



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2005

No. 87

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT B. ADERHOLT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for 5 minutes.

KARL ROVE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week the Deputy Chief of Staff of the President of the United States, Karl Rove, a man who began as a political operator, and was rewarded for his political successes by being named to a very high position in the administration—indeed, he is clearly as influential in shaping the policies of the Bush Administration as anyone other than the President himself—made a speech which was harsh, as is his right, but which was thoroughly

dishonest, which again is his right under the first amendment to the Constitution, but ought not to be a right which high officials of the Federal Government avail themselves of so freely.

Mr. Rove lied. The speech consists of a number of conscious, deliberate lies, particular ones and general ones. Here is what he said in his effort to further the deep polarization of this country from which he believes his side will benefit if he is able to shape the way in which it is perceived. “The most important difference between conservatives and liberals can be found in the area of national security. Conservatives saw the savagery of 9/11 in the attacks and prepared for war. Liberals saw the savagery of the 9/11 attacks and wanted to prepare indictments and offer therapy and understanding for our attackers.”

Mr. Speaker, that is a lie. It is a lie consisting of a number of lies. I am a liberal, Mr. Speaker. And along with many, many other liberals in this Chamber, my response to the savage murders of Americans on 9/11 has no resemblance to the political dishonesty that Karl Rove put forward.

I voted for war in Afghanistan. No one who serves here votes for war easily. No one who has the responsibility of defending the country can be cavalier about sending the young men and women of our country off to battle, to kill and be killed. But the vote to go to war in Afghanistan, to authorize the President, in effect, to go to war, to take whatever measures were necessary, and we knew when we did that that we were talking about going after the regime in Afghanistan which was sheltering that murderer, Osama bin Laden, that vote was virtually unanimous. There was one “no” vote here. There were no “no” votes in the other body.

There are a lot of liberals here, Mr. Speaker. And virtually unanimously we voted to go to war in Afghanistan.

Yet Mr. Rove would lie to the American people and characterize that decision to go to war in defense of the country as indictments and therapy and understanding.

Shortly after that, on the Judiciary Committee on which I then served, we spent a couple of weeks dealing with what should be done to increase the law enforcement powers of this country. And we voted out a bill by a unanimous vote of 36 to 0. There are a number of liberals on that committee; Myself, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the most determined defender of civil liberties I have ever served with, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), the chairman on our side, the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentlemen from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of Members deeply committed to liberalism. And we voted unanimously for a bill that enhanced law enforcement powers. It was not therapy. It was not understanding. It was enhanced law enforcement powers. Now, it is true that many of us subsequently voted against a very different bill that came to the floor.

But the version we reported out of our committee was the one of which the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), boasted a while ago about his bipartisanship, because it provided significantly enhanced law enforcement powers.

Sadly the Republican leadership then decided to kill that bill, and with no debate, no chance to read it, substitute a very different bill that many of us opposed on procedural as well as substantive grounds.

But the fact is that the liberals on the Judiciary Committee unanimously supported increased law enforcement powers. So the notion that we were offering only therapy, that lie, is of

□ 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.

H5179

course refuted by the fact that we voted go to war. We voted for enhanced law enforcement powers.

But then comes the biggest lie of all. What Mr. Rove appears to be trying to do is to perpetuate one of the most damaging acts of dishonesty we have seen from a President of the United States, the argument that part of the reason for invading Iraq was to defend ourselves against 9/11. That is, of course, what is implicit in Mr. Rove's speech. He would put together the attack of 9/11, and what we did in Iraq.

But, the fact is now very clear, the Iraqi regime, despicable as it was, was not involved in the murders of 9/11. The war in Iraq was not based on an effort to deal with 9/11. That was the war in Afghanistan, which we supported.

So what you have from Mr. Rove, I would say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is a couple of specific lies in pursuit of a very big one, a big one that tries to get America to forget how dishonestly this administration argued for the war in Iraq.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Lord God, the Book of Proverbs tells us of Your care and concern for leaders: "Discretion will watch over you. Understanding will guard you."

Lord, without discretion, power and position may be wasted and personal virtues produce nothing.

As a special aspect of prudence, discretion enlightens a person to one's true motives in acting and inspires multiple means to achieve one's goal.

So fill Members of the House of Representatives with discretion this week.

