciscan Order, who taught the young Juarez reading, writing, arithmetic and Spanish grammar. He later entered the Franciscan seminary in Oaxaca and studied Aquinas and other great Catholic philosophers, eventually turning his attention instead to the study of law.

President Juarez was educated in the law in preparation for a political career. In his first political position as a city councilman, he was noted as a strong defender of Indian rights. He participated in the revolutionary overthrow of Santa Anna in 1855, becoming the minister of justice and instituting reforms that were embodied in the constitution of 1857. During the Reform War of 1858 to 1861, President Juarez led the liberals against the conservative faction of Mexico's government. The liberals succeeded only through popular support and the unwavering determination of President Juarez, and he was elected president in 1861.

Madam Speaker, to fully understand the quality of the leadership of Mexico at the time in the person of President Don Benito Juarez, one can compare him to, arguably perhaps, the greatest President in our own country's history, President Abraham Lincoln. Both leaders, in fact, presided over their countries in times of crisis, exhibiting great courage and perseverance in the fight for self-determination. Both grew up in poverty and studied law. Both fought against bigotry and racism.

In fact, President Lincoln and President Juarez were contemporaries who held each other in high regard. In fact, in 1858, upon hearing of Juarez's struggles in Mexico, President Lincoln sent him an encouraging message expressing hope, and I quote, for the liberty of your government and its people. Even in the midst of our own Civil War, President Lincoln provided arms and munitions to President Juarez to support the Mexican people in their fight against France. When the U.S. Confederacy sent an emissary to Mexico to enlist support for their cause, President Juarez jailed the man for 30 days before sending him away, a clear sign of support for President Lincoln's cause.

Madam Speaker, today, the United States and Mexico share close ties. We also share the ideals of freedom and independence. Because of our shared values and the tremendous contributions made by Mexican Americans, I think it is fitting and most proper for us here in Congress to recognize the

historical struggle of the Mexican people for independence and freedom as called for in this concurrent resolution. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 44, which recognizes the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo.

Every year thousands of Americans mistakenly refer to Cinco de Mayo as Mexico's Independence Day. That is why I introduced this resolution, to draw attention to the historical context of Cinco de Mayo.

On May 5th, 1862, the Mexican army defeated the French at the battle of Puebla, fighting that day for the values of freedom and liberty, the same values that we celebrate today in the United States.

Cinco de Mayo has come to represent a celebration of the contributions that Mexican Americans and all Hispanics have made to America. Many Mexicans and Mexican Americans have made the United States their homes, especially in the Southwestern United States. Their rich culture is one of the threads woven into the blanket of American society and their contributions to our Nation have shaped what we consider to be American culture today.

Today there are nearly 40 million Latinos living in the United States. Latinos are the fastest growing minority population in the United States. Latinos have made great contributions in all aspects of American life—the arts, sports, the corporate world, science, and much more. Latinos have fought in all of America's wars, beginning with the Revolutionary War. Many Latinos are fighting and dying for our country today in Iraq, just as several of their ancestors fought for freedom in Mexico over a century ago.

Though the battle was a Mexican event, the commemoration of this date has become an American Tradition. It serves as a reminder that the foundation of our Nation was built by people from many nations and diverse cultures that were willing to fight and die for freedom.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H. Con. Res. 44.

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

Cinco de Mayo represents many things, to Mexicans and Americans alike. To Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, Cinco de Mayo is a celebration of courage, patriotism, and Mexican unity. Cinco de Mayo honors all of the brave soldiers who successfully fought off foreign aggressors, in the town of Puebla, Mexico on May 5, 1862.

Outnumbered, the Mexican Army willingly gave their lives in support of Mexican independence and justice. The battle that ensued in Puebla was instrumental in fighting off French aggressors.

To Americans, Cinco de Mayo is a reminder of how our two nations strive for the same ideals and principles, freedom, justice and unity. It also marks the last time that a foreign power was the aggressor on North American soil. Both of our countries fought for their freedom in the face of great opposition. As a re-

sult of our struggles the United States and Mexico share a unique history that strengthens our unity.

Millions of Mexican-Americans work, live, and contribute to our country every single day. Cinco de Mayo is a celebration of the rich culture, heritage, and tradition that Mexican-Americans have brought to the United States.

This resolution recognizes our Mexican-American community and the close spiritual and economic ties the United States has with the people of Mexico.

In honor of their accomplishments and unity, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution honoring Cinco de Mayo.

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Resolution supporting the ideals of Cinco De May, a day that holds much meaning for many people in the South Texas Congressional district I represent. For many Hispanic Americans, we celebrate Independence Day on July 4, and Cinco de Mayo on May 5. Independence Day celebrates our Nation; and Cinco de Mayo celebrates our spirit.

On the eve of May 5, 1862, the commander of the French forces in Mexico sent this message to Napoleon: "We have such superiority over the Mexicans that tomorrow, at the helm of my troops, I will attack, and I will consider that Mexico is mine." He was wrong. When he attacked the forts of Loreto and Guadalupe on May 5, his 8,000 troops were beaten back by 2,000 Mexicans.

It is important to note why we celebrate this day—we celebrate the courage and the strength of a people who will fight against all odds for the things they cherish—freedom, independence and democracy. The lessons of the French commander should not be lost on us today.

I often tell schoolchildren in South Texas to adopt a new take on the French commander's arrogance by saying: "I will go to school, I will study hard, and I will consider that the marketplace is mine, and we will not be beaten."

We must continue to fight in that same spirit that the Mexicans fought the French. Our young people today must fight to learn—fight for the ability to get good jobs—and fight to go further than the previous generation.

I am pleased the House is moving this resolution, albeit just over a month late for Cinco de Mayo celebrations this year. Nevertheless, this is a good opportunity for many of us in the House of Representatives to explain to our colleagues and our countrymen why this celebration means so much to so many of us.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 44.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Madam 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.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING MANIFESTATIONS OF ANTI-SEMITISM BY UNITED NATIONS MEMBER STATES

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 282) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding manifestations of anti-Semitism by United Nations member states and urging action against anti-Semitism by United Nations officials, United Nations member states, and the Government of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 282

Whereas the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes that "the inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world";

Whereas United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379 (1975) concluded that "Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination" and the General Assembly, by a vote of 111 to 25, only revoked Resolution 3379 in 1991 in response to strong leadership by the United States and after Israel made its participation in the Madrid Peace Conference conditional upon repeal of the resolution;

Whereas during the 1991 session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the Syrian Ambassador to the United Nations repeated the outrageous "blood libel" that Jews allegedly have killed non-Jewish children to make unleavened bread for Passover and, despite repeated interventions by the Governments of Israel and the United States, this outrageous lie was not corrected in the record of the Commission for many months;

Whereas in March 1997, the Palestinian observer at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights made the contemptible charge that the Government of Israel had injected 300 Palestinian children with HIV (the human immunodeficiency virus, the pathogen that causes AIDS) despite the fact that an Egyptian newspaper had printed a full retraction to its earlier report of the same charges, and the President of the Commission failed to challenge this baseless and false accusation despite the request of the Government of Israel that he do so;

Whereas Israel was denied membership in any regional grouping of the United Nations until the year 2000, which prevented it from being a candidate for any elected positions within the United Nations system until that time, and Israel continues to be denied the opportunity to hold a rotating seat on the Security Council and it is the only member of the United Nations never to have served on the Security Council although it has been a member of the organization for 56 years;

Whereas Israel continues to be denied the opportunity to serve as a member of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights because it has never been included in a slate of candidates submitted by a regional grouping, and Israel is currently the only member of the Western and Others Group in a conditional status limiting its ability to caucus with its fellow members of this regional grouping;

Whereas the United Nations has permitted itself to be used as a battleground for political warfare against Israel led by Arab states and others, and 6 of the 10 emergency sessions of the United Nations General Assembly have been devoted to criticisms of and attacks against Israel;

Whereas the goals of the 2001 United Nations World Conference Against Racism were undermined by hateful anti-Jewish rhetoric and anti-Israel political agendas, prompting both Israel and the United States to withdraw their delegations from the Conference;

Whereas in 2004, the United Nations Secretary General acknowledged at the first United Nations-sponsored conference on anti-Semitism, that: "It is clear that we are witnessing an alarming resurgence of this phenomenon in new forms and manifestations. This time, the world must not—cannot—be silent.";

Whereas in 2004, the United Nations General Assembly's Third Committee for the first time adopted a resolution on religious tolerance that includes condemnation of anti-Semitism and "recognized with deep concern the overall rise in instances of intolerance and violence directed against members of many religious communities . . . including . . . anti-Semitism . . .";

Whereas in 2005, the United Nations held an unprecedented session to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz concentration camp;

Whereas democratic Israel is annually the object of nearly two dozen redundantly critical resolutions in the United Nations General Assembly, which rarely adopts resolutions relating to specific countries; and

Whereas the viciousness with which Israel is attacked and discriminated against at the United Nations should not be allowed to continue unchallenged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) welcomes recent attempts by the United Nations Secretary General to address the issue of anti-Semitism;

(B) calls on the United Nations to officially and publicly condemn anti-Semitic statements made at all United Nations meetings and hold accountable United Nations member states that make such statements; and

(C) strongly urges the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to develop and implement education awareness programs about the Holocaust throughout the world as part of an effort to combat the rise in anti-Semitism and racial, religious, and ethnic intolerance; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) the President should direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to continue working toward further reduction of anti-Semitic language and anti-Israel resolutions;

(B) the President should direct the Secretary of State to include in the Department of State's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices and annual Report on International Religious Freedom information on activities at the United Nations and its constituent bodies relating to anti-Semitism by each of the countries included in these reports; and

(C) the President should direct the Secretary of State to use projects funded through the Middle East Partnership Initiative and United States overseas broadcasts to educate Arab and Muslim countries about anti-Semitism, religious intolerance, and incitement to violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and the

gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I would like to thank the leadership, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), our wonderful ranking member, for their efforts in bringing to the floor House Resolution 282.

The resolution, Madam Speaker, expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding manifestations of anti-Semitism by United Nations member states and urges action against anti-Semitism by United Nations officials, United Nations member states, and the government of the United States, and for other purposes.

My utmost appreciation goes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, for his work on this resolution, for his commitment to combating the scourge of anti-Semitism, and for being an example of courage in the face of the most deplorable anti-Semitic acts. I thank the gentleman from California.

As we prepare to consider U.N. reform legislation, Madam Speaker, before the full Committee on International Relations tomorrow, the discussion of this measure is timely and it illustrates an important component of our multilateral strategies. For far too long, the United Nations has permitted itself to be used as a battleground for political warfare against Israel led by Arab states and others. Six of the 10 emergency sessions of the United Nations General Assembly have been devoted to criticisms of and attacks against Israel.

During the 1991 session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, for example, the Syrian representative to the U.N. repeated the outrageous blood libel that Jews have killed Christian and other non-Jewish children to use their blood to make Matzoth.

In 1997, another terrible example, the Palestinian observer at the Human Rights Commission charged that the Israeli government had injected 300 Palestinian children with the HIV virus. This baseless charge was not challenged by the president of the Human Rights Commission or any other U.N. official.

Another example, the goals of the 2001 U.N. World Conference Against

Racism were undermined by hateful anti-Jewish rhetoric and anti-Israel political agendas, prompting both Israel and the United States to withdraw their delegations from the conference.

While recent efforts have been made to address this problem, Madam Speaker, such as the U.N.-sponsored conference on anti-Semitism or the session earlier this year to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, much more needs to be done.

In response, the resolution before us, Madam Speaker, calls for the United Nations to officially and publicly condemn anti-Semitic statements in all U.N. meetings and hold accountable member states who make such statements.

It calls for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organizations, known as UNESCO, to develop and implement Holocaust education programs throughout the world as part of an effort to combat the rise in anti-Semitism.

Further, Madam Speaker, it calls for the United States Ambassador to the United Nations to continue working toward further reduction of anti-Semitic language and anti-Israel resolutions.

House Resolution 282 requests the Secretary of State to include in the Department of State's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices and annual Report on International Religious Freedom information on activities regarding anti-Semitism at U.N. bodies by each of the countries included in these reports; and, further, it requests that projects under the Middle East Partnership Initiative and that U.S. overseas broadcasts include programs that educate Arab and Muslim countries about fighting anti-Semitism, about fighting religious intolerance and fighting incitement to violence.

As we have witnessed, historically and in today's world, such charged rhetoric as anti-Semitism invites violent action. There must, therefore, be renewed vigilance against purveyors of anti-Semitism, and the United Nations must be an integral component of any comprehensive strategy. It must help build a culture of tolerance. The United Nations must hold countries and their representatives accountable. It must make hateful rhetoric and incitement politically and culturally unacceptable, instead of offering an environment that enables the proliferation of anti-Semitism.

As was noted in a meeting last month with Natan Sharansky, strong U.S. leadership in placing human rights front and center on the diplomatic agenda has the potential to bring about dramatic political and social change. We must be willing to take a similar stance regarding anti-Semitism at the United Nations.

Let us begin by rendering our unequivocal support to this resolution and send a clear message to the United Nations and to its member countries

that we are resolute in our commitment to fighting this evil.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, first I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Florida for her extraordinarily gracious and generous observations.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on International Relations, who does such an extraordinary job and who knows firsthand the extraordinarily adverse consequences of racism and anti-Semitism and other "isms" wrought against human beings.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) for her sponsorship of this resolution and for her leadership on these issues.

Madam Speaker, intolerance based upon one's religious beliefs, ethnicity and race is a poison that has coursed throughout the body of human history; and it has caused untold pain, suffering and strife. Unfortunately, that is not on the ash bin of history. It is present today.

The Members of this House, the elected representatives of the strongest and freest nation on Earth, have a moral responsibility to expose and combat such intolerance and prejudice wherever it rears its head, whether it rears its head in the United States, in the United Nations, or any other place in the world. That is precisely what this important resolution seeks to do.

This resolution calls on the United Nations to officially and publicly condemn anti-Semitic statements made at U.N. meetings and by U.N. member states. It is to the discredit of the United Nations that anti-Semitism continues to find a forum in that body. This resolution also calls on the U.N. to create worldwide programs about the Holocaust in an effort to reduce anti-Semitism, and it directs the Secretary of State to report on anti-Semitic activities by the U.N. and its member countries.

Let me add, Madam Speaker, that last year I strongly supported language included in the omnibus appropriation act that directs the State Department to report on votes in the General Assembly concerning Israel. I regret to inform you, Madam Speaker, that there are nations, many nations, indeed the overwhelming majority of nations, who fail to support the United States and its positions on Israel more than 10 percent of the time, the majority of nations in the United Nations.

The disturbing, undeniable truth, Madam Speaker, is that rank anti-Semitism continues today in the world body ostensibly dedicated to peace, understanding and tolerance.

Israel, Madam Speaker, is the only member of the U.N. to never have served on the Security Council. It is denied the opportunity to serve on the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, while well-known human rights abusers, Syria, Sudan, Libya and countless others, serial abusers of human rights in their own countries, have served on that body. And each year, Madam Speaker, Israel is singled out for criticism nearly two dozen times in the general assembly, each year, while Sudan, who has seen the murder of thousands of people, or Rwanda, millions, or at least over a million, receives not the attention that it should.

□ 1500

Madam Speaker, too many U.N. members believe that they can make anti-Semitic statements and take anti-Semitic actions with impunity. This Nation ought to send a very loud, a very clear, a very definitive message that that is not the case. Anti-Semitism is unacceptable in any corner of the world, in any forum in the world, but particularly so in the forum committed to world peace, to world understanding.

Members who believe that they can act with impunity are wrong, and they must be held accountable. They must know that their anti-Semitic statements and actions not only affect their relationship with this Nation but also eviscerate their credibility in the family of civilized nations.

Again I congratulate the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from California for their leadership, not just on this resolution, Madam Speaker, but every day of every week of every month of every year because that is what it takes to ensure that anti-Semitism, racism, sexism, and every other kind of prejudice and bigotry is rejected in this body and in every place that we find men and women of goodwill.

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

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for his powerful and eloquent statement.

I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for bringing this resolution to the floor today. I also want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) for her outstanding leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, it is high time to eradicate a sickening deficiency of the United Nations: its pathological persecution of one member, the democratic State of Israel, whose performance and standards are vastly superior to those of most of its nondemocratic detractors.

Over the years, the United States has occasionally used diplomacy at the United Nations to address this sickness, especially during the tenure of

our distinguished Ambassadors Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Jeanne Kirkpatrick.

Recently, a renewed spasm of anti-Israeli activism has polluted critical United Nations mechanisms such as the General Assembly and the so-called Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing experiences I personally have had during my service as a Member of Congress took place in August of 2001 when I was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations World Conference against Racism at Durban, South Africa.

Secretary General Kofi Annan was anxious to use this conference as an opportunity to reinvigorate the world community in the fight against racism, bigotry, discrimination, and religious and ethnic intolerance. But, instead, we witnessed the hijacking of the conference by those who turned it into a vile outpouring of anti-Semitism and anti-Israel sentiment. This conference was one of the most vicious anti-Semitic displays I have seen since I witnessed the Holocaust in Hungary in the 1940s.

The draft document presented to the conference included phrases such as the "racist practices of Zionism" and where the Holocaust had been cited as an example of racism taken to extremes, Arab and Muslim states proposed replacing it with the term "holocausts" in the plural and lower case, which was yet another manifestation of propaganda to deny and to diminish the unique character of the Holocaust in which 6 million innocent human beings perished.

Despite repeated efforts of the United States and some other delegations to work with the problematic countries at Durban, South Africa, the underlying anti-Semitism, disguised as criticism of Israel, could not be resolved; and it was my privilege to lead the walk-out of the U.S. delegation from that conference. What could have been an important effort to revitalize the fight against racism and intolerance was turned into a lost opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, it is time once and for all for our diplomats to apply themselves in a sustained manner to defeating the absurd series of anti-Israeli resolutions that continue to crowd the agenda of the United Nations, pushing aside long overdue consideration of critical issues such as terrorism, AIDS, climate change, poverty, human rights abuses, and famine. Our resolution takes note of the efforts of some U.N. member countries to delegitimize the State of Israel by denying its opportunity to participate in U.N. organizations including the Security Council and the Human Rights Commission. It also notes that the United Nations has been used to attack the State of Israel. For example, of the emergency sessions of the General Assembly that have been called, six of the 10 were devoted solely to attacks against the State of Israel.

Our resolution, Mr. Speaker, commends recent examples of outstanding leadership in the fight against anti-Semitism. I want to single out Secretary General Kofi Annan, who led the effort to call an unprecedented special session of the General Assembly this past January to mark the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz concentration camp during World War II.

At that special session, Kofi Annan said, "The United Nations must never forget that it was created as a response to the evil of Nazism, or that the horror of the Holocaust helped to shape its mission. That response is enshrined in our Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Such an evil must never be allowed to happen again. We must be on the watch for any revival of anti-Semitism and ready to act against the new forms of it that are happening today." From Secretary General Kofi Annan.

Mr. Speaker, our resolution urges the member states of the United Nations and our own government to step up the fight against anti-Semitism, religious intolerance, and incitement to violence. In keeping with the original mission and the enduring vision of the United Nations as a beacon for humanity's potential at its best, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support our resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her usual gracious, generous gesture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his leadership on this issue and so many other issues that are important to human rights around the world, and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership on the committee and in bringing this resolution forward and dealing with human rights issues in the Middle East.

I also want to identify myself with the statements made by my colleagues, including the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The rise of anti-Semitism globally is undisputable and it is unacceptable. As the ranking Democrat on the Helsinki Commission, I have worked with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), our chairman, to bring up anti-Semitism and fighting anti-Semitism as one of the highest priorities of our Helsinki Commission. I am pleased

that as a result of the priority of our delegation, we are now having our third international meeting on anti-Semitism. That will be taking place this week in Spain.

In the second meeting that took place in Berlin, we were able to come out with a Berlin document, a declaration which stated unequivocally the condemnation by all 55 countries in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe to condemn anti-Semitism and develop an action plan to fight anti-Semitism. It deals with law enforcement and sensitizing law enforcement. It deals with educating our children in Holocaust education. It deals with respect and understanding of people who have different religious beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, it is very wrong when individuals commit anti-Semitic actions. It is even worse when it is sponsored by a government or by international organizations. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we have the resolution before us today that speaks to the United Nations and to the actions within the United Nations. It must clean up its act in regards to its actions of discrimination and anti-Semitism. It is unacceptable, and this resolution speaks to that. And I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 282, regarding manifestations of anti-Semitism by United Nations member states, and urging action against anti-Semitism by United Nations officials. We must not allow anti-Semitism to become a part of the leading international organization that proclaims "the inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world".

I commend the International Relations Committee for acting on this resolution condemning the resurgence of anti-Semitism around the globe. As Ranking Member of the Helsinki Commission, I believe we must recognize that despite great achievements with respect to human rights around the world, much more can still be done.

The history of anti-Semitism is indisputable. Today, though, I want to discuss trend of a growth of anti-Semitism throughout the world today.

In the last Congress, to address this new wave of discrimination, I was pleased to join with Congressman LANTOS and Helsinki Commission Chairman CHRIS SMITH in working to enact the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act of 2004. The State Department then issued its first-ever global report on anti-Semitism, giving us a roadmap to build upon for the future.

Last year I traveled as part of the U.S. Delegation of the Helsinki Commission, with former Secretary of State Colin Powell, to attend a special conference in Berlin addressing anti-Semitism, held under the auspices of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). During the course of the trip I went to visit Auschwitz for the first time. That factory of death reaffirmed to me how we must tirelessly work to build understanding and respect between different communities to prevent future acts prejudice, discrimination, and ultimately violence.

At the Berlin Conference, I gave the official U.S. statement in the session on tolerance, and the meeting ended with the issuance of the Berlin Declaration of Action. The Declaration laid out a number of specific steps for states to take to combat the rising tide of anti-Semitism, including specific actions regarding Holocaust education, data collection and monitoring of hate crimes against Jews, and improved coordination between non-governmental organizations and European law enforcement agencies.

As the leading international organization in the world, the United Nations must make it clear that anti-Semitism has no place within its walls. It must condemn anti-Semitic statements made at all meetings and hold accountable the United Nations member states that make such statements. This is the first step of many that will discourage anti-Semitic sentiment from having any place with United Nations members.

Unfortunately, the United Nations has a long history of failing to aggressively combat instances of anti-Semitism within its institution. In 1975, the U.N. General Assembly concluded that "Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination," and this resolution was not revoked until 1991, after strong leadership from the U.S., and Israel's refusal to participate in the Madrid Peace Conference unless the resolution was repealed.

Until the year 2000, Israel was denied membership in any regional grouping of the United Nations. It continues to be denied the opportunity to hold a rotating seat on the Security Council, making it the only member to have never served on the Security Council despite being a member of the UN for 56 years. Lastly, Israel continues to be denied the opportunity to serve as a member of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. These anti-Israeli actions must cease if we are serious about stopping anti-Semitism.

However, I am glad to note that the United Nations Secretary General has recently spoken out on the issue of anti-Semitism. In addition, in 2004 the General Assembly's Third Committee adopted a resolution on religious tolerance for the first time, which states in part its "deep concern the overall rise in instances of intolerance and violence directed against members of many religious community . . . including . . . anti-Semitism." As Israeli President Moshe Katsav reminded us at our Berlin conference last year, anti-Semitism should indeed receive special attention from the civilized world.

While I welcome these recent steps forward, the United Nations still has a long way to go to combat anti-Semitism. As this resolution states, we must implement awareness programs about the Holocaust throughout the world. This will promote more than just tolerance; it will help the world to achieve racial, religious, cultural, and ethnic acceptance and diversity, leading to a more peaceful and just society.

This resolution also requests that the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations continue working toward further reduction of anti-Semitic language and anti-Israel resolutions. It also asks the Department of State to include information on activities at the United Nations relating to anti-Semitism in its reports on Human Rights Practices and International Religious Freedom. Finally, it asks the Secretary of State to fund projects

that educate Arab and Muslim countries about religious intolerance.

We must combat this rising tide of anti-Semitism in all of its forms, and ensure that it has no place anywhere in the world, especially the United Nations. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA), my good friend and a very important member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from California, our senior ranking member, for yielding me this time to say a few words concerning this resolution.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida representing the majority and especially the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for his support and leadership in getting this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, in my visit to the Holocaust Museum here in our Nation's capital, I always come away with this great lesson that I learned about the suffering of some 6 million Jews in that terrible period during Nazi rule by Adolph Hitler. The words that come to my mind every time I visit that museum are the words "never again." "Never again." And I cannot help but express my sense of gratitude to the gentleman from California, not only as a child of the terrible conflict that occurred to his family but certainly who has been a great teacher and a mentor to me in understanding and appreciating what racism and bigotry and hatred is. And the fact that he has had to live that in his own life and has certainly been a great champion not only of the issues affecting the good people of the State of Israel, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for being that leader whom I admire and respect very much.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the resolution speaks for itself. It is time for the United Nations to give serious attention to this problem. Year after year, the only democratic government in the Middle East has been ostracized, condemned, vilified, falsely accused of so many things. I simply say, enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. I sincerely hope that copies of this resolution will be served to every ambassador from every country represented in the United Nations.