May they be discreet in what they say and discreet in what they do. Since they have such an impact on so many people, they need to be mindful that indiscreet thoughts boomerang their sting when they come to light in word or deed.

In Your sight, O Lord, discretion is the better part of valor now and always.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts 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.

PATRIOTIC SPIRIT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure this weekend to attend a wonderful patriotic program at Calvary Baptist Church in Winston-Salem entitled, "Our Flag Was Still There." Interspersed with music and narration were reminders of times our country has been challenged and brave Americans have risen to the challenge.

As we approach the Fourth of July and all the celebrations attendant to it, it was gratifying to see a major church in our area doing its part to remind us of our heritage and inspire people to pray for our country. I quote Pastor Al Gilbert: "The flag is the symbol that has much standing behind it. Today there are thousands of men and women wearing this flag on their sleeve and standing in harm's way. We must stand behind them as they stand for what is behind the flag. We remember those who made this a great Nation and we invite you to join us in praying for the needs of our country today."

Associate Pastor Larry White: "You are exercising your right to celebrate and worship freely in our great country. In light of the threat to the safety and peace our country has faced in recent years and our current world condition, we especially want to honor the men and women who sacrifice that we may be sustained. We salute you and your commitment to our country."

I am grateful to all of the folks at Calvary, and all the other churches in our country that will have similar programs this weekend, for their patriotic spirit and their prayers.

EXTENDING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY OF OSCAR BROWN, JR.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to extend condolences to the family of a dear friend of mine and a friend of all people who love culture, art, music, literature.

Oscar Brown, Jr., died a few days ago, and of course, Oscar was a noted enter-

tainer who always stayed close to his roots. Some of his great pieces were things like Mr. Kicks and, of course, his great song about the snake.

I simply say to his wife Jean Pace, to their children, especially his daughter Maggie who is a great entertainer in her own right, that we appreciated having the opportunity to know and benefit from Oscar's great works and wish you all much happiness as you continue to live out his legacy.

UNOCAL

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to request that the Bush administration review, under the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, the Chinese National Offshore Oil Corporation's bid to purchase Unocal.

Mr. Speaker, at a time of rising prices on global oil supplies, ready access to energy resources is vital to our economic security. It is imperative that the United States protect its access to these energy resources in order to protect our economy and our national security.

This committee, chaired by Treasury Secretary Snow, may block this foreign acquisition of an American corporation if it finds that there is evidence that the Chinese National Offshore Oil Corporation might take action that threatens our national security.

Such a review is not unprecedented. Mr. Speaker, in 2003, the committee reviewed a bid by Hong Kong-based Hutchinson Whampoa to purchase Global Crossing, and earlier this year the committee reviewed the sale of IBM's personal computer business to the Chinese firm, the Lenovo Group.

Should the committee determine that this acquisition threatens the national security of the United States, it could ultimately issue a suspension or a denial.

Whether the Chinese National Offshore Oil Corporation's actions, through the takeover of Unocal, will threaten our national security is not yet known; however, they justify a thorough review.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS LONGHORNS ON WINNING THE 2005 COLLEGE WORLD SERIES

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to congratulate the Nation's 2005 College World Series champions, the University of Texas Longhorns.

This is an amazing sixth national title for the Longhorns. It also represents a record 32nd trip to the College World Series.

The Longhorns' win caps off another impressive season of University of Texas baseball. The team had a combined 51–16 record in the regular season and the playoffs, setting up another opportunity to compete for the national championship.

Under the guidance of Coach Augie Garrido, the Longhorns went undefeated in their five games of the series, pulling off a 6–2 victory over the Florida Gators in the final match-up on Sunday.

Credit for this outstanding victory is due to the entire Longhorns' baseball team, coaching staff, and the athletic department at the University of Texas.

Special recognition for the win is also owed to the most outstanding player of the series, third baseman David Maroul. His six hits and six runs were a major factor in the Longhorns' championship win.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations go to Coach Garrido and all the Longhorn players on their great victory.