□ 1515

We will let them know that the will of the Congress is expressly stated to this effect in the provisions of the resolution, that enough is enough.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for his eloquent and strong statement.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that this resolution reflects the values of this body and of the American people, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank our wonderful friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for his leadership on this resolution, as well as the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). I urge all of our colleagues to adopt this resolution today.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today in strong support of the resolution regarding the manifestations of anti-Semitism by United Nations member states.

I would like to praise Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for her tireless efforts as the chair of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia. Her commitment to fighting anti-Semitism is unparalleled and she has raised awareness of the issue both within the United Nations and throughout the world.

The state of Israel ardently strives to attain equality of rights which the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights recognizes as the best hope for freedom throughout the world.

However, the past actions of many United Nations member states have challenged this equality through many of their anti-Semitic resolutions, actions, and statements.

The regular manifestations of this blatant anti-Semitism occur throughout the course of the United Nation's history. Included in these acts are statements by members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, those individuals who should be acting upon anti-Semitism rather than participating in it.

I commend the UN for increasing awareness in the past few years of anti-Semitism and refusing to remain silent on this growing global problem. The recent session commemorating the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz marks a keystone in the United Nations' efforts to promote awareness of anti-Semitism.

Nevertheless, members states annually remain critical of Israel and refuse to allow Israel equal rights and opportunities within the United Nations. Israel should have the same chance to participate in the United Nations, rather than be ignored by those states which would seek to spread hateful anti-Jewish and anti-Israel agendas.

I believe that the United Nations should implement measures which: Publicly condemn those United Nations member states who make anti-Semitic and racial remarks, hold those same member states who make anti-Semitic remarks accountable, and promote awareness of anti-Semitism.

The United States must take a firm stand on this issue today. We must declare that neglecting the problem of anti-Semitism is unacceptable.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 282, which calls on the President to take steps to stem the ugly tide of anti-Semitism at the United Nations and in the Middle East.

The hijacking of the United Nations by some member states is an attack against inter-

national peace and the founding principles of the U.N. The use of blood libels by representatives of member states, in reports, and by NGOs, is unacceptable and a betrayal of the U.N.'s mission.

The U.N. is robbed of its moral authority when member states hijack it for illicit purposes. Slandering an entire people, their aspirations for self-determination, and their homeland, is not acceptable. Excluding a member state from the community of nations because of ancient hatreds and slanders is unworthy of an organization founded to promote world peace and end human suffering.

Holding one nation to a standard no other nation is held to is, whether people wish to admit it or not, bigotry at its worst. No other nation would be denounced for taking steps to protect its citizens from acts of terror aimed intentionally at civilians. No nation has exercised as much restraint as Israel, yet no nation has been subjected to condemnation, indeed vilification and demonization, including those countries that practice slavery, torture, and genocide, some of whom have been privileged to sit on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights—a right denied to Israel in the more than half-century it has been a member.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is only as strong and decent as its member nations. That is both its greatest strength and its greatest weakness. When the nations of the world stand by, or worse, participate in, the vilification of the Jewish people, it is a reflection not just on the institution, but on the failings of its members.

I believe it is time for the President to do more to press the U.N., and its member states, to bring an end to institutionalized anti-Semitism. It is not enough to criticize the U.N. It is not enough to denounce anti-Semitism.

This administration must exert pressure on those countries that have gotten a pass on their efforts both in the U.N. and in other forums. Countries like Saudi Arabia and Egypt, who distort the mission of the U.N., must be held to account for their actions.

The United Nations is capable of good and important work, in the eradication of disease, in alleviating poverty. It can and should do more, but it can never live up to its potential and its mission unless it sheds the stain of anti-Semitism.

The United States must take the lead in this important effort. I support this resolution. I hope that the President heeds its message and does what he must do to end the bitter reign of anti-Semitism at the U.N.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in support of House resolution 282 and encourage members of the International community to continue to aggressively condemn anti-Semitic actions and statements.

For over sixty years, world history and international perspectives have been shaped by the painful reminders of the events of World War II. Blind eyes could not hide the effect racism had during the Holocaust that affected millions of Jewish men, women and children. And now, many years later, I join with others to continue to remind the world community to resist the small seeds of hate that once led to the attempted annihilation of an entire race of people.

More now than ever, we must all take a proactive stance against views that promote racial, religious and ethnic intolerance. America's past is certainly imperfect. However, the lessons of the past remind us that through these imperfections we were able to unite and build alliances that promoted a stronger and wiser nation. I now call upon the International community to also build alliances and word for peace by actively condemning the increasing culture of anti-Semitic views and religious intolerance.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives voted to urge the United Nations to take bold action against anti-Semitism and anti-Israel sentiment. I commend my colleagues for keeping the U.N.'s feet to the fire on an issue of such great importance. And I thank Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN for introducing this bill and for her continued vigilance in support of America's greatest ally in the Middle East.

The U.N. is supposed to be a neutral authority working towards global unity. But in fact, it has helped the enemies of Israel internationalize their war against the Jewish state.

Many people know about the 1975 U.N. resolution equating Zionism with racism. Sadly, that is only 1 of the 322 resolutions condemning Israel that the U.N. has passed since 1948.

The U.N. issued Resolution 476 in 1980 declaring Israel's claim to Jerusalem "null and void." It passed Resolution 487 in 1981 to "strongly condemn" Israel for its attack on Iraq's nuclear facility. And in 2003, the U.N. condemned Israel for building its security fences. These are the same fences that have cut suicide bombings by 75% and Israeli fatalities by 55%.

The U.N. is routinely silent on deadly suicide attacks—like the Hamas Passover massacre that killed 30 people at an Israeli hotel. But it will loudly condemn Israel for its military response to such terror. Remarkably, the U.N.'s balance sheet defends countries like Lebanon, Iraq, and Syria, while attacking Israel as a regional aggressor.

This imbalance is unreasonable. But it is hardly the U.N.'s worst masquerading. The U.N. pretends to give a voice to all countries. But when it comes to offering countries a seat on the Security Council, only Israel is barred.

And while 4 of the 7 stage sponsors of terror—Cuba, Libya, Sudan, and Syria—are members of the U.N. Human Rights Commission, Israel cannot even be a candidate. The commission spends 26% of its resolutions condemning Israel, yet Israel doesn't even have a forum to respond.

The news gets worse. The U.N. has decided that its Commission on Human Rights is good enough for all the world's refugees, except the Palestinians. They get their own organization—the U.N. Relief Works Agency (UNRWA).

And instead of being resettled like the rest of the world's 20 million refu-

gees, the Palestinians are kept in camps. It is no surprise that the result has been a breeding ground for violence. More than 48 terrorist operatives have been educated in UNRWA schools. And this past January, the head of UNRWA acknowledged that members of Hamas are on his payroll. Since 1950, UNRWA has been bad for Israelis and Palestinians alike, and it is time the U.N. took responsibility for solving the problem.

Earlier this year, Kofi Annan made a move towards accountability by publicly outlining a series of proposed U.N. reforms. Some of the suggested shake-ups of discredited U.N. bodies like the Human Rights Commission are steps in the right direction. But it is hard to trust a Secretary General who spent part of a trip to the Middle East placing a wreath on Yasser Arafat's grave. And even harder to overlook 50 years of U.N. antagonism against Israel.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 282, which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding manifestations of anti-Semitism by United Nations member states and urges action against anti-Semitism by United Nations officials, United Nations member states, and the Government of the United States.

As we commemorate the invasion of Normandy this week, it is important to remember that the evil the world was fighting then persists today. Recent accounts of anti-Semitic assaults are reminiscent of those encountered before and during World War II. In the suburbs of Antwerp, Belgium, four youths were assaulted on their way home from their Jewish school by a group of men yelling anti-Semitic insults. One of the students was stabbed and seriously injured. In Toulon, France a synagogue and a community center were set on fire. In Dusseldorf, Germany, an ancient Jewish cemetery was desecrated with swastikas and SS symbols. In the United Kingdom, a Jewish woman was beaten severely by three of her neighbors because her mail was written in Hebrew, and they suspected her of being Israeli.

The United Nations and the international community must act swiftly and address this immediate threat. The United Nations and world leaders must shake themselves out of indifference and rise above political considerations that have blinded them to the magnitude of rising anti-Semitic assaults. The international community must remember its commitment to prevent a recurrence of horrors the world witnessed 60 years ago and take meaningful actions to combat this rise in anti-Semitism.

In the last few years, the United Nations and Secretary General Kofi Annan have begun to formally recognize and address this rise in anti-Semitism. Just last year, the United Nations sponsored a conference on anti-Semitism and for the first time the United Nations General Assembly's Third Committee adopted a resolution that condemns anti-Semitism.

Although these recent actions by the United Nations are positive steps, I believe that the United Nations must do more to combat this evil. The United Nations should first begin within its own organization and end the practice of tolerating hateful rhetoric. The United Nations must go further in condemning mem-

ber nations and United Nations officials that use anti-Semitic language. Additionally, the United Nations should acknowledge the detrimental effects of anti-Israel resolutions and work towards reducing their frequency.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation and to remain committed to combating the evil of anti-Semitism.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 282.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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 17 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. WALDEN of Oregon) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 44, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Res. 282, by the yeas and nays.

RECOGNIZING HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEXICAN HOLIDAY OF CINCO DE MAYO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 44.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 44, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—405

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

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

NOT VOTING—28

Andrews	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Platts
Conyers	Jenkins	Rothman
Cubin	Kaptur	Rush
Delahunt	Kennedy (RI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Gutierrez	Lucas	Schiff
Hastings (FL)	McCollum (MN)	Scott (GA)
Honda	Mucelle	Stark
Hyde	Otter	Weldon (PA)
	Oxley	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1851

Mr. KINGSTON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

Stated for:

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 228, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea”.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 228, had I been present, I would have voted “yea”.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING MANIFESTATIONS OF ANTI-SEMITISM BY UNITED NATIONS MEMBER STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 282.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 282, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 2, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Crenshaw	Hayes
Ackerman	Crowley	Hayworth
Aderholt	Cubin	Hefley
Akin	Cuellar	Hensarling
Alexander	Culberson	Hergert
Allen	Cummings	Herseth
Baca	Cunningham	Higgins
Bachus	Davis (AL)	Hinchee
Baird	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Baker	Davis (FL)	Hobson
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Hoekstra
Barrett (SC)	Davis (KY)	Holden
Barrow	Davis (TN)	Holt
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Jo Ann	Hooley
Barton (TX)	Davis, Tom	Hostettler
Bass	Deal (GA)	Hoyer
Bean	DeFazio	Hulshof
Beauprez	DeGette	Hunter
Becerra	Delahunt	Inglis (SC)
Berkley	DeLauro	Inslee
Berman	DeLay	Israel
Berry	Dent	Issa
Biggert	Diaz-Balart, L.	Istook
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Dicks	Jefferson
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Jindal
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Johnson (CT)
Blackburn	Doolittle	Johnson (IL)
Blumenauer	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Blunt	Drake	Johnson, Sam
Boehrlert	Dreier	Jones (NC)
Boehner	Duncan	Jones (OH)
Bonilla	Edwards	Kanjorski
Bonner	Ehlers	Kaptur
Bono	Emanuel	Keller
Boozman	Emerson	Kelly
Boren	Engel	Kennedy (MN)
Boswell	English (PA)	Kildee
Boucher	Eshoo	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boustany	Etheridge	Kind
Boyd	Evans	King (IA)
Bradley (NH)	Everett	King (NY)
Brady (PA)	Farr	Kingston
Brady (TX)	Fattah	Kirk
Brown (OH)	Feeney	Kline
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	Knollenberg
Brown-Waite,	Filner	Kolbe
Ginny	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kucinich
Burgess	Flake	Kuhl (NY)
Burton (IN)	Foley	LaHood
Butterfield	Forbes	Langevin
Buyer	Ford	Lantos
Calvert	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Camp	Fossella	Larson (CT)
Cannon	Fox	Latham
Cantor	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Capito	Franks (AZ)	Leach
Capps	Frelinghuysen	Lee
Capuano	Gallely	Levin
Cardin	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Cardoza	Gerlach	Lewis (GA)
Carnahan	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Carson	Gilchrest	Linder
Carter	Gillmor	Lipinski
Case	Gingrey	LoBiondo
Castle	Gohmert	Lofgren, Zoe
Chabot	Gonzalez	Lowe
Chandler	Goode	Lucas
Chocola	Goodlatte	Lungren, Daniel
Clay	Gordon	E.
Cleaver	Granger	Lynch
Clyburn	Graves	Mack
Coble	Green (WI)	Maloney
Cole (OK)	Green, Al	Manzullo
Conaway	Grijalva	Marchant
Conyers	Gutknecht	Markey
Cooper	Hall	Marshall
Costa	Harman	Matheson
Costello	Harris	Matsui
Cox	Hart	McCarthy
Cramer	Hastings (WA)	McCaul (TX)

McCotter	Pitts	Smith (TX)
McCrery	Poe	Smith (WA)
McDermott	Pombo	Snyder
McGovern	Pomeroy	Sodrel
McHenry	Porter	Solis
McHugh	Price (GA)	Souder
McIntyre	Price (NC)	Spratt
McKeon	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
McMorris	Putnam	Strickland
McNulty	Radanovich	Stupak
Meehan	Rahall	Sullivan
Meek (FL)	Ramstad	Sweeney
Meeks (NY)	Rangel	Tancredo
Melancon	Regula	Tanner
Menendez	Rehberg	Tauscher
Mica	Reichert	Taylor (MS)
Michaud	Renzi	Taylor (NC)
Millender-	Reyes	Terry
McDonald	Reynolds	Thomas
Miller (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Miller (NC)	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Miller, George	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
Mollohan	Ross	Tierney
Moore (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Moore (WI)	Royce	Turner
Moran (KS)	Ruppersberger	Udall (CO)
Moran (VA)	Ryan (OH)	Udall (NM)
Murphy	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Murtha	Ryun (KS)	Van Hollen
Musgrave	Sabo	Velázquez
Myrick	Salazar	Visclosky
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	Walden (OR)
Napolitano	T.	Walsh
Neal (MA)	Sanders	Wamp
Neugebauer	Saxton	Wasserman
Ney	Schakowsky	Schultz
Northup	Schiff	Waters
Norwood	Schwartz (PA)	Watson
Nunes	Schwarz (MI)	Watt
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Obey	Sensenbrenner	Weiner
Olver	Serrano	Weldon (FL)
Ortiz	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Osborne	Shadegg	Weller
Owens	Shaw	Westmoreland
Pallone	Shays	Wexler
Pascrell	Sherman	Whitfield
Pastor	Sherwood	Wicker
Pearce	Shinkus	Wilson (NM)
Pelosi	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Pence	Simmons	Wolf
Peterson (MN)	Simpson	Woolsey
Peterson (PA)	Skelton	Wu
Petri	Slaughter	Wynn
Pickering	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)

NAYS—2

McKinney Paul

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Platts
Green, Gene	Jenkins	Rothman
Gutierrez	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Hastings (FL)	McCollum (MN)	Sanchez, Loretta
Honda	Nussle	Scott (GA)
Hyde	Otter	Stark
	Oxley	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1908

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I missed two votes on June 7, 2005. Had I been present I would have voted yea on roll-call 228 and 229.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor during today's rollcall votes on H. Con. Res. 44 (recognizing the importance of Cinco de Mayo) and H. Res. 282 (expressing the sense of the House regarding anti-Semitism by United Nations members). Had I been present, I would have voted yea on each of these measures.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 65

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 65.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

THE COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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, once again I rise tonight to talk about what Americans pay for prescription drugs compared to what the rest of the industrialized world pays for those same prescription drugs.

And for those who were watching on Sunday night the television show "60 Minutes," there was a very interesting segment, and it featured Dr. Peter Rost, who is both an M.D. and a VP of a very large pharmaceutical company. And what Dr. Rost talked about last night on "60 Minutes" is the same subject that I and many Members of this House have been talking about for several years, and that is that Americans pay by far and away much more for prescription drugs than consumers in any other industrialized country.

I do not know how well Members can see this, but this chart has five of the most commonly prescribed prescription drugs today; and it has prices from London, from Athens, and from the United States. And what we see on these charts is we really have three different price levels. We see the price, for example, of Lipitor in London is \$40.88. That same Lipitor, which incidentally Dr. Rost talked about and is made in Ireland, all of it is imported somewhere because it is all made in Ireland; but in London, \$40.88; in Athens, \$55.65; but a month's supply in the United States is \$76.41.

□ 1915

You look at the entire list and then you total them up, the five most commonly prescribed drugs. In London,

those five drugs are \$195 U.S. In Athens, they are \$231 in American dollars. Here in the United States, \$507.

Mr. Speaker, the chart can get worse, too. If you look at what we see, for example, in Germany, and these numbers again are from earlier this year, when you compare on this chart we have 10 of the most commonly-prescribed drugs brought at the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany, and this is essentially just coming in off the street, not expecting any special discount either in the United States or here, but those 10 in the United States total \$1,040. In Germany, you can buy the same drugs for \$455.57.

Mr. Speaker, it really is time that we do what they do in Europe. It is called parallel trading. For Members, if we can work out the legalities, we are going to try to make available to Members a copy of that 60 Minutes segment so people can see for themselves and hear from somebody who is actually a pharmaceutical insider.

As I say, he is now a VP of marketing of one of the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world. He formerly though worked in Europe for a big pharmaceutical company, and he was involved in what is called parallel trading. That creates a competitive marketplace. Because, at the end of the day, we Americans understand it does cost money to develop these new drugs, and we are willing to pay our fair share. We ought to be willing to subsidize the starving people in Sub-Saharan Africa. We should not be forced to subsidize the starving Swiss.

Americans deserve world-class drugs at world market prices. The time has come to open up markets and allow Americans to have access to these drugs. When we do, you will see the prices balanced so that the prices in Europe are probably going to go up a little, but the prices here in the United States will go down dramatically.

Please join me in this important effort.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO PRIVATE FIRST CLASS WESLEY ROBERT RIGGS

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

Mr. POE. "I don't do it for the money . . . I don't do it for the glory . . . Providing for our future is my responsibility . . . I can't call in sick on Mondays when the weekend has been too strong. I just work straight through the holidays and sometimes all night long. You can bet that I stand ready

when the wolf growls at the door . . . I am solid . . . I am steady . . . I am true down to the core . . . I'm an American soldier."

Words from Toby Keith's "American Soldier."

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of a young American soldier, Private First Class Wesley Robert Riggs, who died serving our Nation in Iraq. Private First Class Riggs, in only 19 years, had exhibited a lifetime of dedication and duty. He was killed during a patrol on May 17, 2005, near Tikrit, Iraq, when a roadside bomb exploded.

He was a native of Baytown/Beach City, Texas. Wesley graduated in 3 years from Barbers Hill High School in 2003. He was active in the Future Farmers of America. To Wesley's Ag teachers, he was well devoted to the curriculum and is remembered for his skills in Ag Mechanics and Meats Technology. They recall his love of fishing, hunting and anything outdoors.

Before enlisting in the United States Army in 2004, Wesley spent his days like many other young Texans. He enjoyed hanging around with friends and working on cars. He liked four-wheeling and camping. He was also a member of the Houston Olympic weight lifting team.

He attended Holy Trinity Catholic Church in Mt. Belvieu, Texas. Reverend Andrew Moore, Wesley's Pastor at Holy Trinity, recalls a dedicated young man that was extremely motivated and driven. He dreamed of a career in law enforcement after his years in the military.

A number of his band of brothers in the military paid tribute to Wesley at his funeral service. Others commemorated him at his memorial service that I was able to attend this past Memorial Day weekend. They all spoke of a comrade who illustrated exemplary service.

To date, Mr. Speaker, in Operation Iraqi Freedom, our United States Army alone has lost 93 Texans in combat-related casualties. It is interesting to note that one out of every ten Americans in the United States military comes from the Lone Star State.

Our military cannot replace individuals of such exceptional character as Private First Class Riggs. However, his service will provide a stirring example for the men and women who carry forward his tenacious fight against tyranny, terror and treachery.

Moreover, Private First Class Riggs helped to establish a democracy, the historic start of which I was privileged to witness in Iraq this past January. Freedom does not come, Mr. Speaker, because somebody carries a sign in protest. It comes because of sacrifice.

So if today we could hear from Private First Class Wesley Riggs himself, as a member once and always of the United States Army, as a member of the Infantry, called "the Queen of Battle," he would resonate the remainder of Toby Keith's "American Soldier:"

"And I always will do my duty, no matter what the price. I have counted

up the cost, I know the sacrifice . . . I don't want to die for you, but if dying is asked of me, I will bear that cross with honor, cause freedom don't come free . . . I am out here on the front line. Sleep in peace tonight . . . I am an American Soldier, an American, an American Soldier."

Private First Class Riggs might also hear the words that were spoken many years ago regarding the band of brothers in Henry V. He could say, inspired by Shakespeare, "For he that sheds his blood with me is my brother. From this day to the ending of the world. But we in it shall be remembered, we few, we happy few, we band of brothers."

Private First Class Riggs, we will not forget you, an Army of one. He received the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal and the Army Service Ribbon. We thank you, Private First Class Riggs, for your service, your dedication and sacrifice to your country.

HEARING FROM AMERICA ON UNITED AIRLINES PENSION COLLAPSE

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to hear from America about the severe loss of private pensions. Tonight, I would like to share with my colleagues some of the testimony my Democratic colleagues and I have received through the first-ever congressional E-hearing.

It is clear from United Airlines' attempt to dump \$6.6 billion onto the Federal pension agency known as the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation and to cut over \$3 billion in pension benefits from its employees that the Federal pension laws are seriously broken.

Like United, other large companies have also abused Federal law to terminate their employees' pension plans and to deeply reduce the retirement security that hard-working Americans had every right to expect to have. These runaway pension terminations threaten employees, investors and taxpayers.

In the case of United, if it is allowed to dump all of its pension obligations onto the Federal Government, then its competitor airlines will seek to do the same. This is a real crisis, and it demands action. This crisis is about hard-working employees who in many cases will lose half or even more than half of the nest egg promised by their employers.

United failed to put away enough for the hard times, but it is the employees and taxpayers that are suffering the consequences. Congress needs to hear from United employees and from other Americans suffering from the collapse of private pension plans.

But, as with so many other important pocketbook issues, this Congress,

under the Republican leadership, does not listen. It does not afford average Americans an opportunity to be heard.

Democrats are listening, and we want to hear from America.

To do that, my Democratic colleagues and I on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and also with the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), held the first-ever congressional E-hearing. We set up an online forum to hear from experts on the United pension crisis and from the employees and the retirees themselves.

The response has been overwhelming. We have received some 2,000 heart-breaking e-mails. These statements demonstrate what a real crisis looks like. I want to share with my colleagues and the public some of these e-mails. On my Web site you can read all of the testimony at house.gov/georgemiller.

Here is the testimony of Mynette Wijnveldt, of Mililani, Hawaii, who writes: "My husband and I were both employed as United Airlines flight attendants for 27 years. In 2001, he was diagnosed with a rare illness and became totally disabled. At age 50, he had to medically retire because he was no longer able to work. While I am still employed by United, I am seriously concerned about our future.

"If United is allowed to dump this pension our family will be hit very hard. My husband's medical retirement was severely reduced due to the early retirement factors, and I have lost 35 to 40 percent because of cuts in the plans resulting from the negotiated changes to our contract.

"If United is able to dump our pensions on the PBGC and walk away from its promise, we stand to lose our home and I will be working until I can no longer do so."

Here is another testimony, from Proctor Lucius in Carlsbad, California: "I sit in jeopardy of losing over 70 percent of my monthly income and with financial obligations not only for my immediate family but assisted living care for my elderly mother. Our future is very ominously bleak. As you are well aware, the costs for everything, especially medical care, are increasing astronomically and Social Security is pitifully inadequate to compensate. Now Social Security is in jeopardy of being thrown into the giant casino of Wall Street. Where does it end?"

Mrs. E.L. Smith of Hanover, Pennsylvania, wrote: "My husband is a retired United Airline pilot with 33 years of loyal service to the company. He also is a two-tour veteran of the Vietnam War with service to his country. I am a second generation, former United Airlines customer service employee. We have an 18-year-old son starting college and a 9-year-old daughter. The loss of my husband's pension will be very difficult for our family, but the loss of medical care will cripple us. Many retirees are in this position, and due to preexisting medical conditions, they will not be able to afford coverage.

"It is frightening to know that the company that has been the backdrop of our lives for decades would do this to us. For many, this is a life-threatening situation.

"My husband was diagnosed with renal cell carcinoma and had a heart attack in 2002. I was diagnosed with cancer 2 years before that. We have significant out-of-pocket medical expenses at this time, and the pension loss will put us in a very precarious position. We will not be able to afford coverage. Please pass legislation to ensure that they do not terminate our pension."