GUANTANAMO PROTECTS AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, I was grateful to join a 16 member delegation led by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the Committee on Armed Services chairman, to view the detention facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

In the extensive briefings by Brigadier General Jay Hood with representatives of JAG, Naval medicine, the FBI, and interrogators, I am convinced we have patriotic professionals conducting a humane mission to protect American families in the war on terrorism. The detainees' meal was as good as any I had in my 31 years of Army Guard service, and I can see why the prisoners this year gained 5 pounds over last year.

I urge all of my colleagues to visit the base to learn firsthand of the hardcore killers who are detained as interrogation proceeds to secure intelligence on terrorist cells. Not a single life has been lost at Guantanamo, but thousands of lives have been saved in the Middle East, Europe and America because of information which enables terrorists to be arrested before they murder at random.

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

GITMO

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I too just returned from a bipartisan delegation to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba in order to review the procedures that are

used in handling and questioning the enemy combatants we have detained there.

After hearing months of criticism from the left and hearing our military men and women compared to Nazis and Guantanamo described as a gulag, I was glad for the opportunity to see the facility myself.

Do my colleagues know what I found? I found Guantanamo to be a well-run, secure facility that is essential in our fight in protecting America from terrorism.

For weeks and months, we have been told that the place was violating virtually every standard of decency in the free world. Well, these detainees do get 3 meals a day. They are allowed to worship. They are receiving health care.

I hope that the Democrats who know that to be true, who were with us, who viewed all the work at Guantanamo, will take a stand and tell the truth about Guantanamo and the wonderful men and women in our military who are serving there, working to keep America safe.

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.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL HOME- OWNERSHIP MONTH AND THE IM- PORTANCE OF HOMEOWNERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 312) recognizing National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 312

Whereas the President of the United States has issued a proclamation designating the month of June 2005 as National Homeownership Month;

Whereas the national homeownership rate in the United States has reached a record high of 69.1 percent and more than half of all minority families are homeowners;

Whereas the people of the United States are one of the best-housed populations in the world;

Whereas owning a home is a fundamental part of the American dream and is the largest personal investment many families will ever make;

Whereas homeownership provides economic security for homeowners by aiding them in building wealth over time and strengthens communities through a greater stake among homeowners in local schools, civic organizations, and churches;

Whereas improving homeownership opportunities requires the commitment and cooperation of the private, public, and non-

profit sectors, including the Federal Government and State and local governments; and

Whereas the current laws of the United States, such as the American Dream Down-payment Act, encourage homeownership and should continue to do so in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) fully supports the goals and ideals of National Homeownership Month; and

(2) recognizes the importance of homeownership in building strong communities and families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 312 which recognizes National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the United States. It is offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), my colleague and friend, who could not be here this moment to carry it. He has done a lot of great work on it.

It has very good sponsors, also the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman OXLEY); the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), our ranking member; of course myself and the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS); the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) and other supporters. This resolution is a testament to the benefits of a strong and robust housing market in this country.

A home is more than just the symbol of the American dream. It is the backbone of our American way of life.

Over the past 3 years, the housing market has driven the national economy as Americans bought and refinanced homes in record numbers. Many regions were spared the worst of the recent recession due to the strength of some local housing markets.

Today, the housing sector directly accounts for about 14 percent of the country's total gross domestic product. Building a home involves multiple segments of our economy, including builders, bankers, mortgage lenders, realtors and numerous other people that are involved in this whole process.

June is National Homeownership Month, and so many of our partners celebrate this because in America, every citizen, regardless of race, creed, color or place of birth, has the opportunity and should have the opportunity to own a home of their own.

Homeownership creates community stakeholders who tend to be active in charities, churches, and neighborhood activities. Homeownership inspires civic responsibility, and homeowners are more likely to vote and get involved with local issues. Families owning a home offer children a stable living environment, and in many cases it influences their personal development

in many positive, measurable ways, at home and also at school.

Homeownership's potential to create wealth is impressive, too. For the vast majority of families, the purchase of a home represents the path to prosperity. A home is the largest purchase most Americans will ever make in their lifetime. It is a tangible asset that builds equity, good credit, borrowing power and overall wealth.

Today, nearly 70 percent of American families own their own homes. And minority homeownership rates, although they have reached an all-time high of almost 50 percent, that is not good. We have to work on that and give it special effort to get those homeownership rates higher.

□ 1415

While many gains have been made, lagging minority homeownership rates are a serious concern to this House. Minority households are expected to account for two-thirds of household growth over the coming decade.