These and many other statements, over 2,000, were submitted to our congressional E-hearing at the Committee on Education and Workforce. This is what a real crisis looks like. Now is the time for Congress to act. Now is the time to do that.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 2327, a bill that would put a 6-month moratorium on the pension terminations currently planned by United Airlines. During this 6-month period, Congress must act to stop companies from unfairly dumping their pension losses. This will allow United and its employees to negotiate a solution through the collective bargaining process. We must not let these hard-working Americans down. We must listen to these Americans. We must understand the tragedy that has befallen them and the financial situations that they have been thrust into after a lifetime of hard work on behalf of United Airlines.

KEEPING MARINES LIKE SECOND LIEUTENANT ILLARIO PANTANO

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday I had the pleasure of attending an American Legion fund-raiser in Wilmington, North Carolina, where the guest of honor was Marine Second Lieutenant Illario Pantano. As you know, I have spoken at great length about Lt. Pantano and his dedication and service to the Marine Corps and to our Nation.

Friday was a day of excitement and disappointment for me. I shared in the joy with his family as they celebrated the dismissal of the charges against him. But it was also a bittersweet celebration as Lt. Pantano announced his resignation from the Marine Corps.

I know the future will bring much happiness for him and his beautiful family, but I was saddened to think that the Marines were losing such an outstanding officer because of such an unfortunate situation.

Mr. Speaker, I was overcome with emotion as Lt. Pantano gave me his officer's sword after he announced his resignation. I cannot bring the sword on the floor of the House because of the rules, which I understand. It is an

honor I unwillingly accepted but will always treasure.

As I look at the sword, I cannot help but think that this whole matter could have been avoided by a more thorough investigation and appraisal of the charges before an Article 32 hearing was held.

All along, I had confidence that the Marine Corps would ultimately come to the right conclusion and exonerate Lt. Pantano of all charges, and, thankfully, that has indeed happened. My only hope is that, in the future, if any other such allegations are to come forward about another member of our Armed Services, a more efficient and complete investigation will take place before this situation ever gets to the seriousness of an Article 32 hearing.

Mr. Speaker, our men and women in uniform are our Nation's defenders and heroes. We are blessed to have so many young, brave Americans willing to risk their lives in the name of freedom.

Lt. Pantano was an outstanding leader that I would be proud to call my son or son-in-law.

□ 1930

I believe his resignation is a great loss for the Marine Corps and a great loss for America.

Let us make sure that in the future we do not lose any more of our Nation's defenders the way we have lost Lieutenant Pantano.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by asking God to bless our men and women in uniform, I will ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and I will ask God to please bless America and the future of this great Nation.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I am sure that the good lieutenant has recognized what a wonderful advocate he has had here on the floor of the House. I think that the gentleman should be commended for his perseverance, for his integrity, and for all that he did, not just for this particular young man, but what the gentleman does in terms of the moral integrity of this institution. I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is extremely kind, I thank him very much, and may God bless America.

THE NICS IMPROVEMENT ACT

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the NICS system, the National Instant Criminal Background

Check System, is the database used to check potential firearm buyers for any criminal record or history of mental illness.

In large part, NICS has been a success. Since 1994, more than 700,000 individuals were denied a gun for failing the background check. However, the NICS system is only as good as the information States provide. Twenty-five States have automated less than 60 percent of their felony convictions into the NICS system. In these States, many felons will not turn up on the NICS system and would be able to purchase guns with no questions asked. In 13 States, domestic violence restraining orders are not accessible through the NICS system. Common sense would dictate that you do not sell a gun to someone who has been served with a restraining order. Thirty-three States have not automated or do not share mental health records that could disqualify certain individuals from buying a gun.

Sadly, this particular loophole in the NICS system cost two of my constituents their lives. On March 8, 2002, Peter Troy purchased a .22 caliber semiautomatic rifle. He had a history of mental health problems, and his own mother had a restraining order against him as a result of his violent background. It was illegal for him to purchase a gun; but like so many others, he simply slipped through the cracks of the NICS system. Four days later, Peter Troy walked into Our Lady of Peace Church in Lynbrook, New York, opened fire, and killed the Reverend Lawrence Penzes and Eileen Tosner.

Peter Troy had no business buying a gun, and the system created to prevent him from doing so failed. It is only a matter of time before the system's failings provoke larger tragedies. We must fix the NICS system now.

While we lay the responsibility for the NICS system on the States, many State budgets are already overburdened, which is why I introduced H.R. 1415, the NICS Improvement Act. This legislation would provide grants to States to update the NICS system. States would be able to update the NICS databases to include felons, people with certain mental and emotional disabilities, and domestic abusers. It is actually enforcing the 1962 gun control law.

We need the NICS Improvement Act to become law, and we need more bills like this to be passed. These are ideas that impose no new restrictions on gun owners, but give the government the tools to ensure existing laws are effective and enforceable.

In fact, the NICS Improvement Act already passed the House in the 107th Congress by a voice vote. The bill had the endorsement of the National Rifle Association. Unfortunately, the other body never acted on the bill.

This is commonsense gun legislation we can all agree on. This bill will save lives while not infringing on anybody's second amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Congress to act quickly on H.R. 1415. If we can prevent a tragedy like the one that occurred at the Our Lady of Peace Church with a simple voice vote, why should we not do it right away?

**HOWARD DEAN AND WASTE,
FRAUD, AND ABUSE**

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I had planned to come down to the floor tonight and talk a little bit about some of the things that I had heard from the constituents in my district; but before I get to that, I have to address some of the comments that have been made by Democratic National Committee Chairman Howard Dean.

Everyone knows that Mr. Dean has a reputation for making outrageous and inaccurate statements, and that is really no secret. But one would think he would have toned down the false statements and the unfounded insults, given his new role as leader of the Democratic Party.

In the past month, Mr. Dean has said the House majority leader ought to "go back to Houston where he can serve his jail sentence." Mr. Speaker, that is despite the fact that the leader has not been accused or convicted of a crime.

This past week, Mr. Dean said, Republicans never made an honest living in their lives. He actually thought that was a reasonable, responsible comment. And this is just so asinine, so juvenile, that it is hard to believe that the Democratic Party would choose him to lead their party.

Mr. Speaker, the next example is so awful and so incredibly sad, I really hate to repeat it, but sometimes it is the light of truth that is the only thing that will stop people from saying things like this. In February, while addressing a group of African American Democrats, Mr. Dean said, "You think the Republican National Committee could get this many people of color in a single room? Only if they had the hotel staff in here."

I cannot fathom what is going through his head when he makes comments like these. It is increasingly apparent that he is out of touch with America and with people who do not march in lockstep with his view. We should not just let these comments slide. He is speaking for one of the Nation's major political parties, and his comments are out of line. I am glad to see that several Democratic Members in the House and Senate have disavowed his remarks, and I would hope that minority leaders PELOSI and REID would join them.

If Mr. Dean would like, maybe we should introduce him to plenty of good, hard-working conservatives who have never been given a single solitary thing, people who have made it on

their own; people who have built a business, who talk about the sweat equity that is in their business, because they have not only built it with their heart, they have built that business with their hands. They deserve the same respect any other American deserves, regardless of the party, because they know what a hard day's work is all about.

Mr. Dean's attitude and his comments are exactly why his party has failed for a decade to win back either the White House or Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to end my comments today without discussing some of the things my constituents and I have been talking about back in Tennessee. Like many of my colleagues, I have spent a great week talking with people in my district and getting their take on what we are doing or not doing here in Washington. This is one of the very best parts of my job.

I learned so much from the listening sessions in my district. We talked about our military; we honored our veterans; and, Mr. Speaker, we talked about issues like government spending, illegal immigration, and waste, fraud, and abuse, which are at the top of the list. And it is waste, fraud, and abuse that I want to touch on tonight for just a few minutes.

I have been working over the past months to target the tremendous number of taxpayer dollars that get wasted each and every year right here in Washington, and I want my colleagues to know that the folks back home are talking about this issue. They want to remind us that government has a spending problem, and that when we spend wisely, we spend less. I heard time and again from my constituents, it is a spending problem, it is a spending problem that you folks in Washington have. You do not know how to say no. They know that when we spend less and when we spend wisely, everybody benefits, especially future generations; and they know there is plenty of room, ample room for reform when it comes to government spending. They support the President's plan to reduce and eliminate underperforming programs and agencies, and they support the budget that this Congress passed that reduces by nearly 1 percent discretionary nonhomeland, nondefense spending. They want us to make even larger strides in that same direction.

We know that rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse is not going to be an easy project; it will be a long-term project, but over the next few months, we will be coming back to the floor to talk just about that issue, and I invite my colleagues to join me.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2744, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. PUTNAM, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-105) on the resolution (H. Res. 303) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2744) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 27, WITHDRAWING THE APPROVAL OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. PUTNAM, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-106) on the resolution (H. Res. 304) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) withdrawing the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

UNITED AIRLINES PENSION CRISIS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I will submit for the RECORD an article in the New York Times entitled, "Pension Loopholes Helped United Hide Troubles."

The article, by Mary Williams Walsh, discusses loopholes in the current laws that allow corporations to grossly underfund their employees' pensions, and to do so legally. They use accounting tricks to give the appearance of healthy financial standing; and as Senator GRASSLEY says, "We saw similar practices and events at Enron but, unfortunately, this time it is perfectly legal."

These companies keep the poor health of their pension funds hidden from the public until they decide to terminate them, as United Airlines currently is doing. United knowingly underfunded its pension fund as it faced bankruptcy, shielding from its workers the truth about their retirement futures.

I would like to share two statements from hard-working people in Illinois who are personally affected by pension-accounting sleight of hand. These statements are from the more than 2,000 dedicated United Airlines employees and retirees who submitted testimony to the online hearing that the

gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and I held highlighting the United pension crisis and clearly showed just how devastating losing one's retirement security can be.

The first letter is from Joseph Krist, Jr., Schaumburg, Illinois: "I am 68 years old and worked for United Airlines at O'Hare Field as an aircraft mechanic from September 1959 until October 2000. I was an aircraft mechanic in the United States Air Force from 1954 to 1958.

"My job at United Airlines was very challenging. We accomplished much work outside in all kinds of weather. In the winter months, if the hangars were full, the work was done outside with one man working while another would hold a heater on his hands. We worked with all kinds of hazardous fluids, which has given me and many of my fellow mechanics cancer and other medical problems. My oldest son was a mechanic for United for 11 years when he came down with leukemia and died 9 weeks later at the age of 34.

"Now that the pensions are being dropped by United Airlines, dumping it on the PBGC, we will be losing more of the money promised to us. I do not live high on the hog. We have two older cars and a 28-year-old house in Schaumburg, Illinois, which still carries a \$124,000 mortgage on it. We presently have this house on the market, as we will not be able to afford the mortgage and the real estate taxes with the estimated reduction in our pension. How will we pay for the increased cost of gas and other living expenses in the years ahead? How will we pay for medical insurance, treatments, and prescriptions?

"The thousands of people and their families who are being hurt by allowing United Airlines to terminate our pensions will surely snowball and affect everyone in the country as more companies shirk their responsibilities. We need someone to support us and give the retirees who sacrificed and dedicated their lives to making this airline and country great the money they earned by the sweat of their brow."

Another one from Karen Harvey-Kincaid of Streamwood, Illinois, and she writes to Congressman MILLER:

"I have been a United flight attendant for 20½ years, never missing a trip, never being late for check-in. I have truly been the friendly skies. I am now 46 years old, not old enough to retire from United, and not young enough to start over at another company. The truth is I do not want to work anywhere but United. But will I be able to afford to work there? I am not talking about the financial toll this has taken on me. It's the emotional roller coaster they have put us through for the last 2½ years. I honestly believe my health, sleeping, and eating habits have all suffered.

"I am now divorced after 12 years of marriage. I didn't take half of my husband's pension because I wanted to

keep mine. If I only would have known. I lie in bed at night worrying if I will lose my house, thinking how many more trips can I pick up this month, knowing that I am paid \$9 per hour less, paying for all of my benefits, losing thousands in vacation pay, and now, a reduced pension.

"I implore you to use this letter as part of your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have tears in my eyes as I write this. I got up at 4:15 a.m. and walked into my house at 7:21 p.m. tonight, after going to San Francisco and back. I welcomed and made happy all 694 passengers today. I only wish I was welcomed and happy at work."

That is again from Karen Harvey-Kincaid from Streamwood, Illinois, one of the more than 2,000 people who wrote to tell their personal stories, how they are being affected by the loss of their pensions. This may only be the beginning, Mr. Speaker, of what we hope will not be the opening of a floodgate of companies that want to escape their pension responsibilities.

[From the New York Times, Jun. 7, 2005.]

PENSION LOOPHOLES HELPED UNITED HIDE TROUBLES

(By Mary Williams Walsh)

Loopholes in the federal pension law allowed United Airlines to treat its pension fund as solid for years, when in fact it was dangerously weakening, according to a new analysis by the agency that guarantees pensions. That analysis is scheduled to be presented at a Senate Finance Committee hearing today.

A second report, by the comptroller general, found that most companies that operate pension funds are using the same loopholes. Those loopholes give companies ways—all perfectly legal—to make their pension plans look healthier than they really are, reducing the amount of money the companies must contribute.

United's pension fund failure is now the biggest since the government began guaranteeing pensions 30 years ago. Most companies are able to keep their pension plans going, despite the chronic, hidden weakness, because they are generating enough cash to meet their obligations to current retirees. Only when a company files for bankruptcy, as United did in December 2002, and terminates its pension plan, as United has, does the government step in and make the plan's true economic condition apparent.

"We saw similar practices and events at Enron, but unfortunately, this time it's perfectly legal," said Senator Charles E. Grassley, the Iowa Republican who is chairman of the finance committee. He said he had scheduled today's hearing because he wanted to find ways to keep pension disasters like the \$10 billion failure at United from happening at other companies.

"The rules are full of serious holes that need to be fixed as soon as possible," Senator Grassley said. "No one should make the mistake that this is an airline-only problem. The reality is that companies everywhere have used the same arcane pension-funding rules" to shrink their contributions.

Many analysts believe that the federal Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation will one day require a bailout because it has been forced to pick up a number of large failed private pension plans. The more big defaults there are in the meantime, the more the eventual bailout will cost.

The federal pension law was enacted in 1974 after a number of scandals in which compa-

nies went bankrupt and their workers discovered there was little or nothing set aside to pay the pensions they had been promised. The law was supposed to make pension failures a thing of the past by requiring companies to set aside money in advance—enough each year to pay the benefits the work force earned that year.

The law also required that if a pension fund got into trouble, its sponsor was to quickly pump in more money, warn its employees about the problem and pay higher premiums to the federal pension insurance program.

United did none of those things, even as its pension fund withered, because its calculations were making the fund look healthy. The fund is made up of four individual plans for various groups of employees.

United's calculations followed the letter of the law until July 2004, when the airline announced that it owed \$72.4 million to its pension fund but would not make the contribution. By that time, the company had filed for bankruptcy protection.

The \$72.4 million would have done little good by then, because the pension guaranty agency told the bankruptcy court that the pension fund had a shortfall of \$8.3 billion.

In its analysis, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation found that in 2002, when United was determining how much it had to contribute to its four plans, it calculated that the plans for its pilots and its mechanics each had more money than needed. It further calculated that the plans for its flight attendants and its managerial workers were close to being fully funded, and did not need any special attention.

On the basis of those calculations, United, a unit of the UAL Corporation, made no pension contributions that year.

Those numbers are on file with the Labor Department. But they do not square with the pension numbers United provided to the Securities and Exchange Commission. That agency requires companies to calculate pension values in a different way. At United, that method showed the four pension plans to be only 50 percent funded; that is, they had only half as much money as they needed to make good on United's promises to its workers.

Pension calculations done for S.E.C. filings have nothing to do with the rules for calculating contributions. But had United been required to use the S.E.C. pension numbers to determine its contribution that year, it would have had to pump money into the plans quickly. The pension law requires companies to make special catch-up contributions any time their pension funds fall below an 80 percent funded level, or even when they fall below 90 percent funded, if they stay at those levels for several years. A plan that was only 50 percent funded would be considered a real emergency.

But the law allowed United to say its pension plans were fully funded, or nearly so, and, therefore, no more money was needed. United's employees were not informed that anything was amiss, as the law requires of badly weakened plans. Nor did United have to pay the higher premiums to the pension guaranty agency that the law expects.

The discrepancy between a company's pension report to the S.E.C. and the Labor Department is but one example of the problems. At today's Senate hearing, David M. Walker, the comptroller general, is expected to testify that companies have so many ways of tweaking their pension calculations that they almost never have to make the special catch-up contributions that Congress required of plans that are slipping.

A recent study by the Government Accountability Office, which Mr. Walker runs, examined eight years of records for the nation's 100 largest pension funds, and found

that only six plans in the entire group ever had to pay the special contributions in that period.

For two of the plans, it was already too late by the time the special contributions came due. Years of insufficient contributions had taken their toll, and those plans collapsed and were taken over by the government.

The G.A.O. study attributes some of the misleading pension math to the use of inappropriate actuarial assumptions in projections and some to a process called "smoothing," in which actuaries attempt to eliminate short-term volatility by spreading changes over several years.

But the pension agency's analysis of United's case shows that the rules for tracking contributions made in prior years have also caused a great deal of trouble. The rules allow companies that put in more than the required minimum in any given year to keep the excess amount on their books and to use it to offset their required contributions in years when cash is tight.

These excess contributions from the past are kept in a running tab called a credit balance.

The trouble is that at United, as at many companies, money contributed in the 1990's was invested in assets that lost value during the bear market that began in 2000. But the pension rules allow companies not only to keep their pension credit balances on the books at the original amount, but they are even permitted to allow their credit balances to compound in value at some interest rate determined by the plan's actuary.

When United's calculations finally began to show that contributions were quickly needed, in 2003, the airline was able to satisfy the requirement with just a small amount of cash and lots of bookkeeping entries from its credit balance.

Senator Grassley said he believed many companies were "booking phony investment gains to hide that workers' pensions are going down the tubes."

He said he hoped the hearing would lead to legislation that would eliminate the loopholes that made such maneuvers possible.

In a later session today, the finance committee is scheduled to hear from executives of some of the major airlines, and from the leaders of some of the unions for airline employees.

□ 1945

SALUTING THE DOC AND JOHNNY SHOW

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to two central Floridians marking a special anniversary. Doc Holliday and Johnny Magic have been a team on the Orlando airwaves for 15 years now.

In an industry where many hear the words "you are fired" more often than Donald Trump's would-be apprentices, the Doc and Johnny Show on XL 106.7 has stood the test of time. These guys are like gum under a bus seat. They have survived four presidents, three hurricanes, and have gotten themselves in trouble too many times to count.

The idea for the Doc and Johnny show came the way many great ideas

in this country come about, over a beer. Doc Holliday is a huge sports fan with a reputation for enjoying the big game with a big beverage. Johnny Magic is a single guy in his 40s, loved by the station's female fans, which sort of makes him the Fonz of Orlando.

They have worked together 15 years and are still going strong. And behind one of the most successful morning radio shows in Central Florida are two men who have shown a strong commitment to making my home town of Orlando a better place. Let me give you three examples.

First, in 1991, Doc and Johnny helped 30 needy families make sure they had Christmas presents under the tree for their children. Last year, the Baby DJ Program help make sure 5,000 kids had toys at Christmas. It is a program I am proud to have personally donated to.

Second, after the events of September 11, 2001, Doc and Johnny broke from their regular format and instead had numerous elected and law enforcement officials on their radio show to make sure the people of Orlando had the very latest information on the war in terrorism in what was a very uncertain time for our Nation.

Finally, when my State was hit last summer with hurricane after hurricane, Doc and Johnny's Neighbor Helping Neighbor program set up shop at a local mall and gave listeners a place to donate and pick up hurricane relief supplies, all free of charge.

When I asked their long term sidekick, Grace Vazquez, her favorite memory about Doc and Johnny, she wrote about a time when the show was on the road in Key West. Grace fell off a moped and broke her arm. Through it all she writes, "One, they never left my side. Two, they still made me laugh. Or maybe it was the painkillers".

Mr. Speaker, Doc may be a fast-talking guy from New Jersey, and Johnny may be a southerner from North Carolina, but my home town of Orlando, Florida, is a better place because they decided to make their home there. I wish them a happy 15th anniversary on their radio show.

SMART SECURITY AND THE CASE FOR LEAVING IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the common theme to the war in Iraq has been the Bush Administration's ability and willingness to mislead the American people. First, they misled about weapons of mass destruction. Then, nearly 2 years ago, they falsely declared the end of major combat operations.

Now they are openly declaring success of the mission, and President Bush regularly speaks of an increasingly democratic Iraq. This assessment suggests the degree to which the President fails to comprehend the disastrous lack

of security that has plagued Iraq over the last 2 years. Personally, I am frightened that our own President has such a failed understanding about the reality of the war that he started.

Just as disturbing were recent comments by the Vice President, DICK CHENEY. In an interview, he said that the Iraqi insurgency was in its last throes. I am not sure which press reports the Vice President has been reading, but somehow I do not think his optimistic assessment of Iraq's insurgency is grounded in fact.

Unfortunately, misleading assessments of the war like these do not magically secure Iraq from the true threats that it faces; and the true threats are an increasingly strengthened Iraqi insurgency, encouraged by the continued U.S. military occupation.

On the ground, a violent wave of car bombings and other attacks killed 80 U.S. soldiers and more than 700 Iraqis in the month of May alone. Vice President CHENEY calls this the last throes?

At some point, the Bush Administration needs to admit what the rest of the American people know, that its current strategy in Iraq is failing. Recent polls show that 58 percent of Americans disapprove of the President's handling of the situation. Now it is time for the President to start listening to the American people.

Members of Congress in both parties understand that our Iraq policy is a disaster. When the House recently debated the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006, 122 Democrats, 5 Republicans and 1 Independent, totaling 128 Members of Congress, voted in favor of my amendment expressing the sense of Congress that the President should establish a plan for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are less secure, not more secure as a result of the war in Iraq. This war has created a whole new generation of terrorists whose common bond is their hatred for the United States and our aggressive militarism.

Unfortunately, we do not follow a smart plan, but fortunately there is a plan that would secure America for the future, the Smart Security Resolution, H.Con Res 158, which I recently reintroduced with the support of 49 of my House colleagues. Smart is a sensible, multilateral American response to terrorism for the 21st century; and it will help us address the threats we face as a Nation. Smart security will prevent acts of terrorism in countries like Iraq by addressing the very conditions which allow terrorism to take root: poverty, despair, resource scarcity, and lack of educational opportunities, as starters.

Instead of rushing off to war under false pretenses, smart security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues, dealing with global crises diplomatically instead of resorting to armed conflict.

Instead of maintaining a long-term military occupation in Iraq, our future efforts to help the Iraqi people should follow the smart approach: humanitarian assistance, coordinated with our international allies, to rebuild Iraq's war-torn physical and economic infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the President must create a plan to bring home the hundreds of thousands of U.S. soldiers fighting in Iraq, helping to secure Iraq by giving Iraq back to the Iraqis and saving the lives of thousands of American troops. We must end this long and destructive war.

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.)

RENEGOTIATING CAFTA

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, at a White House news conference last week President Bush, called on this Congress to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement this summer.

This morning in this Chamber, next to me, the most powerful Republican in the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), once again promised a vote, this time by July 4. Actually, a month or so ago the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) promised that there would be a vote in May, but this time he says he actually means it.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been speaking out against the Central American Free Trade Agreement have a message in return. Let us scrap this agreement. Clearly, this Congress does not support it. And let us renegotiate a better Central American Free Trade Agreement.

President Bush signed this agreement fully 1 year and 2 weeks ago. Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration, Morocco, Singapore, Chile, Australia, all trade agreements negotiated by this administration have been ratified by Congress within 65 days of the President affixing his signature to them. CAFTA has languished in Congress now for 54 weeks without a vote because this wrong-headed trade agreement offends Republicans and Democrats alike.

Just look at what has happened with our trade policy in the last decade. 1992, the year I ran for Congress, we had a trade deficit in this country of \$38 billion. Today, a dozen years later, last year actually, in 2004, our trade deficit was \$618 billion.

From \$38 billion, when the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and others of us in this Chamber opposed

the North American Free Trade Agreement, from \$38 billion a dozen years ago to \$618 billion today.

It is clear our trade policy is not working. Mr. Speaker, opponents of CAFTA know that it is simply an extension of the North American Free Trade Agreement, actually a dysfunctional cousin of NAFTA, which clearly did not work for our country.

Look at the chart. Look at the number of jobs we have seen lost in this country as a result of trade policy.

In the last 5 years, not all of these jobs are trade policy, but many of them are. In the last 5 years, the States in red have lost more than 20 percent of their manufacturing jobs. New York, 222,000. Pennsylvania 200,000. Ohio, 217,000. Michigan, 210,000. North and South Carolina, 306,000 combined. Alabama and Mississippi, another 125,000. State after State after State has lost hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs.