Improving the ability of such households to make the transition to homeownership will be an important test of the Nation's capacity to create economic opportunity for minorities and immigrants and to build strong, stable communities.

Last Congress, the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, I am pleased to report, assisted in the successful enactment of 17 housing-related bills. Through bipartisan cooperation with our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY); and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), who worked on a good piece of legislation, we were able to enact these pieces of legislation today to make existing housing programs work better.

Our work continues, however, in the 109th Congress. The Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity will hold a hearing this Thursday on the recently introduced Zero Downpayment Pilot Program Act of 2005. This was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT). This legislation, which was first introduced last Congress, would provide a program to eliminate the downpayment requirement for certain families and individuals who buy homes with FHA-insured mortgages. Changes have been made from last year's bill that would make it a pilot program and limits the program to 50,000 loans.

It is also my hope to look into the recent legislation introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), which deals with the issue of reverse mortgages. More specifically, it would remove completely the statutory limitation, or ceiling, and the aggregate number of mortgages that may be insured.

In the area of rural housing, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS), who will be speaking later on the floor,

has taken the lead by looking into creative ways to reform the Rural Housing Service.

On March 1, I introduced, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) and many others, the bipartisan Responsible Lending Act, which aims to stop abusive lending practices while allowing the mortgage market to continue to offer affordable credit. I have taken a great deal of time to investigate and find solutions to problems of abusive and predatory lending practices, especially in the subprime market. As the legislative process moves forward, we will continue to work to improve and refine this bill, I would note.

While homeownership is a desired goal for many Americans, I would be remiss if I did not mention that today we know there are people who are not ready to own their own home, and we cannot forget about that. So it is therefore prudent that we continue to pursue alternatives to make sure that affordable rental housing is available. I am working with members of the committee to craft solutions that will address the effectiveness and efficiency of the government's role in the administration of the section 8 program.

We had some roundtables, which the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and others participated in; and I think those are good, effective ways to bring people to the table so they can have an energetic give-and-take about section 8 and where we are.

I recognize there are key questions regarding funding of the Housing Choice Voucher Program. It is my hope to focus strictly on proposals to reform the program to make it a viable alternative in the future. The longer we wait to address the increasing costs of the section 8 program, the greater the risk there is to the section 8 program as well as other programs in HUD that will most surely suffer with some additional problems.

I would also note in this process that I think we have to come to an agreement in terms of what we are going to do with section 8; but I believe the whole community in the United States, housing authorities and others, needs to catch their breath. We cannot have one proposal one year that will completely alter it and the next year we see the same thing. So that is why I think the roundtables are productive ways to look at changes we can agree to.

We have much to achieve together for the American people, and our best hope for being successful is to work in close concert with each other, guided by the same high standards and principles and motivated by the same goals.

Those are a few things, Mr. Speaker, that have gone on here in the House as we mention H. Res. 312 for recognizing

National Homeownership Month. I appreciate my colleagues who do so much to try to help people in homeownership, and I support this resolution.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very pleased to join in support of this resolution. Indeed, I was a prime cosponsor. The main sponsor is our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), who comes to Congress with a distinguished record himself in building homes.

This is a very important resolution, particularly at this time, because we have, I think, an excessive degree of concern right now about homeownership and its role in the economy.

Obviously, speculation is never a good thing. But those who argue that housing prices are now at the point of a bubble seem to be missing a very important point. Unlike previous examples, where substantial excessive inflation of prices later caused some problems, we are talking here about an entity, homeownership, homes, where there is not the degree of leverage that we have seen elsewhere.

This is not the dot-com situation. We had problems with people having invested in business plans for which there was no reality and people building fiber-optic cable for which there was no need. Homes that are occupied may see an ebb and flow in the price at a certain percentage level, but you will not see the collapse that you see when people talk about a bubble.

So those of us on our committee in particular will continue to push for homeownership. And I very much agree with the gentleman from Ohio who has chaired the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the Committee on Financial Services about the importance of this and about the various ways in which we do that.

Obviously, the market will take care of a large number of people, but it will not take care of everybody. And if we are going to expand homeownership, there will have to be a sensible set of public policies, such as reducing the downpayment in the FHA, such as protecting people from lending practices that may at first seem to benefit them but then victimize them. And I hope our committee will pass legislation that will protect people against that.