It is the same old story. Every time there is a trade agreement, every time there is a trade agreement, the President says it will mean more jobs for Americans, it will mean more exports for the U.S., it will mean more manufacturing done in our country and selling those products overseas, and the President promises it will be better wages for workers in the developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, Ben Franklin said the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over again and expecting a different outcome. The President makes the same promises on NAFTA, on PNTR, on trade promotion authority, the same promises, every trade agreement. And every time it comes out exactly the opposite. That is why there is overwhelming bipartisan opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Since then, the administration and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and Republican leadership have tried every trick in the book to pass CAFTA. The administration started off by linking CAFTA to helping democracy in the developing world. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, Deputy Secretary of State Zoellick both have said CAFTA will help on the war on terrorism. I am not really sure why, but they said that we need to pass this agreement with Central America to help us in the war on terrorism. But we know 10 years of NAFTA has done nothing to improve security between Mexico and the United States, so that argument simply does not sell.

In May, then, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce set up a junket for the six presidents from Central America and the Dominican Republic, taking them to Cincinnati and Los Angeles and Washington and Albuquerque and around the United States, hoping they might be able to sell the American people the press and the Congress on CAFTA. Again they failed.

Earlier this year, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

DELAY), and the Ways and Means Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), said there would be a vote on CAFTA by Memorial Day. Memorial Day came and went without a vote. Why? Because they did not have the votes.

Now we have a new deadline for this failed trade agreement. It is July 4th.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats, business and labor groups, farmers, ranchers, faith-based groups, the National Council of Churches, the Latin American Council of Churches, churches, business groups, religious leaders environmental groups, all have said, if CAFTA countries and the U.S. renegotiate CAFTA, we can get a better agreement next time.

□ 2000

KORNER'S FOLLY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a unique historic home located in Kernersville in North Carolina's fifth district. It is called Korner's Folly.

Some folks call Korner's Folly the strangest house ever built. Others say they are amazed at its resemblance to a small castle one would more likely find on the banks of the Rhine River. Everyone is certain that few houses equal its unique nature.

Upon entering the building, one walks past the "witch's corner" which is complete with fireplace and chimney. Soon, however, one learns that he or she is welcome as the house is square with entrances on each side for visitors to come and go as they wish.

Built first as a carriage house with stables, bachelor's quarters and studio, Korner's Folly stands proudly on Main Street in Kernersville, North Carolina. It was built by Jules Gilmer Korner, an artist and interior designer, who is credited with painting Bull Durham Tobacco signs in many areas of the country.

Although 1880 is given as the completion date, Mr. Korner's zeal for decorating and altering the house is evident. The stables were soon turned into a library. The reception, or ballroom, on an upper level with a 20-foot ceiling is decorated with fresco-type pictures and features two magnificent fireplaces. At the very top, one is amazed to find a theater named Cupid's Park for the paintings of cherubs on the ceiling. With 22 rooms, which have ceiling heights from under 6 feet to over 20 feet, a tour brings many surprises and attests to the creativity of the builder.

This unique building was saved from deterioration in 1971 by a group of public-spirited Kernersville citizens who purchased it and began the process of preservation and restoration. They understood the importance of preserving

this unique building as the cornerstone for tourism in the town of Kernersville. They later gave it to the North Carolina Historical Preservation Society which organized Korner's Folly, Incorporated, in order to continue its preservation.

The home now serves as a wonderful museum and a great place to visit. As the words inscribed on the sidewalk by Mr. Korner say, "Come in, you are at home."

I am proud that Korner's Folly is located in Kernersville, North Carolina, and in the Fifth Congressional District which I now represent.

MISMANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC FUNDS

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, there is a major political scandal that is unfolding in the State of Ohio; and I am sure Americans remember how important Ohio was in this recent Presidential election.

If citizens wish to know more about it, they should go to the Toledo Blade Web site, the major newspaper that has been involved in helping to put information out to the public and help Ohioans and, indeed, people in this country, understand what is happening.

In Ohio what is happening is that the Governor of our State has permitted millions and millions of dollars of workers' money from the Ohio Workers Compensation Fund to be invested in high-risk instruments, coins and we think perhaps what is called collectibles, although we are not sure yet. And these investments are ones that no other State in the Union has allowed. But what happened was that some of these so-called high-risk investments when they went to try to find them, it appears as though millions of dollars of these coins are now missing.

There is a grand jury that has been seated in Ohio now that is beginning to call people forward because some of these same individuals involved in this scandal were used to channel money to the Bush campaign in Ohio. In fact, the President of the United States has already returned \$4,000 to one of the givers. We do not know where this is all going to lead, but it is a huge, huge story.

Our Governor, when asked, what do you think about this, that the State of Ohio has taken all of this money, over \$50 million initially and given it to this coin dealer to put into these high-risk investments, what do you think of it, the Governor of Ohio said, hey, we are making money on that. I think it is a pretty good idea.

He thought he was making money on it? Well, think about it. How is it secured? No other State in the Union permitted investments in coins and collectibles. He was only looking at what he thought was yield. But the cardinal

rules of investing public money are safety first; liquidity, can you get it back over night if you need it; and only running a distant third, yield.

This is a very serious issue and yesterday in the State of Colorado there was a search warrant that was issued on one of the related individuals involved in this scandal, and they were in his house for over 12 hours pulling out investments in cigars, wine, over half a million dollars of wine I guess in that house alone.

The State of Ohio is now, through the Inspector General of Ohio, trying to find where is the workmen's compensation money that was improperly invested by those responsible, who had public responsibility for this.

Then today a story broke in Ohio that this same Bureau of Workers Compensation admitted it has lost \$215 million in a high-risk fund that few people knew about. The bureau had invested \$355 million with a Pittsburgh investment firm called MDL Capital Management beginning in 1998. But last year after diverting \$225 million into a fund that works like a hedge fund, the fund itself lost \$215 million. And although the bureau says it knew about the loss since last year, Governor Taft was only notified about it today.

There are investigations going on, including the Ohio Inspector General, the bureau spokesman, Jeremy Jackson told the Toledo Blade today. But the news came to light as a handful of agencies are looking into the bureau and its dealings with the Toledo area coin dealer, Mr. Tom Noe, who is one of the people that took some of this \$50 million and put it into coins and purportedly collectibles.

The Ohio Ethics Commission on Monday said it was looking into other investments held by the bureau, the agency charged with providing assistance to injured workers.

This is where I want to say in my district, the ninth district of Ohio, we have had four deaths of people, iron workers trying to build the largest transportation project in Ohio history over the Meumee River. These were unnecessary deaths because the State of Ohio was not inspecting the project properly. In fact, though the project was a year and a half ahead of schedule, they signed an acceleration agreement with the company to try to make the workers finish the project faster, even though it was a year and a half ahead of schedule. And the cranes that were used in this project collapsed because the company was not securing the foot of the cranes properly.

So the State of Ohio not only has taken workers' compensation money and misinvested it, they have not even done their job in protecting the lives of citizens who are trying to build Ohio forward in a very rough economy. It is unbelievable what is going on in our State.

At the center of this new loss of money was a man named Terry Gasper who was the former chief financial offi-

cer for Ohio's Bureau of Workers Compensation that is supposed to be there for the workers. The money is set aside by the companies for the workers, not to be put in these crazy investments that can never be recovered, but for workers who are injured on the job.

By the way, on that transportation project in our district, we have many injured workers who would benefit from that money. I will be submitting for the RECORD the most recent article about additional losses from the State of Ohio.

Shame on the Governor of Ohio. Shame on the State officials of the State of Ohio. What a tragedy they have perpetrated on the people of our State.

[From the Blade, June 7, 2005]

(By Mike Wilkinson and James Drew)

COLUMBUS.—The Ohio Bureau of Workers' Compensation admitted today that it lost \$215 million in a high-risk fund that few people knew about.

The bureau had invested \$355 million with a Pittsburgh investment firm, MDL Capital Management, beginning in 1998.

But last year, after diverting \$225 million into a fund that works like a hedge fund, the fund lost \$215 million. Although the bureau has known about the loss since last year, Gov. Bob Taft was notified about it today.

"There are investigations going on, including the [Ohio] Inspector General," bureau spokesman Jeremy Jackson told The Blade.

The news came to light as a handful of agencies are looking into the bureau and its dealings with Toledo-area coin dealer Tom Noe. The Ohio Ethics Commission on Monday said it was looking into other investments held by the bureau, the agency charged with providing assistance to injured workers.

At the center of the MDL deal were Terry Gasper, the former chief financial officer for the bureau, and Jim McLean, the chief investment officer. In a memo to the governor, Tina Kilmeyer, acting bureau administrator, said Mr. Gasper did not notify former bureau Administrator James Conrad about the investment.

In the wake of the growing Noe scandal, Mr. Conrad resigned two weeks ago and left the agency on Friday. Mr. McLean was put on paid administrative leave today pending a management review of the situation.

The bureau last year asked the Ohio Attorney General to appoint special counsel in the case and ordered Mr. Gasper to either resign or be fired. He resigned Oct. 6, 2004.

MEDAL OF HONOR FOR DICK WINTERS

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to introduce legislation to authorize and request the President of the United States to award the Medal of Honor to Richard D. Winters of Hershey, Pennsylvania, for acts of valor on June 6, 1944, in Normandy, France while an officer in the 101st Airborne Division.

Mr. Speaker, I do not take this issue lightly. It is with extreme concern that I had to resort to taking this action to right a wrong that occurred 61 years

ago. 61 years ago, Mr. Speaker, on D-Day at a place called Brecourt Manor, Dick Winters led an ad hoc group of paratroopers, mostly from E Company, 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment, against a numerically superior force of German defenders, manning a battery of four 105-millimeter guns.

These guns were zeroed in on firing on Utah Beach during the initial D-Day seaborne landings. With only 12 men, Dick Winters led the attack that destroyed the German battery, killed 15 Germans, wounded many more, and took 12 prisoners.

The base-of-fire technique that Dick Winters used would become a textbook case for assault on a fixed site and is still taught at West Point.

Winters and his men destroyed these guns during a vicious engagement, lasting over 2 hours against heavy machine gun and infantry fire. This action saved countless American lives on Utah Beach. Dick would later be wounded, refused to be evacuated, maintaining that he would stay with his company.

He was nominated for the Medal of Honor by Colonel Robert Sink, his commanding officer of the 506th Regiment, a West Point graduate. His application for denial of the medal was based on an utterly arbitrary reason. The division commander directed that only one Medal of Honor was permitted to be awarded in the 101st Airborne Division for the Normandy campaign.

Mr. Speaker, it was never the intent of Congress to have an artificial limitation imposed on a soldier who committed acts of heroism and bravery as documented by his colleagues, by his subordinates, and by his leaders. Winters was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Nation's second highest military award for his actions. This is a high honor, but he deserves the Medal of Honor as recommended by his commanding officer.

The Army has reviewed the matter and maintains that the Distinguished Service Award is appropriate. Thousands of people worldwide disagree. Again, Mr. Speaker, because of an artificial limitation imposed by the commander of the 101st Airborne that only one medal be given for the Normandy campaign, Dick Winters' recognition and the recognition of those who served with him have been denied.

Dick Winters was immortalized by HBO in the miniseries "Band of Brothers," produced by Tom Hanks and Steven Spielberg. Andy Ambrose, the son of Stephen Ambrose who wrote "Band of Brothers," has publicly supported Winters for the Medal of Honor, and so have thousands of other people all across the country, including every military person that served with Dick Winters and observed his heroism.

The entire Pennsylvania congressional delegation, all 19 members, Democrats and Republicans, including the gentleman from Hershey, Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN), where Dick Winters resides, have signed on as original

co-sponsors of this legislation. Both chambers of the Pennsylvania State legislature having agreed and have publicly supported and passed legislation encouraging Congress to take this action.

Dick Winters is a humble man. He did not want this kind of attention. In fact, those who have supported this effort who came to me have said that Dick Winters did not want this to take place. But all of those people who served with Dick Winters, all of those soldiers who were there, who saw, who observed, and who realized his heroism in landing on D-Day and taking Easy Company all the way in to Hitler's headquarters, understand that Dick Winters deserves the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when Congress enacted the legislation creating the Medal of Honor, it did not allow artificial imposition of limitations. It said whatever soldier under any condition that is recognized by his or her peers for their actions should be eligible to receive this commendation.

In the case of Dick Winters, because of an artificial limitation, he has been denied that solemn honor of our country.

My bill does not mandate that the President award this Medal of Honor. It simply authorizes and allows the President to make this honor if he so chooses.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, we just celebrated D-Day. Sixty-one years later, when hundreds and thousands of American men stormed the beaches to liberate Europe, one of those bravest heroes, one of those extraordinary of the ordinary people who responded was Dick Winters. I encourage my colleagues to sign on and join us in righting this wrong and providing the support for the President to give Richard D. Winters the Medal of Honor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). 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.)

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

(Ms. CARSON 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 California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD 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 New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE FUTURE OF THIS GREAT COUNTRY

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I address the body tonight about the future of this great country, and the previous speaker said we did just have a chance to celebrate Memorial Day.

In the district that I was in, we recognized the anniversary of the D-Day landing, and we understand that it is with the sacrifices of brave young men and women throughout history that a nation is able to sustain itself, and it is only through those sacrifices in each generation. One generation cannot pay for the next generation.

But, tonight, I would like to look a little bit at the economic future that faces us, both in the world and in this country, and would like to have a discussion about what it is that will allow America to offer its promise into the future so that our sons and daughters, our children and grandchildren, would have the opportunities that our generation has seen.

I am the second-oldest year of the baby boom generation, and I will tell my colleagues that my mother and father grew up in very difficult circumstances in West Texas. When my father graduated from high school, he went to work for a cousin of his farming and actually in the role as a sharecropper.

I recently had a chance to visit with my mom and dad in the place where I was born and lived the first 2 years of my life. They were in circumstances that not many Americans would look to these days and find satisfactory, and yet I had parents that were willing to work through all of the circumstances that faced them to raise six children, to give every one of them the opportunity to attend college and graduate from college.

My mother went back to school when I was starting college. She graduated summa cum laude in 3 years, and I graduated somewhat below that in four and a half years, but their sacrifices in my parents' generation made possible the potentials in my generation. Now then we must look beyond our current circumstances into the future, and that is the discussion that I would like to have tonight.

When I am discussing that, I would, first of all, like to keep track with numbers on the chart and do some recognition there. So we will continue the discussion here much like a chalkboard discussion.

The first number I would put on the chalkboard is the number 2.55. That is the approximate size of our outlays, the approximate size of the budget that the United States has every year. It is the approximate size of the government spending. Now if we need a benchmark, and all numbers are relative, and so a benchmark that is very handy to the 2.55, that is trillion, is also then \$11 trillion, and that is the approximate size of our economy. So 2.55 is our government size. Eleven is the size then of our economy.

The important thing to understand about those two numbers is the relationship, and I simply divide the 11 into 2.55, and that equals about 23 percent. The 23 percent then is the most important number in the whole relationship. That is the percent of the 2.55 of our overall budget, and we, in fact, as people in our individual households are concerned about that same relationship.

If we want to know how much money that we are saving, we simply take the amount of money that we earn, we subtract the amount of money that we spend, and then we would have the rest available either for discretionary spending or for savings.

If the United States has one weakness going into the future, it is our savings rate, and that rate generally is about 1 percent. For instance, in comparing that, if one looked into mainland China, we would find that the people there, according to recent reports, save almost 60 percent of their total income. That tells us that there is much money available for reinvesting. There is much money available in times of economic downturns. There is much money there for education. There is much money there for the future.

So as we consider the U.S., we are right now the world's leading economy. We are, in fact, one-quarter of the entire world's whole economy, and so we would say that, with that information, that the U.S. is poised for a good future, and I do not doubt that.

As a business owner, as a person who made payroll checks, who looked into the future to ensure that I could write the payroll checks the next 2 weeks and the next month, I always liked to do forecasting. It is at this point, where we begin to examine some of the relationships that exist, some of the pressures in our economic system, that we begin to have deep understandings about things that we should be doing right now.

Always, wisdom is the taking of a current situation, adding time to it, extending it as far into the future as possible and discerning those things, those outcomes from current situations or current activities.

As we begin to take a look at the competitive pressures that we face in the world, all of us know and we recognize that our \$11 trillion economy is under duress. Some would say a lot of duress, some would say less duress. But we would know that China, for in-

stance, is causing great trade to occur between the U.S. and China. When any one of us go to the store, we find certain numbers of goods on the store shelves that actually only originate in China, and we know that with each \$15 purchase or each \$150 purchase that that money goes towards China. So we would say that China represents a downward pressure on our \$11 trillion.

Let us say that the 11 becomes 10. Then the important thing is to understand that we still must do the division. If we have a \$10 trillion economy, then our relationship here is 2.55. That is, over 25 percent of our economy at that point would be government spending. So anything that drives our overall economic size, the \$11 trillion of our economy, to a lower point are things that put us on an unstable ground. Anything that causes this top figure, the numerator, to increase also are things that push us in an unstable direction.

As we consider the effects, we must understand the relationship of what happens when this number begins to increase and what happens when this number begins to decrease. As the 2.33 gets larger, then we can understand, and economists of all kinds agree, that we move toward stagnation if our relationship gets too large.

We have stagnation if the number becomes larger, and if the number becomes smaller, then we have vitality and growth. So if this number is lesser on the scale of vitality, if this number begins to get larger and larger, then we would see stagnation occur.

There are examples of that in the world right now. Our number is .25; and, of course, we must add State and local taxes, State and local governments. Because the effect is cumulative. That as we consider adding about 16 percent State and local, then our number is actually converted to about .40. Since those State and local taxes and spending are beyond the capabilities of the Federal Government to affect, we simply understand that as we approach .25 in this Nation, we move towards stagnation. As we make the number smaller, we move toward vitality and growth; and so .25, according to many economists, is an extremely important position for us.

Now as we look around the globe, we might want to consider other countries, just to verify the example. Germany is an example, and Germany at this current point has a relationship not of .23 but of .52. If the relationship is actually .52, we would say, well, if this theory holds true, if this economic premise holds true, that we would think that Germany has a more stagnant economy, one that is less vital, one that has less potential to create jobs. The Germans themselves say that they have not created a job in 10 years.

They have economic spending of the government that is too high a relationship to the overall economy, and what that does is it begins to soak out the reinvestment dollars. It soaks away

the potential for companies to grow and reinvest in research and development. It soaks away the pay raises so that even the people are stagnant in their incomes, and there is not a growth potential.

So we find that, in fact, this number got larger for the European countries, and Germany is just one of the many European countries that is stuck at a low growth rate and with very limited capability to produce jobs and new industries.

If we look even closer, we would have to consider the former Soviet Union. What Ronald Reagan understood was that the Soviet Union had a number that was very high. It was almost a fully controlled state economy, and he understood that, with just a little bit of pressure, the Soviet Union's economic system would simply collapse. He began to arm us, watching them arm in return, watching them drive their government spending higher and higher, knowing that we could sustain it because we had low percentages and they could not sustain it because they had high percentages. In fact, during Ronald Reagan's tenure as President, the economy in the Soviet Union collapsed, the Wall fell down, and freedom moved to many people.

While an astute observer would ask at this point, what about mainland China? Mainland China has got a state economy that has the Communist Party that runs that government exactly the same way as the Soviet Union. But, in fact, what has happened is that the Chinese have recognized, after the mistakes the Soviets have made, they have, in fact, privatized pieces of their economy. So the estimate for China is actually about .40. Estimates range as high .60, which is not much above Germany, and not everything is known about the Chinese economy, but the estimate is that where we are at .23 and, adding in our State and local economies, about .40, the estimation is that China is very similar to that .40.

So one would ask, what about their economy? The Chinese economy is performing very well. There are pockets of poverty throughout China, but the Chinese economy is growing strongly. They are producing jobs. They are, in fact, showing that this relationship between government spending and the entire economic size is, in fact, a very important measure.

It is not enough to simply know right now what the situation is. We must look forward into the future. We must forecast where we are going, and if we allow our economy to decrease down to 10 or 9 because of the competitive pressures of China, the competitive pressures of the European Union are also well-known, the competitive pressures of India, providing much software, those competitive pressures are all realized as taking pieces of our economy because they are providing as good a product as we are at a better price. Then we realize that the downward, the

long-term trend is for this economy size to decrease, increasing the relationship of government spending to our economy, moving us towards stagnation, moving us toward a point where our children might not have the hopes and the dreams fulfilled that our generation has had.

□ 2030

Now, if the economic size is sustained and we are able to continue our growth and continue to build our economy against this worldwide competition, we also have to worry about the size of our government spending. If we maintain this \$11 trillion or even grow it, our number here could increase simply by increasing the size of our government spending. That is a very important function as we consider our relationships right now. We are fighting currently on the Republican side to hold spending back. We are somewhat hampered because of the mandatory spending programs which are allowed to escalate without us being able to give comment on those each year. In this year's budget process, though, those mandatory programs, welfare, Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare, those mandatory programs are actually coming to review to see if we cannot begin to dampen this down because there is great understanding we are facing increasing economic pressures. Also there is understanding if we can reduce spending, there is movement here toward a smaller relationship and toward a more vital economy, giving promise for the future.

So we have to answer the questions, how are we spending the money and to what purpose, and are we actually achieving anything. One of the more distressing things as I look through many of the programs, we are spending lots of money but we are not coming out with outcomes. The outcomes desired maybe are never measured by the bureaucracy that puts the money in. There is not a relationship between money spent and outcomes, so we have to ask ourselves how can we convert to that sort of a system.

There are considerations in this Congress that would allow us to measure benefit for dollars spent and not just talk about the dollars spent. Many times we in this body are simply urged to spend more money to cure the problem. The problem is not that we do not spend enough money, the problem is that we do not always get the outcomes that we would like.

For instance, there are welfare-to-work programs that for \$50 per person operate and there are programs that for \$500 per person operate, and then we have some programs trying to put some people back to where the expenditure is \$30,000 per person. At some point we can no longer just throw money at the \$30,000-per-person program saying that it is worth any cost to put people back to work. Instead, we need to put the most people back to work the most effectively for the few-

est number of dollars. Those are business decisions that anyone in business would have to make, and they are business decisions that we in this country are going to have to make. We are either going to make those decisions while we have a nice future looking at us, or we are going to wait until we move into stagnation and then try to correct it from a point of weakness.

For myself as a former business owner, I wish we would go ahead as a Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, and recognize that Republicans and Democrats are not enemies of each other. The enemies of the country are those who would decrease our economic size; they are those who would force us into greater spending for no greater output; and they are those, as the terrorists say their ambition is, who would annihilate America. Those are the enemies of America. Republicans and Democrats have different philosophies and different points of view, but in my mind those are simply tensions on the system to pull us back and forth. But we are not enemies; we each want to see our kids and grandkids have a future that we ourselves have seen. That is my commitment in coming to Congress, to see what we can do to ensure that the future of this great country has the vitality and the vibrancy to continue to offer promise for new generations.

If we are going to consider the spending, we have to understand the competitive models of government. We often are very familiar with competitive models in companies. Formerly, much of the retail buying in this country was done at Montgomery Wards, maybe Wacker's if we went back far enough. Today, the great amount of retailing is done by large chains like Wal-Mart and Target. They provide great avenues for shoppers to go and satisfy their daily needs; but those companies came about, replacing other companies that did not see the efficiencies of greater distribution points, the efficiencies of computerization. So each one of us in our own way is familiar with competition that occasionally will drive one company out of business while raising up a new replacement in its place.

If we are familiar with competition among companies, we also to an extent have seen competition among States. One State will offer incentives so that a company would come in and provide jobs in that State. We find States that will simply bid away jobs from another State by offering greater incentives. So in our mind-set, we are very familiar with competition among companies.

We are somewhat familiar with competition among States. What we must begin to be aware of is that there is competition among countries. Entire nations are beginning to compete the cost of government. They are saying we can regulate you in the same way except at a better price. Large international companies are beginning to move around. They have flexibility.

The Internet allows the exchange of data freely; and if a company can find a nation that charges a lower tax rate, they are just as liable to go there to find their home as they are to go to a nation that provides higher tax rates.

Now, that all needs to be considered in this entire economic discussion, and so we will flip the chart here. We will begin to look at one nation. Many of us are aware of the Irish miracle, that is the miracle of Ireland where they went from an economy of one size and grew it proportionally larger. What Ireland did was no miracle at all. What Ireland did was they just recognized that companies are looking for competitive governments. Their tax rate internally was very similar to ours, about 36 percent for domestic corporations. They were after the corporations that would come from outside Ireland, and so they offered a 10 percent rate of tax to foreign companies. Foreign companies saw where they could move from the United States, which has a 36 percent Federal tax rate, plus the local and State rates, so companies from many nations began to move to Ireland to take advantage of this low tax rate that was offered to foreign companies.

The European Union saw this as messing up their economic model, and so they browbeat the Irish and said they needed to review that 10 percent tax rate; that 10 percent tax rate needs to be changed. That is, we do not want you competing with us, us European nations. You need to come up to match us, not us begin to figure out how to offer government cheaper.

The Irish, being the Irish, looked at the proposition that they should reconsider their tax rate, and they did. They actually were very accommodating. They went up and said you are correct, the 36 percent is far too high, and they made that 12 percent, creating an economic boom on domestic corporations; and they went to 12 percent here. So we now have, again, the Irish miracle of domestic growth as well as still being extremely competitive with their foreign corporation rate. In fact, this past year, just 5 to 10 miles north of my district in New Mexico, the Irish have come in and are reinvesting in America by building a cheese plant in the area of Portales and Clovis, New Mexico.

Now, the idea that government can and should operate cheaper, just like any company can, is one that is going to affect us. If we as a Nation do not realize that we cannot sustain the high 36 to 45 percent tax rates that we are charging, if we do not realize that and begin to lower this number here, we are going to face a future that moves us toward stagnation and away from economic vitality.

That is extremely important for the next generation, but it is also important for our generation because as 40 million baby boomers move to retirement and we begin to retire in 4 years, 3½ years now, as we begin to move to retirement, we have to understand that Social Security is a pay-as-you-go system, that we do not actually have

money in the bank. We simply have those bonds; but if we do not have workers in the system here providing the jobs locally, then we are going to see that pay-as-you-go system under great duress.

If Social Security comes under duress, it is going to have to be bailed out with more government spending which is going to increase this number. It is going to increase this number, and we are going to move toward stagnation just as the Europeans have and just as the Soviet Union did. The stakes are extremely high for this country to begin to realize that it must know how its money is spent, and it must get the value for the dollars that we spend. No company can stay alive and afloat indefinitely by mispending its money, and now we are into a situation worldwide where governments will compete; and we in the United States have to be willing to compete also. Our government has to run more efficiently, more effectively, and with lower tax rates.

Many of my friends have asked why in the world in a period of deficits did the Congress offer tax cuts. Again, it is very simple. The Democrat Governor of New Mexico said it best, tax cuts create jobs. As we cut the taxes, we were looking at the fact that we only had a couple of options. If we want to change this relationship and run a deficit, we either need to cut spending or increase the size of this economy. That 11 needs to become 12 or 13 or 14. Those are really the primary objectives. Anything else is simply window dressing.

The hope is that in cutting taxes we make this relationship less, it moves us toward vitality growth and gives companies and individuals more income of their own to put back into ventures that are most promising and into ventures that can sustain research and development and growth; and so we gave the tax cuts with the anticipation that we would establish a rate of growth.

The rate of growth that we intended to get was we had hoped for a sustained 4 percent. Now, if this were the target, it would be nice to know exactly what kind of growth rate we did get. It is almost 2½ years since the tax cuts, and the first quarter out after the tax cuts was about 8.25 to 8.5 percent rate of growth. There was understanding there was pent-up demand, so we thought this number would actually settle down; and over time it has settled down into the 4 percent range.

As we face the elapsing, or the phasing out, while the tax cuts were temporary, they expire at the end of the year, as we face those expiring tax cuts, we realize that we are going to have pressure for this number to decrease back down. What we as a Congress need to do is be willing to go ahead and continue to extend the tax cuts in order to give our economy the vitality and the growth that we have seen with the tax cuts.

Now, you would ask what is happening in some of the rest of the world.

Again if we look at Europe, all of industrialized Europe is about at the 2 percent range.

□ 2045

So we have been for the last year and a half almost double the rate of growth of the industrialized countries in Europe.

Another factor would have to be the job creation. Initially, our recovery, there was concern that we were not producing enough jobs. That is a valid concern, and so you would have to look at a couple of things. Why did we not create jobs at the beginning of the recovery?

Again, as a business owner, I would tell you that the last thing I wanted to do was hire permanent employees because permanent employees might have to be laid off. As we went through periods of expansion, the first thing we as a company would do was we began to extend overtime hours and asked people to just come in and work a couple of hours a day extra and we will be okay, we will be able to meet the increased demand with that sort of expansion of labor.

When we could no longer ask our employees to work overtime, they all would like to spend time with their families, then the next step that we would do is to hire temporary people, hire people to come in on a part-time basis, people that if the economy began to slow back down, you really have not given them the full promise that they were going to be here for you.

As we then would work our way through temporary employment and still find that we could not solve the demand with overtime and temporary employment, then my wife and I would go out looking for new employees; and then the third step that we would take would be to hire full-time employees.

We were able to do that over a period of years. When we bought the company, we had four employees. We sold the company in late 2003 and we had almost 50 employees. So we had judiciously expanded ourselves through 14 years, one small increment at a time.

One of the most critical times in our business life occurred in the 1999 to 2000 range. We were in the oil and gas business. We did down hole repairs in oil wells. We did not actually own any of the oil wells. We simply repaired them. In 1999 and 2000, the price of oil and gas dropped tremendously. The price of oil in our location had fallen from about \$25 down to about \$6. Our revenues as a company at one point fell 80 percent. We were working at 20 percent the income rate that previously we had.

It was not just our company. Many companies that were competitors and friends of ours worked in the same industry, and they saw the same 70 and 80 percent declines in their revenues.

We made a decision, my wife and I, that we could not lay off employees, that we would sacrifice the company, if need be, in order to keep the people who had made a promise with us. They

had invested their lives with us. We had, in turn, invested our lives with them. So we said, we are not going to lay you off; we will give you 60 days' notice before we actually begin to lay people off or give pay cuts. We continued that line of thinking for almost 11 months.

If companies will take care of their cash, if companies will live within their means, then you have got the capability to do that. But if you have expended every single dime all the way through, then you do not have the means to withstand these deep drains when they occasionally occur.

A nation is exactly the same way. A nation must carefully guard its cash, its reserves. It must carefully, carefully spend its money and understand that it is getting value for every dollar spent, that we are building infrastructure, that we are making our Nation more competitive as a nation and as a government with other governments, because we will at some point in the near future be held to a standard of competing with nations.

Our rate of growth at this point is good, but if we look into the future and see the threats to our economic size, to see the pushes to increase our government spending, then we will understand that there are some dynamics that we must be very aware of because they affect the outcomes of this Nation. Literally the military sacrifices, the sacrifices of our young men and women who are soldiers and who are fighting for freedom, who have fought for freedom in the past, their sacrifices will be somewhat less useful if government does not adequately spend its resources. We must understand that we have got to progress on all fronts and that we simply do not have a path into the future based on what we have done in the past.

If we are to consider another one of the dynamics that is loose in the world today, one of the competitive measures that we have to be concerned with is governments who begin to review their entire government spending, who begin to make changes and make their government more effective. Again, those are competitive pressures from one nation to another. Because a nation that adapts itself to a more lean government, producing the same results with fewer dollars, is going to be a nation that has economic vitality; and a nation that does not carefully marshal its own spending, its own government spending, will be a nation that is moving toward stagnation and toward a noncompetitive situation into the future.

As we consider that particular ramification, one must look at the example of New Zealand. The government in New Zealand several years ago decided to really carefully look at their own situation. As they reviewed industrial economies throughout the world, they said, our economic vitality is not so great. We would like to improve our lot. And they set about having deep

discussions internally about what functions should be in government and what functions should not be in government.

That is a discussion that this Nation needs to engage in heartily. I do not know exactly where the balance is. Government always has a function. There is always the need for regulation. There is always the need for oversight. But sometimes I think that our government is delving into things that are not inherently governmental, and other nations are beginning to sort through those pieces, and we will face the competition.

So New Zealand began to look and in their own circumstance, at the time I forget, the numbers are maybe not exactly correct, but they are close enough. They had between 50 and 60,000 people in the Department of Labor. I often ask my audiences, and I did just this last week when I spoke about this in New Mexico, if you think of a government agency that began to trim away fat, began to push nongovernmental projects outside the government back into the private sector where they belonged, how deeply do you think they would cut? How deep do you think that New Zealand went?

Mr. Speaker, that is a question that we must ask ourselves. I will tell you that the answer is New Zealand cut from between 50 and 60,000 employees in the Department of Labor to one. That, by the way, was the individual doing the study. I suspect if he were not getting his own paycheck he might have even eliminated that. When governments begin to get so efficient that they move from 50,000 down to one, I will tell you that the United States in the long term has to answer that same question. Because if we do not recognize that we are under competitive pressure from other nations, if we do not recognize that and begin to lower our government spending, keeping us in a position of vitality, then we are going to be moved by other nations into stagnation, and our children and grandchildren will find that they just do not have the opportunities that we in my generation have had.

If New Zealand can offer those kinds of benefits, we have to ask ourselves what are we doing in the United States. I will tell you that, in my district, there are many national forests. New Mexico is not often identified as a State with water and forests, but we actually do have many national forests. As I go into the Forest Service and I look and I talk to people who are retired and I talk to current people, I think that we have got great people in the field, but we have adopted and adapted programs and philosophies in our Forest Service that make us not so lean as this.

In fact, if we are to look at one particular office that operates in my district to see the relationship that is going on in the United States, and I have been told by a retired forest ranger, he says that I used to work this

whole forest. I cut timber, I provided the restoration, I had projects that would clean up streams, clean up the forest, I had some economic enterprises that were going on in and around that I supervised, and I handled all the grazing. He said, it was myself and one person half time in addition to me.

Now, that was maybe 30 years ago. To find out the benefit that we are reaping today from our efforts to control or not control the size of government, you would ask today what are we doing and how many people is it taking. I would tell you that that gentleman says in the area that he and one half-time person formerly operated that now then there are 142.

So when New Zealand went from 50 to 60,000 down to one, in the U.S. we went from one up to 142, and that has occurred over and over and over again throughout many agencies. So that you can see that maybe we are not 142 times a larger government overall, but we are moving and trending in the wrong way.

If we have gone from one to 142, you would think, well, we are running our forests much better, that our forests now are just the examples of forestry that we would like to have. But I will tell you that the exact opposite is true. That when this gentleman was in charge, we were not burning hundreds of thousands and millions of acres of forest land, but we are today. It is not because we are not spending enough money. It is because we have adopted a philosophy that says that we can no longer cut a tree.

At one point in New Mexico 20 years ago, there were 22 lumber mills; and today there are two. Many of the forests in New Mexico have not had a timber sale in decades. If you have not had a timber sale, that means you have not cut timber. So you would think, well, those trees are out there growing and we are not cutting, so they are probably now becoming crowded and, in fact, that assumption is entirely accurate and valid. The historic function of New Mexico forests had fire cleaning out the forest every 8 years. If we look at the tree rings, you will see about every 8 years a very hot fire would come through and with our arid climate and the fires, we would find that New Mexico generally hosted between 30 and 50 trees per acre.

If New Mexico's 142:1 relationship were to be looked at and you think if we are doing a better job or a worse job, you would want to know how our forests are growing, so historically our arid climate would relate to 30 to 50 trees per acre. And again I ask my constituents when I am in New Mexico, what do you think is the population of trees per acre now? We have got 142 people in this one circumstance to 1½. Are we doing a better job?

Now, then, the average number of trees per acre, 1,500, whereas nature by itself kept that number around 30 to 50. We can look at pictures from 100 years ago and realize that nature had a size

or had a population density of trees that its area and its climate would support. But we have now, because we have stopped putting out all forest fires and we have stopped cutting trees, 1,500 trees per acre average and some areas are up to 2,500.

If you had people in the same circumstance crowding in like that, you would expect a couple of things. You would expect nutrition to be decreasing. If we had in the same place 30 people per acre used to live and now 1,500 to 2,500, you would expect that disease would be somewhat more prevalent and you would expect catastrophes to be always on the edge. The same is true with our forests. We have now the threat of disease. We have the threat of malnutrition. The trees are starved for light, so they stay small diameter and they grow toward the same height as the big mature trees; and as they get very tall and very small, they do not have enough nutrients to grow larger and they, in fact, are susceptible to insects, to disease.

But the worst susceptibility that they have is to fire. Previously, a fire that would burn along in the grass underneath and char the trees and leave the tree rings, it showed us that every 8 years a hot fire would come, those trees now have enough kindling, they have enough small diameter trees that any fire becomes explosive. The fire spreads up those small diameters. It burns in the top of the trees now, not in the bottom. So that we have the cap fires that run across the top of the forest killing the green part while leaving the tree standing and we have burned millions of acres.

□ 2100

We are succeeding in this example to make our forests less healthy with 142 workers where formerly we had one. Those kinds of inefficiencies must be dealt with in the long term because as we grow to this proportion and we are finding the New Zealand model that pushes away from 50,000 to one, the relationships back here are influenced and affected so that if we cannot control these costs, we have no economic future. It all begins to relate at some point.

The discussion needs to be even far more complete than this. As we consider the effect of our economic size, we must take a look at the number of workers that we have available. Again, we have got about \$11 trillion in our economic size right now. We must understand that 40 million workers, baby boomers, are on the verge of or beginning to retire. As we retire, we have to ask ourselves what about the replacements; do we have enough replacements. I will tell the Members, Mr. Speaker, that everywhere I go, I hear the same comment: we need workers. We need workers who will show up tomorrow. We need workers who can pass a drug screen. We need workers who can read and write, and we need workers who are productive. If we are not

able to provide those workers or if the workers are not capable of doing the jobs and competing with other nations, our 11 becomes smaller, our relationship becomes larger, and stagnation and even economic collapse are all in the potential field of vision.

So as I go around my district, we begin then to talk where are the workers coming from. Now, we have a great discussion right now about immigration, and I have got good conservative friends who say we need to stop the borders, we need to plug off the borders. For me, I am simply looking at our economic future and saying we have got to replace these 40 million workers. We are about 5 percent unemployment right now, and 5 percent unemployment leaves employers everywhere telling me, Please, Congressman, we need workers, we need people who can show up, people who can be productive, people who can reason and think.

If we do not bring workers in, that is called immigration, I will tell the Members that we have one other choice, and we will do that if we do not bring workers in. The other choice is to send the jobs to where the workers are. Companies cannot work without employees. So we understand if we begin to export jobs to where the workers are, our 11 becomes 10, becomes nine, becomes eight; and again the economic promise of our future is limited because we have a budget right now that is providing very much inflexibility and decreasing. We have shown very little capability to decrease this number.

In my freshman year, the first month we were here, Republicans suggested a 1 percent decrease in the discretionary spending, which would not have even been nearly 1 percent of this overall figure, and the outcry from the American public was tremendous: please cut someone else's program; do not cut mine. We have shown a very deep incapability, either Democrats or Republicans, of reducing the size of the budget. If we also begin to export our jobs to where our jobs go to where the employees are rather than bringing employees into this country and providing jobs, our economic life is equally very difficult.

It is not just that we are needing the workers. We do desperately need them. But the new thoughts, the new ideas, the new inventions, that this Nation was built on immigrants and this Nation will continue to be built on fresh, innovative ideas that come in to us, it is that understanding that must drive us to the final conclusion: that for our economic vitality, for our economic future, this Nation must be open to immigration.

Again, looking at the German models, the European models, immigration is not a word that is friendly there. We find that their societies are not replacing themselves any better than we are. Our birth rate is about .8 for every couple of two. We are not even getting the 50 percent replacement rate in our

growth, and the European countries are doing somewhat worse, and they are affected with the problem even worse than we are so that their aging generations do not have the hope, unless they change their immigration policies, that they will actually be able to sustain the high cost of retirees, the high cost of the aging on a decreasing economic pie.

As we then look into the future, we see the need for our economy to sustain or to grow. We need the vitality of new ideas and new workers coming into the system. We must explore the ways that we can restrain our spending. We must look at the ways to make departments more effective and efficient. We must realize the mistakes that we are currently making in our policies that move us toward stagnation, and we must differentiate those policies from the ones that would move us toward vitality.

We need to recognize that nations begin to compete with nations. We need to realize the economic model of Ireland in lowering its tax rates to both domestic and external corporations, creating a tremendous boom there. We must understand that if we cut taxes, it helps us to create growth and jobs; and if we raise taxes, it actually decreases our capability to grow the economy and create jobs.

We must look at the economic models of other nations who are beginning to see how they can run government more effectively than any other nation is operating government. Nations will compete just as States have competed, just as companies have competed. This Nation must understand that it will compete. We need to be able to move to that model of competition before we move into stagnation, before we run into the deep budget problems that come if we allow our jobs to continue to be taken away by high tax policies, by anti-growth policies. Finally, we must understand that the climate for businesses is one that is extremely critical.

I met recently in this building with foreign economic chairmen, chairmen of boards, CEOs of nations from outside this country that are operating in this country. They said that the factors that affect them are overregulation, overtaxation; but one of the most important things they said and the most destructive thing they find is the overlitigation, that in this Nation they will find their litigation costs to be tremendously higher. So we as a Nation must look to the economic numbers. We must look to the relationship between the size of government and the size of our economy. But we must also be aware of those factors that would cause people to say, Even in the stable environment of the United States, I am going to operate somewhere else because of the fear of litigation.

And not litigation to hold them responsible for things that they have done wrong. Many times the class action lawsuits are not intended to stop

anything. Class action lawsuits have been in order to create a litigation solution. That is, they did not create a solution in operation, but they simply brought an economic solution, which then generally the trial lawyers have benefited from to the tremendous disadvantage of the people for whom they are suing.

That is one reason this body did two things in the early part of this year that have helped the business climate tremendously: we reformed the class action task load. We have reformed the way that class action lawsuits are allowed to come to the courts. We have given people the capability to present their problems without allowing the abuse of the process. And the second thing that we did that is so pro-business is we began to reform bankruptcy. No longer can people hide assets inside their estates and preserve mansions while not paying their bills. These are two things that generally have great effect on the economic promise of this Nation, two changes that were made by this Republican Congress in this year, both of which have been signed by the President.

We have got more work to do. We must deal with health costs, with both health insurance and with the cost of health care in the Nation. I think that we have committees that are working on that. We must deal with the question of extending the tax cuts if we are going to make the tax cuts permanent or if we are going to allow them to phase out and to realize that we are tampering with the future of the economic vitality of this Nation if we do not recognize the value of lower tax rates.

We need to understand that we also should deal with the regulation. Every day I talk to business owners. They tell me that they are overwhelmed with the paperwork of simply meaningless documents that many times are filled out and sent in and sometimes no one ever looks at them.

These are functions that we must review. We must review the cost of our government. We must review the effectiveness of our government. There are always things that we will do by government and we should do by government, but we must understand that we are going to be competing and that those functions must be done properly and with the best resources available, without waste in the governmental process. And at the end of the day I think all of us have the same ambition: to pass along a Nation that is just as vital as the Nation that we inherited.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address this body tonight. I appreciate the indulgence in allowing me to speak on such important matters.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). 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. I would also like to thank the Democratic leader for allowing the 30-something Working Group to reappear on the floor again for another week to talk about issues that are facing 30-somethings throughout this country and are also facing Americans in general.

When we talk about issues such as Social Security, the debt, national security, health care, education, those are issues that we all care about. And for the last couple of weeks, we have been talking about Social Security, talking about strengthening Social Security, talking about making sure that Social Security is there for not only the 30-somethings but the 20-somethings, those that are receiving survivor benefits, retirees that are receiving benefits from Social Security, the 48 million Americans that we speak of, and also those that are receiving disability because of an injury while they were working.

But it is an honor being here once again with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Last week we recessed for Memorial Day, or Memorial week, and I had an opportunity to go to Puerto Rico to speak, along with the Senate president of the Puerto Rican Senate, to put 20-plus names on the wall of proud Puerto Ricans that died in the line of duty defending our great country.

□ 2115

They are great Americans, and I was glad to be there. It was really a moving event for me. They even added the name of a fallen hero from World War II. In Puerto Rico it is kind of hard. Here in the United States they usually say that a person is from the place that they trained or the base where they were assigned, not necessarily where they came from. So the family went through a lot of trouble in trying to get this information up and finally were able to place him on Memorial Wall there by the state capital for Puerto Rico, the capital of that territory.

It is good to see the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back.

Memorial Day is one of the special days. Memorial Day, the 4th of July, Veterans' Day, those are some of the great moments to be a Member of Congress, because you get to go to all the different parades and all the different events and meet some of the great heroes from communities in Florida and Ohio, those people who were just from average homes, average families, and just went and did their duty. I think it is good that several times a year we remind ourselves.

One of the things that I think that generation of soldiers from World War

II gave us was a real spirit of what it is like and what it means to be an American. It was great over the past week to have these experiences, because I think in many ways we are losing that, that sense of community, that sense of we are all in this together.

During the war, and I am sure the gentleman has heard stories, as I have, of the kind of sacrifices that each community made, each family made. Some would send soldiers off to fight, some would send soldiers off to be a part of support units, some would serve here at home. But then the women and the mothers had their own roles to play back here at home. Whether it was going to the factory or working in the house or working on the farm or wherever it was, everyone in the country made that sacrifice to have the kind of success we had.

I think if there is one governmental program that is indicative of that spirit, it is the Social Security program. We have been focusing on this for many, many months now, really since the beginning of this Congress, and just trying to hammer away at this issue and trying to get our arms around it.

I think we have come to grips with the fact that this program is not in a crisis state. It is the greatest program that this country runs. It runs at a 1 percent administrative cost. Ninety-nine percent of the money that goes into the system gets back out into the pockets of beneficiaries. Only 1 percent is administrative costs. Even those folks out there that may say government does not run efficiently, and I would agree that there are cases throughout government where programs do not run as efficiently as they should, would say this is efficient.

I think part of what we need to talk about from the Democratic side is about reforming government, about making it run efficiently, about how it should run in an age based on information, with technology and knowledge and communication abilities that we have today. How do we make this government run more efficiently? There is no question that we need to address that problem. Social Security is not one of those programs. Ninety-nine percent of what goes in comes back out and goes to the beneficiary.

One of the kind of myths that we are trying to fight here with our 30-something Working Group is that this program is not in a crisis state. We kind of just want to start the debate from there. We are kind of reacquainting ourselves with this.

Here is a chart for the folks at home to look at. It starts in 2005 and continues to 2070. It basically in the navy blue here, from 2005 to about 2047, 2048, if we do not do anything with Social Security at all, we will still be able to pay 100 percent of the benefits, 100 percent of the benefits. If we do not touch this program, if we do not implement anybody's reform package, we will still be okay until 2047.

Then even after that, to the late 2040s, until 2075 where the light blue is,

we are still able to pay 80 percent of the benefits that beneficiaries should be receiving. If we do not touch it, we are 100 percent until 2047 and then still good until 2075.

For the people at home, you make the judgment. Is that a crisis? Is this program being solvent until 2047, 2048, a crisis? That is the real question.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this is very interesting. I am so glad. For us, we hear it, we know it here in the Halls of this Congress. That is what we were elected for here, to find out this information, to not only share this information with our colleagues in this Chamber and Democrats and Republicans and the one Independent we have here in this House, to share that information with them, but it is important that we do not allow some of these statements that are being made while the President and others are flying around burning all kind of Federal jet fuel saying otherwise, that it is a crisis.

I think the American people know exactly what is going on. It is our job to make sure that in the minority, since we talk about this, we have to explain what the minority-majority issue means. It is important for everyone to know that Democrats, we are in the minority in this House. We cannot agenda bills to come to the floor. We cannot call hearings or committee meetings. All of these privileges are left to the majority, which is the Republican Party at this particular time.

We also have to remember that for many of the issues we are talking about here there are alternatives to those issues. We will be talking about those tonight.

This Federal debt that you have here on the chart right beside you, every American's share of that debt that is on that chart, we had a solution for it and it worked. We were dealing with surpluses. Now we are dealing with that large number.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. In 1993, a Democratic House, Democratic Senate and Democratic President passed a bill that balanced the budget; and we began to pay down the debt in the country because we were running at the surplus level.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I will say this: When we balanced the budget, we did it without one Republican vote in this House. Our children did not have to pay \$26,349.67. Someone who was just born when we started this Special Order already owes that to the Federal Government. Those are the issues we talk about.

But as relates to Social Security, one may say, what are Democrats standing for? We are standing for strengthening Social Security, bottom line. We stand for what happened when Tip O'Neill was in that Chair and Ronald Reagan was in the White House and how they came together and came up with the bipartisan bill without privatization. That is what we stand for.

We look to go back to the days when we saw the Senate, the other body, voting to adopt a Social Security plan 58 to 14. That is bipartisan, Democrats and Republicans. In 1983, when this House voted to put Social Security where it is now, because, as you mentioned, into 40-plus years, and I would just say 40-plus, even though we know it is higher, 100 percent of the benefits will be provided and then 80 percent after that. But in 1983 this House, and it was a Democratic House at that time, but that did not matter, because we moved in a bipartisan way, some 243 Members of the House versus 102 voted for Social Security. If you want to break it down at the partisan level, it was 80 Republicans that voted for, 48 against; 163 Democrats voted for, 54 against. That is a bipartisan bill that passed this House. The discussion that is going on today is far from that.