We also have pending now, and it came out of our committee, legislation dealing with those government-sponsored enterprises whose function is to promote homeownership and homes in general, the Federal Home Loan Banks, Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. And I hope that legislation along the lines that came out of our committee, which enhances the regulatory regime but does not intrude unduly on their ability to function, will be maintained.

I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio for having noted a very important point

that sometimes gets overlooked. Homeownership is an important part of our policy, but it is not the entire housing policy of the Federal Government; nor is it the entire housing need of the Nation. Some people will never own. There will be people who choose not to own; there will be people who for their economic circumstances will not be able to own. And there is no conflict between promoting homeownership and recognizing that decent, affordable rental housing will also be very important indefinitely for tens and tens of millions of Americans.

I welcome the initiative that the gentleman from Ohio talked about with regard to improving our public policies so that we are able to expand the stock of affordable rental housing and do it in a way that protects both the renters themselves and the taxpayers.

I just want to add, as I bring these remarks to a close, Mr. Speaker, and I enjoyed working with the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), that I want to pay tribute to a couple of organizations that have done a good deal to help us with this. I found the National Association of Home Builders has been a very constructive participant in our efforts to promote homeownership. The National Association of Realtors has also played a very useful role in helping us shape public policies that expand homeownership.

There are also a variety of advocacy groups that work with us so that we can make homeownership available to people who might not on their own in a market situation be able to afford it, while those groups, of course, at the same time, work with us on the need for affordable housing.

So as an example of what we are trying to do for an overall comprehensive housing policy, I very much support this. And let us be clear: if a family is inadequately housed, if they either have housing that is not adequate or are paying far too much of their income to get adequate housing, then a degree of social disorganization can result which causes problems elsewhere.

So maintaining a comprehensive set of policies that expand housing opportunities for people at various levels of the income scale is a very important part of our responsibility, and I welcome the chance to support this resolution as an example of one important piece of that.

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in closing to once again thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and also reiterate that the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) has been very active and has been a great member on the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity. Along with a lot of our other colleagues, he has done a wonderful job on the committee, and it has been a pleasure having him on the committee. We also appreciate this resolution.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate homeownership in America.

Recently, President Bush designated June as National Homeownership Month as he has done for the past three years. To complement this designation, H. Res. 312, provides congressional recognition of National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the United States.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the House of Representatives: (1) Fully supports the goals and ideals of National Homeownership Month; and (2) recognizes the importance of homeownership in building strong communities and families.

IMPORTANCE OF HOMEOWNERSHIP IN AMERICA

For generations, the goal of owning a home has been the bedrock of our economy and a fundamental part of the American Dream.

Over the last three years, as we have faced the challenges of war and economic uncertainty, the housing markets have helped to keep our economy strong. Nationally, housing generates more than 22 percent of the Gross Domestic Product and accounts for nearly 40 cents of every dollar spent.

America's housing markets are the envy of the world. We enjoy the lowest interest rates and the highest homeownership rates of any developed nation. In fact, the national homeownership rate in the United States has reached a record high of 69.1 percent and more than half of all minority families are homeowners. Over 73.4 million Americans are now homeowners, with many more achieving this goal every day.

Homeownership is the single largest creator of wealth for Americans. It is the largest investment most families will ever make and a key to promoting long-term economic stability. For these reasons, we must continue to promote policies that ensure more Americans may achieve the goal of homeownership.

HOMEOWNERSHIP BUILDS STRONGER COMMUNITIES

Aside from helping millions of Americans achieve their dreams, homeownership also helps to build neighborhoods and strengthen communities.

For families across this Nation, a home is not just four walls and a roof. It is a refuge from the perils of the outside world, a break after a hard day's work, and a foundation on which to raise a family. A home is a place for children to learn, play, and grow, as well as a place where the elderly may retire with a lifetime of memories.

Owning a home also provides homeowners a tangible stake in their cities and towns. Families who own homes have a vital stake in their communities, a stronger interest in the safekeeping of their neighborhoods, and a deeper commitment to the quality of their schools and libraries. Each home is a critical piece in a successful neighborhood, allowing families to enjoy community events together and share in the lives of their neighbors and friends.