To start talking about, well, Democrats, they do not want to do anything, or they just want to keep things in the status quo, well, guess what? My constituents are not calling me complaining about Social Security. I do not think the gentleman's constituents are calling him either. Because it is one of the best Federal programs and initiatives that has ever been launched in this country.

We want to strengthen it. We want to strengthen it without going to privatization. From the beginning they are saying benefits will be cut even if you are not part of the privatization program. If you opt not to be a part of the majority side privatization plan, you still lose benefits. So I do not understand the logic there.

But when I started looking at the information and we started looking at the Congressional Budget Office and what they are saying, the only plus benefit I can see here is \$940 billion to Wall Street.

Guess what? I care about the folks that sent me up here from Florida. I care about their well-being. I care about them receiving 100 percent of their benefits versus 70 percent. They paid into it, and they have the right to have their benefits.

Now I just want to say this again, because I want to make sure there is no confusion in this House: To the Members that are watching us, to make sure that they understand that we want to strengthen Social Security without taking us further into debt, and if we have to deal with the whole issue of borrowing the money, at least have a plan to pay it back. That is how we got to that number; not "we," but the majority side, because we have been voting against the budget that they put forth. We have just been spending on a credit card. Where is my credit card? If I can have it, this is the congressional spending credit card right here.

I do not consider myself a hard partisan, because I have some good friends on the other side of the aisle that care about this, that care about this Fed-

eral debt. They do not believe in using a credit card to give out all kind of cake and ice cream when we do not need it as relates to the Federal dollar. I am using "cake and ice cream" as a metaphor. Because if I was to feed my kids only cake and ice cream, what kind of health will they be in?

If we just spend and borrow and allow foreign countries to hold 44 percent of our debt and say we are a financial superpower, that is a misstatement, because soon it is going to be over 50 percent, if some of the Members of Congress, and I mean some of our Members on the majority side, if they do not go see the wizard and say, "you know something? I came here as a fiscal conservative and I want to leave here as a fiscal conservative."

But I can tell you one thing. The leadership on the other side is damaging that image of those individuals that came here. So, obviously, we are in a Federal debt situation, and growing.

We are going to have to make one of two things happen: Either the American people are going to have to rise up and say, enough is enough, we are saying we are going to deal with Social Security for future generations and then we hand our children a debt that as far as the eye can see and say you handle it? When the President marched down this aisle here, went up to the podium and said, if you are over 55, do not worry about it? So now grandparents and parents over 55 are supposed to say to their kids and grandchildren, good luck?

That is the reason why I believe we do not have a bill coming to this floor on Social Security. Yes, there is some discussion, but I believe as long as the majority side leadership and the President are talking about the privatization, the gamble of Social Security, and if you look at some of the articles that are coming out now on this whole issue, you have to be very skeptical of what the President is talking about.

Even the poll that came out, the Washington Post-ABC News poll, I wanted to talk about that, because we are not talking about issues facing Americans.

Health care. When a company's employees come in and start looking at the benefit package, and the small business owner says you will be better off getting Medicaid versus the plan that we offer because the premiums are too high, that is not health care.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as the gentleman is saying that, this survey that the gentleman was just talking about, the Washington Post-ABC News poll said that 58 percent of those interviewed said that the President is concentrating mainly in his second term on problems and partisan squabbles that these respondents said were unimportant to them. Four in ten, 41 percent, said the President was focused on important problems, a double-digit drop from 3 years ago.

The people are speaking. They are saying that, as the gentleman said, like this chart that we went over a few weeks ago showed, giving our debt over to these foreign countries, reducing the independence of this country, pushing the burden off on our children and grandchildren, the next generation, and asking them to foot the bill, that is the issue.

Health care. We have had a health care crisis in this country for how many years now? How many years? And now we are talking about an issue that does not present itself for another 40 years?

These are the issues that we need to begin to talk about. We need to begin to talk about the escalating costs of health care, year in and year out, 15 percent, 20 percent; the rising, skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40 percent. The most profitable industry in the world, and we are not talking about it?

These are the issues that we need to focus on. And to have this charade going on on the side, this dog-and-pony show about an issue that does not present itself for another 40 years I think is misleading and not the proper execution of I think the top leader in the country. I just really believe that.

□ 2130

It is time for some real leadership in the country, and we just do not seem to be getting it now. The poll is absolutely right. We get into these partisan squabbles. We want to work. We want to solve some of these problems. We know there are different philosophies, and it is okay to have a fight about it, but at the end of the day, do what is best for the country.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with stating your opinion or my opinion or the gentlewoman from Florida's (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) opinion or anyone in the 30-something Working Group's opinion, as long as they have merit and foundation, and that it is meaningful and that it is fair play.

And there is nothing personal about what we are talking about. I mean, one may speak of the President, but the bottom line is that the President is term-limited out. There is not anyone who thinks there is some political motivation here to try to make the President look bad; this is not the intent here. The intent is saying that there are leaders in this House, may they be Democrat or Republican, who are going to have to rise up and say, you know, you are wrong, I am sorry.

We are going to talk a little further about young people and dealing with debt; but before the gentleman takes that chart down, I want to make sure, because we are both on the Committee on Armed Services and we are dealing with the issue of national security, and we are dealing with making sure that our democracy stays strong and we protect the homeland. So I think that chart there is very appropriate that the gentleman has up there.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we went over this a few weeks ago, and this is a portion of foreign-owned debt. It rose to 41 percent under the Bush administration. In the far left corner here, we have the year 2000 and over here, 2004. The purple is the debt held by foreigners. The aqua, turquoise, either/or, is domestically held debt and the billions of dollars, which comes to about the trillions. And in the blue, as my colleagues can see, the portion of the debt held by domestic banks, domestic concerns, domestic interests, has flat-lined. The purple is the foreign-held debt, and it begins to increase; it is starting to move up into the main and starting to even break through the border here.

We can see that increase right there, and that is what worries us. It is that increase right there that says we are losing a portion of our independence, because when the Chinese, for example, own a higher and higher and higher portion of our debt, then we have to begin to factor that concern in when we are dealing with North Korea, when we are dealing with the situation in Iraq, when we are dealing with the way they are manipulating their currency.

Right now, the Chinese are manipulating their currency, some say up to 40 percent. And why is the U.S. not taking a stronger stand? Why are we not being firm with the Chinese? Well, it is tough to play hardball with the bank when they are funding your debt; and that is really what is happening right now, is that the bank is becoming China and they are funding our debt, so we have less leverage over them as they begin to wipe out the manufacturing.

So here we go, here is our debt, here is the chart that we are becoming way too familiar with, the national debt of \$7.79 trillion, and each person shares \$26,000. This is the issue. This is the crisis in this Chamber, and this is the crisis that the country needs to come to grips with.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure because, once again, I believe in third-party validators, and I believe that it is important that if folks want the current number as we stand right now as it relates to the Federal debt and where these numbers come from, I think it is important. I just want to make sure that the Members understand. The U.S. Treasury Web site will give this information also; you can go to www.house.gov/budget/democrats, just to make sure that you are able to get that information and pull it up for yourselves and share it with your family and friends, and I do mean that in the most serious way. I think it is important that we share that information.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing that the gentleman mentioned before I yield back; there are a number of things that are going on in the economic sense. We talk about Social Security, because it is economics for families. And I think that it really, really hits home when

families are going to have to find a way, how they are going to make up for that 30 percent that they are going to lose under the President's plan and the majority's plan.

A part of this effort of coming to the floor every week, our working group meets and we talk about these issues, are for the following reasons: one, we want to let folks know that we want to strengthen Social Security. I do not think there is a Member on the Democratic side, and I will even add some of my friends on the Republican side, who do not want to strengthen Social Security. Folks get elected protecting Social Security. But for the life of me, I do not understand why we do not have more of our Republican colleagues letting the President know we appreciate you on their side of the aisle, we voted for you, but you are wrong. And, I mean, that takes courage, and it takes leadership. I think it is important so that we can move on to issues of dealing with Social Security so we are not stuck in neutral or in park on Social Security because someone has said that is the only way we will deal with Social Security unless the private sector gets its cut. So I think it is important that we understand that.

There is an article today in The Washington Post that is talking about "big pension plans fall further behind," and this is exactly what the President is talking about. I have airline pilots, I fly back and forth from Miami to here, and they are telling me, they used to get \$12,000 in pension a month on their pension plans. Now it is down to \$2,000. That is what we are going to do with Social Security, which is security, the word security, saying that it will be there for you. So I think that is important.

But I just wanted to share that piece, because I think it is important that we add that information in so folks do not feel that this is the Tim Ryan philosophy or the Kendrick Meek philosophy. This is a bipartisan effort here as it relates to getting the information, especially from the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is absolutely right. When we check and verify our own statistics here that we are using, again, the poll that we had mentioned talking about really what the main issues facing the people of the country are, a strong majority of self-described political Independents, and this is the ABC News Washington Post poll, 68 percent of self-described Independents say they disagree with the President's priorities. Sixty-eight percent. The hard-core numbers on Social Security and the President's priorities are 30, 35, maybe 40 percent in the grand scheme of things. So we are talking about 60 percent of the country not agreeing with the priorities of the President.

As we talk about what the crises are in the country, one thing that I think ties into what we are talking about, the national debt, the annual deficits,

the \$26,349 that each citizen owes to that debt, the \$500 billion annual deficit that we are running, plus, it kind of feeds into a notion in the whole country about debt. So what the 30-something Group wants to talk about a little bit tonight is the issue of young Americans dealing with debt. Because we are really, by the decisions we are making, putting a \$26,000 bounty on the heads of young people, tax bounty on the heads of young people, the minute they are born; and they owe the government that much. Then we begin to look at, project that \$26,000 out for another 22 years from the day they were born, and then we begin to deal with young Americans in college. And this was a very interesting statistic that we were able to find in an article last week.

According to a survey released by Sallie Mae, the Nation's largest provider of student loans, college seniors expected to graduate this year, probably right around now, with \$28,953 in debt; basically \$29,000; \$26,000 of it is going to be student loans, and another \$2,800 of it is going to be credit card debt. So if you are graduating from college today, you owe the 26 grand already from the debt that we need to pay off, which each citizen owes, and then they owe another \$28,000, \$29,000 basically in student loans and credit card debt.

And that feeds into a real problem that we have in this country. It is a disincentive to go to school, it is a disincentive for college, and really it traps a young man or a young woman coming out of college with a good education, and all this debt. That is not freedom. And we hear freedom, freedom, freedom in this Chamber time and time and time again.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there are even some folks who would start a freedom caucus in the Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We have freedom french fries down in the House diner. We do not have French fries, we have freedom fries. Freedom. Is this freedom? Is owing \$29,000 when you get out of college freedom? Is owing the government \$27,000 freedom? Is that freedom? That is not freedom. So we cannot really just apply freedom to little areas that are convenient. And freedom is economics too, and I believe that we are beginning to get into a situation by letting the credit cards run rampant through this Chamber, letting the spending get out of control in this Chamber, and it takes away the freedom for our young men and women.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important, and I am glad that the gentleman shared that information as it relates to the debt that young people are in now. But guess what? Who is going to help them pay that debt? Nine times out of 10 they are going to come out and try to get a job and I guarantee you, dealing with that kind of debt, and we want them to be able to move into a home, I mean they are going to be living with their parents writing their name on orange

juice saying that they will get out of the house some day because they owe so much.

Now, I am going to talk about what Democrats are doing to put money into the pockets of Americans who are going to educate themselves, making this country strong. Are you ready?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Ready. Let us do it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We spend a lot of time making sure we have answers to problems, and I think it is important that the Members understand, if this was a Democratic House, as it stands now, this would not even be a discussion, this would already be an action, or some of the stuff that is happening to Americans would not be happening.

Now, Democrats in this House, we introduced a bill that would help over 1.3 million Americans as it relates to not losing money in their student loans and Pell grants. We talk about the Bush administration and the majority. Well, I can tell my colleagues that late last year in the 108th Congress, 1.3 million college students will lose Federal scholarships, will be unfairly reduced, their scholarship money will be reduced starting in the 2005-2006 school year due to congressional change that the Bush administration and the majority side made to the formula. And what Democrats are doing, we have put forth a bill to replace those dollars to make sure that young people who are trying to go to college, they will have an opportunity to go and not come out in that kind of debt.

It is going to get worse. Those are numbers under the present situation. The debt ratio on those kids and those young people that are trying to educate themselves, some are men and women that are serving in uniform, some are individuals that are trying to better themselves, these cuts will make over \$300 million in a reduction in their scholarship money. So we have legislation that is on the floor now to replace those dollars.

Now, all we can do as Democrats is try to fight through the tall bushes here in the House, here in Washington, D.C., to try to replace that money for these young people. The gentleman talks about freedom. That is definitely not financial freedom, I say to the gentleman.

I will tell my colleague another thing on top of that: we are not only working with what we have and putting forth legislation, but we are also urging young people now, today, now, and parents and Members of this House that have children that have college debt or loans that they owe, to consolidate those loans now before July 1, because on July 1, the interest rate will go up 2 percentage points.

□ 2145

Mr. MEEK of Florida. So you have the opportunity to do it now and work very hard. If you have a problem in getting good information on how to

consolidate, there is information on line that they can use to be able to consolidate that information. You can go on the www.pirg.org/consolidation. That is pirg.org/consolidation to learn more. Or you can go on the House Democrat's Web site, which is www.house.gov/Georgemiller, who is our ranking member on education and workforce. That is house.gov/georgemiller.gov.

I think that is important, to be able to share that information. Because this is for real. This is what everyday Americans are facing. This is not fiction. This is not what we should do or what we want to do. This is exposing what is going on here in Washington, D.C., \$300 million to kids and young people that are trying to educate themselves.

Better yet, the President comes up here, tells folks over 55, do not worry about the Social Security issue. You will not be affected. We are doing this for future generations. And this is what we are doing to future generations.

So I would say this again to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) who is here, that when the rubber meets the road this is what we are doing. Well, when it does meet the road, and which it has met the road now, we have this kind of scenario for young people, coming out with not only student loan debts, but only a Federal debt to the Federal Government, so you might as well make that a little under \$50,000, when they come out of college in what they owe.

I am so happy that that my colleague from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is fighting these battles, who used to be chair of the education, higher education committee in the House of Representatives when we were in the Florida House of Representatives a couple of years, well more than a couple of years ago, but dealt with these issues that are facing young people. And I am so glad you are here.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am so glad to be here; and I appreciate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI's) willingness to put this group together of the members of the 30-something, 10-year period. We each have a few more years to go.

I want to piggyback on something you were just talking about related to the eligibility bar for financial aid. I can tell you just from personal experience all of the way back to when I was entering college and my parents were applying for financial aid for me; and the calculation, even back then, as to what we were eligible for and what the formula said that my parents could afford to pay and lay out that would come out of their pocket for college costs was unbelievable then.

And now, with the changes in the financial aid formula today, I mean, even, I grew up in a middle-class family, you know, regular, average middle-class family, you know, not wealthy at

all, parents who certainly did not live paycheck to paycheck but had a mortgage and car payments and credit card debt and, you know, pretty significant month-to-month bills. And none of that is taken into consideration when you calculate financial aid.

I mean, those major expenses, other than your income, have nothing to do with the formula. So when they say, and back then the numbers were something like, my parents, based on their income, could be expected to pay \$16,000 a year for my college education. Now, given all of the bills that they were struggling to pay for, there was no way.

Now, fast forward to 2005; and the bar has been raised even higher. And add the credit card debt that has drastically increased, with the bar on the graph at a steep incline. You add that to parents' credit card debt, you have kids now who are starting out with credit card debt even in high school.

I mean, that was unheard of when we were in high school. I mean, kids did not start college with credit card debt. They certainly did not begin having credit card debt as early as they do now, with credit card companies literally preying on brand-spanking-new college students with offers and, you know, kids who are willing to sign up to get a credit card just to get a cool t-shirt.

These are students that are not financially sophisticated enough to make the kinds of decisions that they are going to have to make so that they will understand the ramifications for themselves financially for themselves down the road. And we have got to have policies that are going to be able to help them get along in the years to come.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Another part of the Democratic platform, one that we will be issuing in the next few months, is financial literacy. Combat this at a young age, combat this. These kids are in grade school and high school and teach them about the stock market and compounding interest and all of the different aspects to managing money and being debt free, if you save now, and what it turns into 30 years from now. That is another part of the Democratic proposal. We need to teach these kids how not to get in this position here. We need to teach many leaders in the Congress here how not to get ourselves in this position here as well.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Or allow Americans to get themselves in that position. I know that this is a country based on freedom but not based on ignorance. It is important that we share this information. If we know better, we will do better.

And the bottom line is, if the leadership was in place here in this House, the \$300 million that I spoke of that took place in the 108th Congress in the closing days of the Congress has reduced the amount of money that students are able to get as it relates to their Pell Grants, it never would have

happened if we were in control, if this was a Democratic House.

So the challenge has to be there for the majority side to do better; and the bottom line is, better is not happening when it comes down to those kinds of statistics that you have there, Mr. RYAN, that the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) just spoke about. I think it is important that we remember.

So we talk about solutions. Solutions is making sure that we make good decisions and we have good leaders in place that will allow legislation to either be stopped that is bad, coming from the other body, or recommendations from the White House, just say no, this will not happen. We are looking for future generations, and we are here to protect future generations.

But the bottom line is, if we continue to do this kind of rubber-stamping that is going on here on Capitol Hill, we are going to continue to go on a downward spiral. The deficit will continue to get higher. In the 108th Congress, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I said, well, this is the highest debt in the history of the Republic. How could it get worse? It is worse now, and it will continue to get worse until something different happens here in this Chamber and in this Capitol and in this city. So it is important that we look at these issues.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One of the comments that a previous speaker made here not too long ago was that we do not have many options. You can raise taxes or you cut spending or you grow the economy. Well, you cannot grow the economy if you are putting this tremendous burden on students, the next generation of people who are going to go out and create things and not making the proper investment into education as we have talked about before. A lot of our urban areas and a lot of our rural areas, where many of those kids go to school in poverty, do not have health care, are not getting the kind of education that they get in some of the suburban areas.

Those are the kids that we need to fund, educate, and let them go out and create and grow the economy. But you cannot do that by tying a ball and chain around their neck and throwing them over the river, because they sink, and at the same time not make the kind of investments.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You talk about financial literacy. You are absolutely right. What is happening now, number one, we are not setting the example at the top of the mountain. I mean, what we are doing here is adding to our deficit month after month, year after year.

What kind of message are we sending to generations that are going to come behind us about the importance of minimizing your debt? I mean, we are deficit spending. So why would most Americans think that that is not a normal way, a responsible way to live?

Most Americans, let me not overstate it, many, many Americans live

paycheck to paycheck, and they live right to their means. This is a society where, no, I cannot have that now because I cannot afford it right now, is not instilled in people from the time that they are young. That is why financial literacy is so important.

We have a Financial Literacy Caucus. I am on the Financial Services Committee, and we have begun an effort, especially on the Democratic side, to try to educate generations coming up through life that at some point you have to decide what you can afford to have, and there has to be a now and a someday and not everything can be in the now.

That is also a lesson that Congress and the President could learn, too: Not everything can be in the now. Sometimes we have to make some financial decisions that will say, well, it would be nice if we could afford that humongous tax break for the wealthiest few, but in order to be fiscally responsible we cannot have that now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And patriotic. Quite frankly, tell the wealthiest people in the country, we would love to give you a tax cut. Who would not? Who in politics would not like to tell a really rich person I want to give you a tax cut? I mean, that would be great.

But you have to do the right thing, and you have to say, you have to meet your responsibility to society. We cannot afford to give you a tax cut right now, because we have a \$7.79 trillion debt. Now you can be selfish and still want one. Why not give the middle-class guy the tax cut, who has all of this debt burden, who is trying to send their kids to school? We cannot afford to give Warren Buffet a tax cut. I am sorry, Warren.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I represent a district with a pretty sizable percentage of wealthy individuals. And when I am home, I cannot tell you the numbers of people who come up to me and say, you know, I would love to have a tax break, but I care about my children's education a lot more. I care about the Nation's financial and fiscal health a lot more. Keep your tax break. I barely felt it, and it really is not going to make that much difference in my life.

Many, many people who are wealthy and qualify for those tax breaks understand where their priorities are and should be. It seems that only the administration and the leadership of this Congress does not have their priorities straight.

I mean, even Mr. OBEY, when we were considering the Defense Appropriations Bill in the last couple of weeks, when he offered an amendment to reduce the tax break for the wealthiest few Americans, I think it was half a percent. I think it was an incredibly small amount of money, just a little bit less of a tax break, that the wealthiest few would have received in order to expand the inspections, the percentage of inspections that we perform at our ports, for the cargo in ports, and that, even that amendment was rejected.

We chose tax breaks for the wealthy over our homeland security. Now if that is not priorities being out of whack, then I do not know what is.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I remember last year as well, we did the same thing for veterans benefits. It was an increase of, I do not remember how many billions of dollars, but it basically made it full funding. But it had to reduce in kind dollar for dollar what would be needed for the veterans from the tax cut that went to the top 1 percent. Voted right down, party line.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, what is very disturbing is when we commemorate or recognize or reflect on those that have fallen for our democracy, our veterans or our past veterans or those that did not even get an opportunity to be a veteran because they were an enlisted person and they died. Right down the street from here is Arlington Cemetery. When their colleagues or comrades that served with them, you know, side by side, and they come to Washington, D.C., to remember those that have fallen and to know when we honor them on one day, even on Veterans Day, we honor them on two days, their sacrifice to our country, and better yet on that next day, that Tuesday, they are waiting 6 months to see the ophthalmologist or they have to pay more on a copayment.

We did not keep up with our end of the promise. You know something, it is even harder to keep up with it because of this Federal debt. But we would much rather make those that have been extremely, extremely successful in this country to save a few more dollars.

There is actually another article that I am going to bring up a little later, but I just want to share this with you all. My uncle served in Korea, and he took a bus up here with some other veterans when we dedicated the World War II Memorial out in the Mall here.

□ 2200

It was a well-attended event, very historic. My mother came, a past Member of this Congress. We sat out there. And they had all the World War II veterans and veterans in general stand up. Some of them could stand. Some of them could only put their hand up in the air.

When you look at what is happening here with the Federal debt, taking this Federal credit card that I keep pulling up and charging it to the American people and to their future for many of the wrong reasons, it cannot help but make you very upset with the individuals that are making the decisions. And that is where the rubber meets the road.

When you start looking at those who have served, who allow us to celebrate the very freedom that we live under right now, and they are having to run around here worrying about if they can make a co-payment or not. You go to the VA hospital, they do not treat.

There are not a lot of veterans, unfortunately, that are Members of Congress, or maybe it would be a lot different in this town. They are waiting and waiting. And some of them call my office. Congressman, this is all I need. Can you help me?

It should not be an act of Congress to get what they need to get out of the VA or veteran benefits in general. And we are about to have a whole other crop of veterans after this war or after some of them leave the military that are going to need those services. And I guarantee you right now there is not an American that I run into that says, Congressman, we are giving the veterans too much. If anything, can you do something. There is a veteran next to me, he is not even part of a meal program because he or she cannot afford to get it.

So I would just leave it at that because I am getting upset talking about it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Look at the numbers here. The reason the gentleman is upset here in trillions of dollars over 10 years, we have a graph. We have to have a graph for everything. Permanent tax cuts, 1.18 trillion over 10 years. Tax cuts for top 1 percent 800 million; VA budget, .3, 300 million. When we need to fully fund this everyone says we do not have the money, but we have the money for this, and we have the money for that. So this is the question.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I do not want to be greedy on the time, but I just have to say this to my colleagues, what happened? Was it the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) that stood up and said, we are going to do the right thing. A Republican chairman. We are going to do the right thing by our veterans, and I am going to pass a budget that is going to help the veterans.

You know what happened to him. They moved him off the committee. He lost his chairmanship. This is not the Wasserman Schultz/Ryan/Meek story. This happened and veterans throughout this country know it happened.

So when we start talking approximate issues such as Social Security; we start talking about Medicare when we were told \$350 billion and now it is up to \$724 billion; when we start talking about issues such as Leave No Child Behind authorization bill far beyond what the appropriations actually is, folks have to pay attention to this. And I will guarantee you this, if we had the opportunity to run this House, this would be a nonissue. As a matter of fact, we would be working in a bipartisan way to correct some of these issues. We are not saying Democrats will do it. No. Democrats and Republicans and the one Independent in this House will do it. So this is so very, very important.

You know something, I do not care. I hope that there is a Member in a leadership position right now that is listening that is saying we have got to

change this because the pressure is being applied by the Democratic side of this aisle. And if they do not take the leadership responsibility to do what they have to do on behalf of these Americans, then guess what, they may be making a career decision. That is what democracy is all about. So I feel in no way sorry by pointing out the blatant inequities in leadership and being able to provide for those veterans and being able to provide for future veterans when we start talking about Social Security and what we should be doing here in Washington.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, we cannot emphasize enough, this is just another example of how the priorities here are out of whack. We had an opportunity a few weeks ago to visit our troops who were injured in fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan at Walter Reed Army Medical Hospital. These were young men, about a dozen of them, that I had an opportunity to visit, the most heart-wrenching stories, many of whom lost their limbs, mostly lost their legs, had their limbs obliterated, defended our country. Every single one of them said to me that all they wanted to do was to go back and they were so sorry to leave their buddies behind.

These are people that when they become veterans we slap them with a disabled veterans tax. We say to them that for every dollar that they earn in disability payments, we are going to deduct a dollar from their pension. That is the reward we are giving them for serving our country and for becoming injured in the line of duty.

Then we are saying to our members from the National Guard that unless you are within, I think it is, 90 or 180 days of being activated for duty, we are not going to pay for your health care. We do not provide health care to our members of National Guard who we know now are going to be activated at some point, who we know are giving up the salaries that they earn in their regular jobs, who are sometimes covered, sometimes not covered by health insurance at their regular jobs. But one of the things that members of the National Guard have to have to worry about is how to even pay for health care for themselves and their families. Yet we are still providing tax break after tax break for the wealthiest few Americans.

I mean, it just is shocking that the top of the priority list is tax breaks and this trickle-down concept that does not ever seem to go away when it comes to the Republican leadership in this Congress, that if we give the tax breaks to the wealthiest few that somehow their investing and spending is going to flow down and help all the little people.

We are at the point in our lives where we are real live grown-ups now. Has it worked in our lifetime? It still is not working, and we are still not providing for the people who really need the help, who are defending our country. In-

stead, we are taking money back from them.

We talk about the death tax. We should be talking about the disabled veteran tax, because that is what we are doing to our veterans' pensions when they have been injured in the line of duty, and it is absolutely unconscionable.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) offered a motion here to recommit a couple of weeks ago.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What happened?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. A party-line vote went down. And that was on the health care side of it. That was on making sure our Guards and Reservists have coverage regardless. And the gentleman brought out the numbers and it was maybe a billion dollars, but these men and women are picking up and they are in all our districts, and they pick up and they leave their families and come back and leave and come back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They spent 1.8 on tax cuts.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Exactly. And we have the money if we wanted it, if we wanted to ask the top 1 percent to make a sacrifice to help fund this. That money will work its way back into the economy anyway. The fact that that is bad for the economy is an argument that I have never bought into. It is the voodoo economics, the trickle-down economics theory. I would rather have it in the hands of people who are making 50, 60, 70, \$80,000 a year that go out and invest in their kids and those kinds of things. But to say we do not have the money, I think, is shameful.

These are good people. These are not bad people. But to choose them when you have to make decisions based on the whole society right now over this group, I think, is shameful.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let us get into some closing comments because we have about 5 minutes left.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I have a couple of e-mails that I would like to share from last week. We asked everyone 2 weeks ago to e-mail us in what they thought their priorities were in the country. If it was Social Security, they could say it was Social Security. If not, tell us what you think the real crises are in the country.

We have Jim Munroe and Nancy Grover from Albuquerque, New Mexico: "The number one priority has to be turning the deficit around while making the tax system fair and equitable."

Mari Howells from Erie, Pennsylvania, a 30-something Dem who saw us a couple of weeks ago: "Health Insurance! Our health care system is awful. It is bringing the whole country down. Number 2: the war. What a mess. Number 3: poorly funded schools."

I am going to take a minute here to read a beautiful e-mail that we received a couple of weeks ago from a man who saw us three on C-SPAN. He was laid off on September 11, 2002, from

a Fortune 500 company in Dallas, Texas. Informed that his position had been dissolved, "and since I was one of the highest paid, 38,000 a year, on their help desk, that I had to be one of the first ones to go. I was given 2 weeks severance pay and found out through my network that the company had outsourced the help desk to an overseas vendor. I am a proud veteran of the U.S. Air Force where I served 8 years and received an honorable discharge. Before being unemployed I had great health insurance and I am in fact a cancer survivor, but after losing my job and not being able to afford the \$340 monthly payment to COBRA to keep my health insurance, I had no other choice but to go to the Dallas VA hospital to register for my health care.

"I am 41 years young and I have now been unemployed for almost 3 years. My father was forced into early retirement because of his heart and my mother just recently lost her job of many years at a local bank. They could barely make it on their mediocre salary and his Social Security. I do not know what they are going to do now and now I have nothing to help them with because I do not have a savings, checking account or 401(K).

"When I was working, I used to send my mother \$250 a month to help her and my father out a little bit, but I cannot do that any more. He has a temporary job at the bank that pays \$13 an hour with no benefits, a lot less than I used to make but I am very happy just to be working again. God bless you."

So these are the real people that I think we need to begin helping.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is not a lot more that can be said other than that I think that we need to continue to come to this floor every week and I can commit to you that I will join you and make sure that we can continue to highlight the direction that they are taking this country and the increased debt and the selection of the people who need the least over the people who need the most. And I am not talking about people who are struggling to make ends meet.

You have average working families in America whose priorities include health care and quality education and just making sure that they can stay out of debt. And, instead, the wealthiest few are the priority of the leadership in this Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The e-mail is 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. That is 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. Send us an e-mail. Tell us what you believe to be the main crises facing this country.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Www.pirg.org/consolidation. Student loans, get them consolidated before the interest rate goes up almost 2 percent by the first of next month. And 70 percent of our troops are under the age of 30, which is a younger generation right now fighting in Iraq.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). The Chair would like to remind Members that their remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and not to the television audience.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago on this floor there was a very prolonged and serious debate on stem cells. Now that we have had time for emotions to subside, I thought it might be productive to spend a little while this evening talking about the subject of stem cells and why there is so much interest in it across the country.

A few months ago there was so much interest in this subject in California, for instance, that the voters voted favorably for a resolution that would make \$3 billion from California taxpayers available to do research on embryonic stem cells.

What are stem cells? We have a chart here which kind of shows this.

□ 2215

There are fundamentally two types of stem cells. There are adult stem cells and there are embryonic stem cells.

I guess the ultimate stem cell is the fertilized ovum, which is referred to here as a zygote, because from that cell develops all the cells of the body. That single cell, produced from the union of the egg and the sperm, divides and divides again and again until finally it is a blastocyst; and then it goes to the gastrula stage, and at that stage the three germ layers begin to sort out the cells that are already differentiating, is the technical term that is used for that.

Every cell in our body, of course, has all of the same gene complement. And by mechanisms that are not clearly understood, during the embryonic process genes get turned on and get turned off, and the cells that are destined to produce your skin, for instance, the genes that are producing all the other tissues of the body are turned off, and only those genes necessary for producing the skin are still active.

Here we have the three germ layers: The ectoderm, which is the outer layer, and from that will develop your skin and your nervous system.

Then we have the mesoderm, that will be the middle layer, meso meaning middle, and from that will develop most of the weight of your body, all of your skeletal muscle, your cardiac muscle, much of the kidney, the blood cells, the smooth muscle in your intestines and stomach and so forth.

Then from the innermost layer of this inner cell mass as it is called here, the mass of cells that differentiates

into these three germ layers, the endoderm, the internal layer, produces not very much of the mass of your body, the pancreatic cell and the thyroid gland and the line of the things like your lung and intestines and so forth are produced from the endoderm.

Then, of course, there are the unique germ cells produced, the sperm in the male and the egg or the ova in the female.

The reason for the intense interest in these stem cells is because of the perceived potential for affecting the course of many diseases and hopefully curing many of our diseases.

We have fundamentally two kinds of problems with our health. One is from tissue deficiencies when the tissue no longer does the kind of thing that it was destined to do and this embryonic development is wearing out or diseased. Then we have diseases from pathogens. These are organisms that can be outside that invade us.

Primarily, the hope is that stem cells will be useful in treating diseases of tissue deficiency. Although if the pathogens have destroyed a tissue and then the body has marshaled its resources with the help of the doctors with the antibiotics and so forth so that the pathogen is destroyed, then there is some hope that through the use of stem cells that you might be able to repair or replace the tissue damaged by the pathogen.

There are a lot of examples of diseases that might be amenable to cure or at least assistance through these stem cells. One is diabetes, which is a deficiency of insulin. Insulin is produced by some little cells that look like islands under the microscope because they are very dissimilar to the cells that they find themselves in. These cells are distributed through the tissue of the pancreas.

The pancreas is a big gland that produces a lot of enzymes. When the food leaves the stomach and goes into the small intestine, the pancreas produces enzymes for the digestion of fats, carbohydrates and proteins. So it is a very important digestive gland.

There is no real reason why these little islands of tissues, called the islets of Langerhans, named for the person who first described them, need to be in the pancreas, but that is where they are. They could, in fact, be any part of your body and do the same thing, which is secreting insulin.

We use insulin to treat persons with diabetes, but everyone knows, particularly the family of those and the patients who have diabetes, that insulin does not cure the disease. It simply prolongs life, but, ultimately, even with insulin, many of the people who have diabetes will end up having peripheral vascular problems with maybe amputation of toes or limbs, usually the lower limb, have problems in the eyes with the peripheral vascular there in the eyes and have vision problems.

Diabetes is the most expensive disease that we have. It costs more to

maintain and treat the people with diabetes than any other disease. There is the hope that if we could generate islets of Langerhans cells from these stem cells that you could eradicate diabetes, that you could implant these cells in the body, and it could be in any tissue. It could be in muscle tissue or under the skin. You could implant these islets of Langerhans cells there that produce insulin and whatever else these cells do that is not done simply by replacing the insulin which is lost. We might be able to eradicate diabetes, which, of course, would be an enormous contribution.

This is one of the most heart-wrenching things that the congressmen see, is when these little kids come to your office, they have to prick their finger maybe a dozen times a day, and they need insulin so frequently that they have an embedded little pump under their skin, about the size of a hockey puck. They may have to wake up during the night and prick their finger so that they can set the pump so it produces the right amount of insulin.

This is just one of many diseases that authorities in medicine and the general public believes might be helped with stem cell research: multiple sclerosis, lateral sclerosis, Lou Gehrig's disease.

That is one that I am personally very familiar with. My grandmother died from that disease. This was a long time ago, and it took quite a long time to diagnose that disease. She was falling. For quite a while they did not know why, and finally they diagnosed it as Lou Gehrig's disease, as was the common name for it then. I remember watching my grandmother deteriorate until the only motion that she had left, that she could communicate with us, was blinking her eyes: once for yes and two for no. Then she slowly died when she could no longer eat or drink. She did not want to be force fed.

We did not have any dream then of stem cells and what they might do for that disease, but I can understand the hope that families have who have a loved one who has a disease like this and the hope that they have that there may be a medical advance and a miracle cure for the disease.

Alzheimer's disease, my mother had Alzheimer's disease. How nice it would have been to have turned back the clock in her mind so that she was the mother that I spent the first 60 years with.

Then, of course, there is a very large category of autoimmune diseases. I have a list here of 63 autoimmune diseases. That is an interesting type of disease. When we are developing in our mother's womb very early and our heart is beating and we have a circulatory system and we have white cells, there is a particular kind of white cell called the T cells. Very early in our embryonic development those T cells are imprinted with who we are, and that is very necessary because they have to understand who we are, who you are, who I am, so that if some

foreign invader comes in there or virus or bacterium or something, they recognize that as being foreign so that they can reject it.

For reasons that we do not understand, occasionally our autoimmune mechanisms get confused, and they see some of us as not being us, as being foreign, and so they attack it. We call those autoimmune diseases, and there are a lot of those autoimmune diseases: Addison's disease, autoimmune hemolytic anemia, autoimmune hepatitis. It goes on for 63 of these diseases.

Multiple sclerosis is one of those, by the way. Lupus was one of the first of these diseases that was identified as an autoimmune disease. There is a hope that stem cells could be useful in treating all of these diseases.

Then, of course, there are the injuries of central nervous tissue. We have two kinds of nervous tissue in our body, the central nervous tissue that is in our brain and spinal cord and then the peripheral nerves. That is the nerves that run to and from the brain and spinal cord. For reasons that is difficult to understand, they have two very different responses to injury.

Peripheral nerves regrow very easily. There is a classic phenomenon known as Wallerian degeneration and then regeneration of the nerve. If you cut a nerve well up in your leg that goes to your toe, it may be a long while before you get feeling back to your toe, almost always, unless a lot of scar tissue develops where the nerve was cut.

But for some reason that we do not yet understand central nervous tissue has no power to regenerate. Of course, what we are trying to do medically is to find out why central nervous tissue is different than peripheral nervous tissue, but absent finding out why so that you can turn that around there is the hope that with these stem cells we could grow nerve tissue that could then be placed in the body, injected in the body to help repair.

So there are a lot of diseases out there that medical specialists and the public generally believe could be cured or at least the course of the disease quite favorably changed with the use of stem cell technology.

There are, of course, two kinds of stem cells: embryonic stem cells and adult stem cells. Most of the work that we have done so far is with adult stem cells because we have been working with them for over three decades. We have been working with embryonic stem cells just a little over 6 years, and so the techniques for using adult stem cells are far better developed.

So there are more medical applications from adult stem cells than there are from embryonic stem cells, but we have not had enough time working with embryonic stem cells to determine whether or not they have the increased potential that most people believe they should have. The medical specialists believe this. The general public understands this.

If you are dealing with a cell that is not differentiated, that is, that it has

not developed far enough along so that genes are turned off, a lot of leads are turned off, it could then develop into anything and everything with proper manipulation in the laboratory. So that if you are using embryonic stem cells there is the hope that they should have a wider application than adult stem cells.

□ 2230

There is another interesting characteristic of embryonic stem cells, and I do not know how important it will be. Only research will determine that.

At least 50 years ago, embryologists had determined that you could take a mother white mouse and a mother black mouse, each of which was pregnant and they have multiple babies in their uterus, and you could go into the uterus of the black mouse and take a little patch of skin out of the black mice, you could sew it into the skin of one of the white mice. When the white mouse is born, it has a little patch of black skin. Quite amazingly, it is not rejected.

Everybody knows when you transplant an organ from one person to another, there is a big rejection reaction to that. So we have a lot of anti-rejection drugs that we give. The person who gets that organ transplant must take those anti-rejection drugs. As soon as they stop taking them, the T-cells recognize this thing as foreign and start to attack it. Its use in the body is destroyed.

I do not know whether this little mouse experiment, whether the miracle of no rejection is a donor phenomenon or host phenomenon; but when you take skin from one embryo to another, there is no rejection. So using embryo stem cells, they might be less rejected. That would be good news.

I would like to spend just a couple of moments reflecting on some of the elements of a debate here in this Chamber. These debates are a bit like a battle. They are a battle; you are fighting for your position. Like all battles, emotions rise and sometimes things are exaggerated a little by one side or another. Now that emotions have subsided and we are dealing with other issues, I thought it might be instructive to look at some of the arguments made on both sides.

The argument on the pro-life side was that life is sacred, that these little embryos are human life, and the President has a position which I very strongly support, that it is just morally wrong to take one life hoping you can help another life. There has got to be another way to do it.

The bill we were debating said we should take some of those 400,000 surplus embryos that were produced in the in vitro fertilization clinics that were going to be discarded anyhow, we should take those embryos and use them to produce embryonic stem cell lines. For the last 4 years we have been dealing with what started out as maybe 60 cell lines, which has now

dwindled down to 22, all of them contaminated with mouse feeder cells so they are only good for research. They would not be good for medical use so there is a need for additional embryo stem cell lines. These are the only stem cell lines we can use Federal money exploring. The private sector can destroy all of the embryos they wish; there is no prohibition. You just cannot use Federal money so there are only 22 cell lines we can use Federal money to explore.

The argument on the pro-life side, and I subscribe to that argument, that for any one embryo, there is no certainty that embryo is going to be destroyed, that it is going to be abandoned. The argument on the other side is there are 400,000 of them. Of course they are, you cannot keep them frozen forever, and by and by they will be discarded. But not all of them, because we now have, I understand, over 100 babies who have been born from adoption of these snowflake embryos.

We have surplus embryos because when you go for in vitro fertilization, under hormone stimulation the mother produces more than one ovum; and they are put in a petri dish and exposed to sperm and fertilized. Then the doctor watches their growth, and the doctor chooses generally several because they do not all adhere to the uterus and grow to become babies, and so he wants to be sure there will be at least a baby. So he implants several in the uterus, and there are several left over that are then frozen in the event none of those take or the mother wants to have a baby later.

I remember when I was running a farm several years ago, I was breeding cattle to a bull that had been dead for 8 years. I do not know how long the sperm and the ovum or these embryos will survive frozen, but they will survive for quite a long time.

The argument on the pro-life side is that for any one of those embryos, it could be adopted; and that is true. If you have a reverence for life, as I do, you need to find another way to pursue embryonic stem cell research without destroying embryos, and we have a bill that does just that. We have talked to experts from NIH and others around the country, and in a few moments I will be talking about that bill.

One of the arguments made by the pro-life people is we have had 58 medical applications from adult stem cells and none from embryonic stem cells, and that is true. But as Paul Harvey would say, the rest of the story is maybe the reason it is true because we have spent 3 decades working with adult stem cells and only about 6 years working with embryonic stem cells, and you will not know if they have the same potential until you have an equivalent amount of time to work with them.

The arguments on the other side were that these cells are going to be thrown away anyhow and why not get some use from them. I have just reiter-

ated my argument, which is the argument of the pro-life community, which is for any one of those embryos, they could be adopted. In fact, some of these snowflake babies came to the White House during this debate, so they can be adopted.

There was another bill that we voted on that night and that was the umbilical cord blood bill which many mothers are now having frozen because there are some stem cell-like cells there that might be useful. But the argument is although they might be useful, they would not be as useful as the embryonic stem cells themselves.

"As a physician-scientist," and this is a direct quote from Curt Civin, co-director, Division of Immunology and Hematopoiesis Sydney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center, one of the centers at John Hopkins University School of Medicine, and we are fortunate in our State to have one of the best universities and one of the best medical schools in the world, that is Johns Hopkins, he says, "As a physician-scientist who has done research involving umbilical blood cord stem cells for over 20 years, I am frequently surprised by the thought from non-scientists that cord blood stem cells may provide an alternative to embryonic stem cells for research. This is simply wrong," he says.

By the way, all of the 58 diseases that have had applications from adult stem cells, all of them are represented by organizations that support embryonic stem cell research because the general belief is there ought to be more potential from embryonic stem cells than from adult stem cells.

Just a little history why I am standing here this evening and how I got involved in this. I did not come to this Congress until, and this was 13 years ago, until I was 66 years old, and so I had a former life. In that former life, I was a scientist. I have a Ph.D. in human physiology. I taught medical school and postgraduate medicine and spent a number of years doing research at medical schools and at the National Institutes of Health.

Several years ago, in 2001, I believe it was, there was a little like symposium at the National Institutes of Health where staff and members went out. I went out with a fairly large number of staff members where the experts from NIH were briefing the staff and members who were there on stem cell research. This was just before the President came down with his executive order on stem cells, and this was kind of an educational activity on the part of NIH. There were several researchers there; and as we can see in the next chart, I suggested it ought to be possible to take cells from an early embryo without hurting the embryo and that was because of my knowledge of what happens in twinning.

Now, the first chart here shows the usual type of twinning. That is where you have two zygotes. That is the mother sloughed two ovum, not just

one, and both were fertilized and both came down and were implanted in the uterus and they grew two fetuses, and they are called womb mates because they share the womb.

Well, we also can have twins, and the next chart shows identical twins and what happens with identical twins.

This can occur apparently in at least two different stages in the development of the embryo. Here we have the zygote, which is the union of the egg and the sperm, and that then divides to two cells; and they have left out a lot of stages here because there is a lot of stages between the two cell and the inner mass cell stage.

These embryos can split at the two-cell stage or later on when they grow two inner cell masses. You can tell at what time they split by how they present themselves. If they are presented in two placentas, they split early and they go their separate ways. If they split later, they are generally presented at birth in a single placenta so the doctor knows the approximate time they split.

I recognized what was really happening here was in a sense you were taking half of the cells away from the original embryo, and both halves went on to produce a perfectly normal baby. So it seemed perfectly logical to me that you ought to be able to take a cell or two from an early embryo without hurting the embryo. There has been a lot of research since that.

By the way, the experts at NIH said, yes, that should be feasible. I mentioned this to the President at an event where we had just a few moments to talk about it, and he turned the pursuit of this over to Karl Rove who went to NIH and asked them about my suggestion that you might be able to take cells from an early embryo, and he came back and called me and said they tell me they cannot do that.

I said either they did not understand the question or there is some confusion, because these are the same people that can take a single cell and take the nucleus out of that cell and put another one in it. That is what you do in cloning. If you can do that in a single cell, obviously you have the capability of taking a single cell out of a fairly large mass of cells.

So he went back a second time and asked them and they told him the same thing, and so the President came down a few days later with his executive order that all the stem cell lines we have produced by destroying embryos; and since he was opposed to taking one life with the hope that you might help another life, he could not support the destruction of any additional embryos, but that Federal money could be used in pursuing research and medical applications using what he was told was roughly 60 lines of stem cells that were in existence at that time.

□ 2245

Several years later in my office, just this year, as a matter of fact, talking

with the people from NIH, they explained how this misunderstanding occurred. It is awfully easy to have misunderstandings when your backgrounds are very different, which is one of the problems we have in dialogues, of course. You can think that you are carrying on a dialogue when you are really carrying on simultaneous monologues, which was apparently sort of what happened in this discussion between Karl Rove and NIH. Because what they had really told him was that they did not know if they could make a stem cell line from such an early embryo, and that is true, and that is why I wanted animal experimentation to determine whether you could do that or not.

Our next chart shows some of this progression, and it shows what we are talking about and what we were talking about there. This is half of the reproductive life of a mother. It shows an ovary, and there is one on each side, of course. Then it shows a funnel-like thing that sweeps over the ovum, it is called the infundibulum, and then the fallopian tube and down to the uterus. This shows just half of the tract. There is a mirror image of this over on the other side.

By the way, there is an interesting thing that sometimes happens. These sperm are very energetic. They are released, of course, in the vagina of the mother, and they then make their way up into the uterus, through the cervix into the uterus, and then they swim all the way up the fallopian tube, and they can swim out through the end of the fallopian tube out into the body cavity. Sometimes the egg is not picked up by the cilia in the fallopian tube, and it also floats out into the body cavity, and the egg can be fertilized there. We call this an ectopic pregnancy and, of course, the baby cannot grow there, so that has to be removed.

The ovum starts down the fallopian tube and very high up in the fallopian tube, it is fertilized. Then it divides into two cells and four cells and eight cells. It is at the eight-cell stage in the laboratory. This same process of fertilization and growth occurs in the petri dish in the laboratory, and it is at the eight-cell stage in the laboratory that they ordinarily implant the embryos. This goes on, of course, to produce the inner cell mass that we saw in the earlier chart there which then differentiates into the germ layers. It is at these later stages that it actually implants in the mother's uterus.

The convention is ordinarily that implantation is done at the eight-cell stage. So my suggestion was that you could take a cell from the eight-cell stage, and it would not harm the embryo. As a matter of fact, if the embryo splits at this stage or at the two-cell stage or down here at the inner cell mass stage of the two inner cell masses, both groups of cells go on to produce a perfectly normal baby. So, obviously, there was the potential that

you could take a cell from an early embryo without harming the embryo.

I have been carrying on this dialogue with the pro-life community and with the scientists at NIH now for these 4 years. During one of these discussions, the representative of the Catholic bishops, Mr. Dorflinger, made a suggestion. There are some things that you see in life that are just so obvious that you say, gee, why didn't I think of that. His contribution was just that kind of thing. He said, in addition to taking a cell out of that inner cell mass, and, by the way, this is now done more than a thousand times around the world. We do not know how many more than a thousand times. But in the laboratory they want to know that this embryo they are going to implant in the mother does not have any genetic defects so that they are going to have a healthy baby. So they take a cell out of the eight-cell stage and they do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis on it and then they implant those remaining cells in the mother and more than a thousand times they have had a normal baby born.

Mr. Dorflinger's suggestion was, and in addition to doing that preimplantation genetic diagnosis that you also establish a repair kit. That is kind of what you hope you are doing when you freeze umbilical cord blood. You hope that there are some stem-cell-like cells in there, that if there are future medical problems and stem cell research development has gone on to the point that you can make some meaningful applications that you could then be using tissues that would not be rejected like the tissues from an embryonic stem cell from another person.

But clearly if the repair kit was established from a cell taken from an early embryo, it would be exactly the genetic composition of the child, of the person, of the adult as they grew, and so any defect could then be very effectively treated with tissues that would not be rejected.

The President has a group of people, the President's Council on Bioethics, and because of the enormous expected potential from stem cell research, they have been looking at alternatives for embryonic stem cell research that might be ethically acceptable and they have just fairly recently issued a report, *Alternative Sources of Human Pluripotent Stem Cells*. It is called a white paper. In the body of that white paper they describe four different techniques.

The next chart shows a little paragraph from that, and I have highlighted a part of it.

It says it may be some time before stem cells can be reliably derived from single cells extracted from early embryos and in ways that do no harm to the embryo, thus biopsied. But the initial success of the Verlinsky's Group's efforts at least raises the future possibility that pluripotent stem cells could be derived from single blastomeres. A blastomere is simply a cell from the

blastula. It merely means a cell removed from the early human embryos without apparently harming them.

Then there is a little asterisk. If you go to the bottom of the page you see, "A similar idea was proposed by Representative ROSCOE BARTLETT of Maryland as far back as 2001." This is the proposal that I made to the President that was pursued by Karl Rove with the misunderstandings that we talked about a few minutes ago.

In the body of their paper, they talk about four different approaches. One of the approaches is to use embryos that obviously are not going to live because they are really bad and they are going to die. You could take cells from them like taking an organ from a person who is brain dead. I would have a little concern, Mr. Speaker, about how good a stem cell I was getting from an embryo that was dead.

Another suggestion is to manipulate the genes of the cells so that if they develop they will never produce a baby. It would be kind of a freak, I guess, and since it is not going to be a baby, then you could take cells from that. Again, I would have a little concern, was I really getting a normal cell when I was taking it from something that was genetically engineered so that it was not going to grow to be a baby?

In the text of their white paper, they do a very good job of talking about developing the repair kit and the fact that the cells could probably be taken without hurting the embryo. They look at all of the pluses and minuses of this.

But then it looks like almost, Mr. Speaker, that somebody else wrote the recommendations, because let me read from the recommendations here. The recommendations say, the second proposal, blastomere extraction from living embryos, we find this proposal to be ethically unacceptable in humans owing to the reasons given in the ethical analysis: We should not impose risk on living embryos destined to become children for the sake of getting stem cells for research.

I agree. That is not what they talked about in the text of their white paper. There they talked about preimplantation genetic diagnosis. This clearly has to be for the benefit of the baby. The mother does not want to have a baby that is going to have a less than optimum opportunity for a good life with a genetic defect, and she has the opportunity to determine that and so she does it. And then they also talk about developing the repair kit.

So what we were proposing is that there would be cells made available, surplus cells from the repair kit, only after the parents had made three decisions which were in the interest of their baby. The first decision was to do in vitro fertilization. I know that there are those who do not believe that we ought to be doing in vitro fertilization. They kind of think that is like playing God. But there is an old axiom that I really subscribe to, Mr. Speaker, and that is that man's extremity is God's

opportunity and God is not going to do for us what we can do for ourselves. And these parents have made the decision they want a baby and in vitro fertilization is the only way they are going to get one, so they have made the decision.

Then they have made the decision they really want a healthy baby, so they are going to do preimplantation genetic diagnosis. And, by the way, they refreeze the embryo that was defective. It could be adopted. There are some families and, God bless them, that are really fulfilled by taking into their home handicapped babies, babies with defects, that they are going to be with them for a lifetime and these people feel fulfilled in taking these children into their homes, children who have HIV, crack cocaine babies and so forth and so these embryos could be adopted.

By the way, this is not genetic engineering. There have been some suggestions that this is an unacceptable technique. Just looking at what kind of genes are there, Mr. Speaker, that is not genetic engineering. That is not a very believable argument against this.

Then the parents have made a third choice, and that is to establish a repair kit for their baby. And only after the parents have made those three what I think are ethical choices, they want to have their own baby, they do not want their baby to have a genetic defect and they want their baby to have a repair kit and only after they have made those three decisions, then we would ask for some surplus cells from the repair kit to establish a new stem cell line.

There are two things that I want to refer to here. One is a letter from Dr. Battey, who is the spokesperson at NIH for stem cell research. He wrote me on May 23, fairly recently, a three-page letter in which he says, live births resulting from embryos which undergo preimplantation genetic diagnosis and are subsequently implanted seem to suggest that this procedure does not harm the embryo. At least for a thousand times we have had a normal baby. They are not adults yet, and so the clock has to run for a while before we determine whether there is any defect.

I would be very surprised, Mr. Speaker, if there is a defect. Because you can take half the cells away from an early embryo to produce identical twins, and both halves produce what looks like perfectly normal people. So I would be surprised if there is any long-term effects from this.

Also, it is not known if the single cell removed from the eight-cell stage human embryo has the capacity to become an embryo if cultured in the appropriate environment.

Then I would like to turn, Mr. Speaker, to the Science section, Monday, June 6, just yesterday, Stem Cell Advances May Make Moral Issue Moot. A Dr. Lanza, and our office has spoken to Dr. Lanza, he is publishing a paper imminently. Some of the details could

not be in this article because he was holding those for his paper.

In one approach pioneered by Robert Lanza and colleagues at Advanced Cell Technology in Worcester, Massachusetts, researchers plucked single cells from eight-cell embryos, embryos so young they do not have stem cells yet. Stem cells are ordinarily derived from inner cell mass. I do not understand saying that these are not the conventional stem cells but they certainly, I think, have the capacity to produce stem cells.

Fertility doctors have known for years that early embryos seem unfazed by the removal of any one of their eight virtually identical cells called blastomeres. In fact, it is common today to remove a single representative blastomere from a laboratory conceived embryo and test that cell for diseased genes before deciding whether to transfer that embryo into a woman's womb.

If this technique were applied to humans, and I skipped a couple of paragraphs where he talks about work with animals, if this technique were applied to humans, then a single cell taken from an eight-cell fertility clinic embryo could give rise to a self-replicating line of embryonic stem cells without compromising the donor embryo's odds of someday growing into a baby.

So the thing that Dr. Battey said had not yet been, and he was correct because this paper is yet to be published, I think it may be published today or tomorrow, but he has now in mice, and if it is doable in mice it is probably doable in higher animals, including humans, that they have developed stem cell lines from a single cell taken from an early blastomere.

I would just like to spend a few moments now talking about the bill which we have filed. It has a number of cosponsors, and I am very pleased that several doctors in the House have signed on to our bill.

□ 2300

Our bill really has nothing to do with working on humans because we think that we ought to do some animal experimentation before we start working with humans. So what our bill does is simply to make some moneys available for a several-year study, and we ought to go up to nonhuman primates. These are animals like chimpanzees and the great apes. To make sure that what has been done in mice and what has been done more than 1,000 times in these clinics, and what has been done, of course, is taking cells from an early embryo without apparently hurting the embryo, that we could develop these cells into a stem cell line. That has now been done, as was noted in the paper yesterday. This is the science section of The Washington Post. So the potential is there to do this. And all that our research does is to ask for animal experimentation so that we can check and double-check and make real-

ly sure that this is a safe procedure for humans.

I would like to put up the last chart that we are going to refer to now. This is a little bit like one that we looked at previously. This shows again half of the reproductive tract of the female; and, of course, what we are talking about are procedures that are done in the laboratory. But they are mimicking what happens in the body. By the way, when the little baby girl is born, she has in her ovary all of the ova that will ever be there, and they mature generally during her reproductive life, which may span 30, 40 years. They generally mature from one side or the other one a month. But they are all in there. And this shows the development of these ovum. And finally they grow and there is like a little blister on the side of the ovary, and then it breaks and the ovum is free.

In the laboratory, of course, these have been washed out of the reproductive tract of the female, and they are now put in petri dishes and exposed to sperm. In the body, the sperm is deposited in the vagina, makes its way through the cervix, up through the uterus, and swims clear up through the Fallopian tube. In a laboratory, of course, they simply with a pipette put the sperm in the petri dish with the ovum. And there will be many sperm. There are millions of sperm. And really quite a miraculous and very rapid transformation takes place. As soon as one sperm enters the egg, the egg then sets up a defense so that no more sperm can enter because if another sperm were able to make its way in and they had three sets of chromosomes instead of two, that would be fatal.

By the way, in flowers that is not fatal. That is called polyploidy, and that is how we get bigger flowers and better smell and so forth. But plants react very differently to extra hormones than humans do. Tisomy-21 produces mongoloid babies. That is just having one extra of one chromosome. So we do not react well to extra chromosomes; and so the ovum, after one sperm has entered, it sets up this defense so that no more sperm can enter.

The same thing happens in the laboratory. And then it divides, and the doctor watches that division. And down at eight-cell stage, they take a cell out and do preimplantation genetic diagnosis; and as recent research has demonstrated, the paper that is going to be published very shortly by Dr. Lanza, they have done this in mice, but if it is possible there, it ought to be possible in higher animals, and our research would determine that. They have produced stem cell lines from a single cell taken. What this means is, Mr. Speaker, that we now have been able to produce, we will be able to produce, embryonic stem cell lines without harming an embryo.

I have heard people say that they are just unalterably opposed to embryonic stem cell research. I hope that is not what they mean. I hope what they are

mean is that they are unalterably opposed to embryonic stem cell research if it means killing an embryo. I am unalterably opposed to embryonic stem cell research if it means taking one life with the hope that we will be able to help another life. But with these recent advances in medicine and research in the laboratory, there is the real hope that we can take cells from an early embryo to benefit the embryo.

And I would like to say again the reasons that the parents are taking cells from this early embryo, the fundamental reason they are taking the cell is to do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis. And the President's Council on Bioethics mentions the possibility of creating a repair kit, which certainly would benefit the baby. So the parent has now done three things which they think is ethical. I think that they are ethical, and there ought to be surplus cells from the repair kit, and it is those surplus cells that would be made available for additional stem cell lines.

But I want to reiterate again that the bill which we have just looks at animal experimentation. Although human research, human developments, human applications have gone beyond some of the exploration that we have done with animals, we still think that it is prudent to work with animals where we can determine with more cases and more intense experimental observation to make sure that there are no untoward effects of doing this.

I hope that this research can bring the two sides together. We had a couple of weeks ago a very heated debate. The emotions on both sides were rather obvious: those who wanted to take some of these more than 400,000 frozen embryos that they said were going to be discarded anyhow to get some good from them, and they were so convinced of this in California that they voted for \$3 billion to proceed with this. The argument on the other side, which position I take, is that morally I have big problems with taking one life, and this little embryo could become under the right circumstances a baby. More than 100 times it has. From these frozen 400,000, there are about 100 or so, we call Snowflake babies, because this is a program to offer these embryos for adoption, and more than 100 times they have been adopted, and the President had some of those babies at the White House a couple of weeks ago when we were having that debate, and they came to the Hill also when we were having that debate here on the floor.

With the ability to take cells from an early embryo not to establish a stem cell line, that is not why the parents took it. They took the cell to do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis. They then would like to establish a repair kit. We know they would like to do that because they are more and more freezing umbilical cord blood, which, as the one doctor I read from said, is a poor second choice to an embryonic stem cell line, but it is better

than nothing. So we know that parents would like to do that. And it is only after that if the animal experimentation supported by our bill shows that this is efficacious and will not harm the baby, only after that would stem cell lines be derived from surplus cells from repair kits that the parents had decided to establish for the benefit of their baby.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this ought to remove all of the ethical objections. But there is just one more, and I just want to spend a moment talking about that, and this is a good chart to talk about it from. Since these cells at the eight-cell stage are quite undifferentiated, which means they have not really decided what they are going to be, it is possible that they might take that one cell and establish another embryo. The President's Council on Bioethics thinks that is very unlikely. But what I would like to see them pursue is the development of stem cell lines and the preimplantation genetic diagnosis from the inner cell mass stage.

Now, that is the stage at which embryonic stem cells are ordinarily taken from when the embryo is destroyed. That is before the embryo is implanted in the normal process. Here is the inner cell mass, and here is where it is implanted a couple of days later, 2 or 3 days later, in the uterus.

□ 2310

Ordinarily, and I am not sure why they use the eight cell stage in the clinical laboratories, but I would like to see cells taken from the inner cell mass. There is no ethical question involved there because these cells in the inner cell mass cannot produce a baby because they have already lost their ability to produce decidua. The decidua is the amnion and chorion which is commonly known as the placenta, and they have lost the ability to do that, so they cannot produce a baby, but they can produce all of the tissues of a person, because these are what produce, back to our first chart that shows the inner cell mass differentiating into these three germ layers.

So the last possible ethical objection to deriving stem cells from pre-implantation genetic diagnosis and the development of a repair kit would be gone if we could take the cell from the inner cell mass, because the inner cell mass, those cells could not possibly produce a baby, because they are sufficiently differentiated that they cannot produce the deciduum.

I have used this term "differentiation" a number of times, and what we try to do with adult stem cells, because they are already differentiated, we try to de-differentiate them. We try to confuse them with ques, with chemicals, with exposing them to other cells and the products from other cells so that they can kind of forget their development and they now go back to a prior less-differentiated state where they could produce more variety of cells. But you avoid those problems

with the embryonic stem cell, because it has the capability to produce any and every cell in the body.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that with these recent medical advances, with the knowledge that we have, that it is perfectly feasible to ethically develop embryonic stem cell lines from embryos which should have, in the view of many of the experts, and clearly in the view of most Americans if you poll them, should have more potential than adult stem cells. Only research will tell that, and only time will tell whether or not that is true.

But with the hope that these large numbers of diseases so devastating to our people could be affected or maybe cured with embryonic stem cells, we really must pursue this, and now we have the opportunity to do that without offending those who have a problem with taking one life so that we might help another life.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we now are on the cusp of advances that will bring these two sides together. We have enough things to be concerned about and to discuss in our country, we do not need to be discussing this, and I think the two sides with these present advances can come together. I hope that we will have an early vote on our bill and it will reach the President's desk so that he has a bill that he can sign that will promote embryonic stem cell research.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and before 4:00 p.m. June 8 on account of official business.

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 Mr. RYAN of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and June 9.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and June 8 and 9.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, June 9.

Mr. KELLER, for 5 minutes, today and June 8.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and June 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. SIMMONS, for 5 minutes, June 9.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, June 8.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, June 8.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the House title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1760. An ACT to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard in Madison, Wisconsin, as the "Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building".

A BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on May 27, 2005 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2566. To provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 8, 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:

2223. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the intention to reallocate funds previously transferred from the Emergency Response Fund; (H. Doc. No. 109-31); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2224. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting certification that the export to the People's Republic of China of the specified items is not detrimental to the United States space launch industry, and that the material and equipment, including any indirect technical benefit that could be derived from such exports, will not measurably improve the missile or space launch capabilities of the People's Republic of China, pursuant to Public Law 105-261, section 1512; (H. Doc. No. 109-32); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

2225. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-73, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 527, S.O. 03-1181, Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2226. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-74, "Rental Housing Act Extension Amendment Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2227. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-75, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 342, S.O. 03-5369, Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2228. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-89, "Rental Housing Conversion and Sale Amendment Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2229. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-76, "Closing of a Portion of Davenport Street, N.W., abutting Squares 1672 and 1673, S.O. 03-2366, Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2230. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-84, "Victims of Domestic Violence Fund Establishment Temporary Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2231. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-85, "Local, Small, and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Certification Temporary Amendment Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2232. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2233. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2234. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2235. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2236. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2237. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2238. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2239. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2240. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Grounds; Baltimore Harbor Anchorage Project [CGD05-03-036] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received June 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2241. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19525; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-18-AD; Amendment 39-14026; AD 2005-07-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2242. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20631; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-025-AD; Amendment 39-14012; AD 2005-06-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on May 26, 2005 the following reports were filed on June 2, 2005]

Mr. HOEKSTRA: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence H.R. 2475. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with amendment (Rept 109-101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BONILLA: Committee on Appropriations H.R. 2744. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

[Filed on June 7, 2005]

Mr. BARTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Resolution 169. Resolution recognizing the importance of sun safety, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 109-103). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1812. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a demonstration grant program to provide patient navigator services to reduce barriers and improve health care outcomes, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PUTNAM: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 303. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2744) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes

(Rept. 109-105). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 304. Resolution providing for consideration of (H.J. Res. 27) withdrawing the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization (Rept. 109-106). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on May 27, 2005]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration H.R. 22 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HYDE (for himself and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 2745. A bill to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure that benefits under part D of such title have no impact on benefits under other Federal programs; 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. FILNER:

H.R. 2747. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance military and veterans' life insurance programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2748. A bill to condition the minimum-wage-exempt status of organized camps under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 on compliance with certain safety standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2749. A bill to require cigarette products to be placed under or behind the counter in retail sales; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2750. A bill to amend section 502(h) of the Housing Act of 1949 to improve the rural housing loan guarantee program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2751. A bill to amend section 526 of the National Housing Act to provide that any certification of a property for meeting energy efficiency requirements for mortgage insurance under such Act shall be conducted by an individual certified by an accredited home energy rating system provider; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2752. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to make available to Federal employees the option of obtaining health benefits coverage for dependent parents; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2753. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public funding for House of Representatives

elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2754. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to eliminate a limitation on benefits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the income tax treatment of legal fees awarded or received in connection with nonphysical personal injury cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Social Security to disclose certain taxpayer returns and return information upon written request by an order from a State or local court in a family law proceeding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an inflation adjustment of the dollar limitation on the exclusion of gain on the sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2758. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program of infertility treatment services for individuals entitled to health insurance benefits under that program by reason of a disability; 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. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2759. A bill to assure equitable treatment of fertility and impotence in health care coverage under group health plans, health insurance coverage, and health plans under the Federal employees' health benefits program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, 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 Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2760. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the preparation of audit reports based upon the financial auditing of Medicare Advantage organizations and to make such reports available to the public; 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. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2761. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for annual screening mammography for any class of covered individuals if the coverage or plans include coverage for diagnostic mammography for such class and to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of annual screening mammography under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2762. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a demonstration project for the use of an Internet-based form for submission of certain claims under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2763. A bill to authorize the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to make grants to local educational agencies to support the purchase or lease and use of vending machines that offer for sale healthy foods and beverages in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. CLAY:

H.R. 2764. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2 methyl 5 nitrobenzenesulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2765. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on p-cresidine sulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2766. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2,4 disulfo benzaldehyde; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2767. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on n ethyl N (3-sulfobenzyl) aniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2768. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on m-hydroxy benzaldehyde; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2769. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2 amino 5 sulfobenzoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2770. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2 amino 6 nitro phenol 4 sulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2771. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2,5 bis [(1,3 dioxobutyl) amino] benzene sulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2772. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4 [(4 amino phenyl) azo] benzene sulfonic acid, monosodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2773. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on oleoresin turmeric; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2774. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on basic yellow 40 chloride based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2775. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on direct yellow 119; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2776. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4 [(4 amino phenyl) azo] benzene sulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2777. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on oleoresin paprika; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2778. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to permit a voting registrar to remove an individual from the official list of registered voters for elections for Federal office on the ground that the individual no longer resides in the registrar's jurisdiction if the individual fails to vote in any election held during 2 consecutive Federal election cycles, the registrar sends a notice to the individual at the end of the second cycle, and the individual fails to respond to the notice within 60 days; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 2779. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to enable Federal agencies responsible for the preservation of threatened species and endangered species to rescue and relocate members of any of those species that would be taken in the course of certain reconstruction, maintenance, or repair of Federal or non-Federal manmade flood control levees; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Ms. BEAN):

H.R. 2780. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for the Transportation Security Administration to issue regulations requiring turbojet aircraft of air carriers to be equipped with missile defense systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2781. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Naugard 412S; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2782. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Triacetoneamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2783. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Iponazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2784. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Omite Tech; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2785. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pantera Technical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the same capital gains treatment for art and collectibles as for other investment property and to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 2787. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to restore the mission of the Federal Aviation Administration to promote civil aeronautics; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. HOOLEY):

H.R. 2788. A bill to establish the Mark O. Hatfield-Elizabeth Furse Scholarship and Excellence in Tribal Governance Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Res. 305. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the National Congenital Heart Defect Awareness Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Res. 306. A resolution to recognize and honor the world's nearly 20,000,000 refugees; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2789. A bill for the relief of Gabriella Dee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. HART, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DENT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 2790. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Richard D. Winters, of Hershey, Pennsylvania, for acts of valor on June 6, 1944, in Normandy, France, while an officer in the 101st Airborne Division; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. SNYDER.
 H.R. 23: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 41: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 65: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FOLEY, and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 111: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 115: Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 176: Mr. COX, Ms. HARMAN, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 195: Mr. KOLBE.
 H.R. 216: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
 H.R. 224: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 282: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 302: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 303: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. NORWOOD.
 H.R. 328: Mr. GILCHREST.
 H.R. 333: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 363: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 371: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 389: Mr. BUYER.
 H.R. 448: Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 457: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 463: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 468: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 503: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 515: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 543: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 551: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SABO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 554: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 558: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 602: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 615: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 652: Mr. FORD, Mr. HERGER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 670: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 676: Ms. CARSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 699: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 713: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 736: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 747: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 752: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 771: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 780: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 783: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 800: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 801: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 818: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 820: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 831: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 839: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 864: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 865: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 869: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 880: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 887: Mr. BERRY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 896: Mr. FORD, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 898: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 916: Mr. BERRY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 923: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 940: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 945: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 963: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 968: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORD, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 986: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 988: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 997: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 998: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1000: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1010: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1020: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 1079: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1102: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1124: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 1155: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1156: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1157: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 1175: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1204: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. REYES, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1216: Mr. GILLMOR and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1220: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1288: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MICA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr.

MCCRERY, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 1299: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1352: Mr. INSLER.
H.R. 1365: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 1376: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 1390: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1409: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 1424: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1471: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1505: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1510: Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 1511: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 1520: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 1526: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1547: Mr. DREIER and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1558: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1585: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 1592: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 1606: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 1607: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 1619: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 1620: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1642: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.
H.R. 1652: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1671: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1696: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1704: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 1744: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 1748: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 1791: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1823: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 1851: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 1861: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1863: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1898: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 1955: Mr. SCHIFF and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1973: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. LEE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2012: Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 2017: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 2044: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2047: Mr. ORTIZ and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 2061: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2074: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2076: Mr. FILNER and Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 2106: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 2123: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 2183: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2209: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 2218: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2338: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CASE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 2290: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 2327: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BACA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WEINER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 2328: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2331: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2350: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2355: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2363: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 2367: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2369: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2370: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2423: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 2427: Mr. BASS, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 2429: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 2457: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2500: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2526: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 2533: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2626: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2641: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2646: Mr. TERRY, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2648: Mr. BARROW, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2658: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2681: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 2688: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2694: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BACA, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2717: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2719: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 37: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 71: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Con. Res. 85: Mrs. CAPITO.

H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 159: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 160: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. DENT.

H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. CASE.

H. Con. Res. 172: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SIMMONS.

H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. OSBORNE.

H. Res. 121: Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 146: Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Res. 175: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 189: Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Res. 199: Mr. HOYER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 279: Mr. SHAW.

H. Res. 282: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.

H. Res. 282: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.

H.R. 65: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY
AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 51, line 21, insert the following before the period at the end:

: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be expended in contravention of section 213A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1183a)

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 2, line 19, after the dollar amount insert the following: “: *Provided*, That \$875,000 of the funds made available by this appropriation shall not be available until the Secretary of Agriculture submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the National Animal Identification Plan, including the lessons learned and the effectiveness of the pilot programs funded in fiscal year 2005, an analysis of the economic impact of the proposed National Animal Identification System on the livestock industry, and the expected cost of implementing the National Animal Identification System”.

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report on the National Animal Identification Plan, including—

(1) the lessons learned and the effectiveness of the pilot programs funded in fiscal year 2005;

(2) an analysis of the economic impact of the proposed National Animal Identification System on the livestock industry; and

(3) the expected cost of implementing the National Animal Identification System.

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. BACA

AMENDMENT No. 4: Under the heading “COMMON COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT”, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$855,000)”.

Under the headings “COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE” and “RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES”, insert after the first dollar amount, and after the dollar amount relating to an education grants program for Hispanic-serving Institutions, the following: “(increased by \$855,000)”.

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT No. 5: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 7 _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who make loans available under section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272) to processors of domestically grown sugarcane at a rate in excess of 17 cents per pound for raw cane sugar or to processors of domestically grown sugar beets at a rate in excess of 21.6 cents per pound for refined beet sugar.

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. CHABOT

AMENDMENT No. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. LANGEVIN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of Rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 203 of the Agriculture Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out a market program under such section.

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. PLATTS

AMENDMENT No. 7: Page 5, line 8, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 5, line 13, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 18, line 12, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$1,227,000)”.

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. REHBERG

AMENDMENT No. 8: Strike section 759 (page 80, lines 7 through 10), relating to the delay in country of origin labeling for meat and meat products.

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHWARZ

AMENDMENT No. 9: Add at the end (before the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 7____. It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture should use the transfer authority provided by section 442 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7772) to implement the strategic plan developed by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for the eradication of Emerald Ash

Borer in the States of Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana.

H.R. 2744

OFFERED BY: MR. SWEENEY

AMENDMENT No. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries or expenses of personnel to inspect horses intended for slaughter, horse carcasses, or horse meat under the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127).