As millions of American families have demonstrated, increased homeownership helps to build better communities, and better communities help to build a better America.

CONGRESS'S ROLE IN PROMOTING HOMEOWNERSHIP

As responsible legislators, we need to ensure that government helps, rather than impedes, homeownership in America. When I came to Congress, I made it my top priority to highlight Federal policies that have hindered

the availability of housing in this country and to find ways for government to positively impact homeownership in America.

While we have done much to help Americans become homeowners, we must do more. We must remove the hurdles and needless regulations that keep homeownership out of the reach of some American families. We must also promote fair lending and fair housing regulations to increase housing opportunities for all Americans. With June designated as National Homeownership Month, there is no better time to address these issues.

Now more than ever, Congress must cultivate an environment in which more Americans may turn the dream of homeownership into reality.

SUPPORT NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP MONTH AND H. RES. 312

I am very pleased to see the President has made it a priority to promote affordable housing and homeownership.

His Administration has taken a leading role in finding new and innovative ways to expand homeownership, particularly among minorities and families in low-income areas. I commend the hard work of Secretary Jackson and his team at HUD for their work in developing programs to increase affordable housing and encourage homeownership.

As a vital part of this goal, National Homeownership Month is a reminder of the importance of housing issues in America. This bipartisan resolution, H. Res. 312, recognizes the need for National Homeownership Month and the overall importance of homeownership in America. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 312 to reinforce our commitment to housing opportunities and to help guarantee the dream of homeownership for more American families.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 312.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation, House Resolution 312, and to insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL DESEGREGATION 50TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

pass the bill (H.R. 358) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the desegregation of the Little Rock Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 358

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Little Rock Central High School Desegregation 50th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) September 2007, marks the 50th anniversary of the desegregation of Little Rock Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas.

(2) In 1957, Little Rock Central High was the site of the first major national test for the implementation of the historic decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Brown, et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka, et al.*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

(3) The courage of the "Little Rock Nine" (Ernest Green, Elizabeth Eckford, Melba Pattillo, Jefferson Thomas, Carlotta Walls, Terrence Roberts, Gloria Ray, Thelma Mothershed, and Minnijean Brown) who stood in the face of violence, was influential to the Civil Rights movement and changed American history by providing an example on which to build greater equality.

(4) The desegregation of Little Rock Central High by the 9 African American students was recognized by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as such a significant event in the struggle for civil rights that in May 1958, he attended the graduation of the first African American from Little Rock Central High School.

(5) A commemorative coin will bring national and international attention to the lasting legacy of this important event.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue not more than 500,000 \$1 coins each of which shall—

- (1) weigh 26.73 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and
- (3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the desegregation of the Little Rock Central High School and its contribution to civil rights in America.

(b) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

- (1) a designation of the value of the coin;
- (2) an inscription of the year "2007"; and
- (3) inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(c) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

- (1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts; and
- (2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee established under section 5135 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) COMMENCEMENT OF ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act beginning January 1, 2007, except that the Secretary may initiate sales of such coins, without issuance, before such date.

(c) TERMINATION OF MINTING AUTHORITY.—No coins shall be minted under this Act after December 31, 2007.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of the face value of the coins, the surcharge required under section 7(a) for the coins, and the cost of designing and issuing such coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and marketing).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS AT A DISCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) SURCHARGE REQUIRED.—All sales shall include a surcharge of \$10 per coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges which are received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Interior for the protection, preservation, and interpretation of resources and stories associated with Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, including the following:

(1) Site improvements at Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site.

(2) Development of interpretive and education programs and historic preservation projects.

(3) Establishment of cooperative agreements to preserve or restore the historic character of the Park Street and Daisy L. Gatson Bates Drive corridors adjacent to the site.

(c) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation, H.R. 358, and include extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in support of the Little Rock Central High School Desegregation 50th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act sponsored by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. Speaker, it is easy in 2005 to lose sight of how far we have come in fewer than 50 years of desegregation. No one will deny, and most also will admit, that we have much work to do. But as we approach 50 years of separation from the mid- to late 1950s, when the real work of desegregation was done, it is worthwhile to pause and reflect. The bill of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) gives us a perfect opportunity to do just that.

A year or so ago, Congress approved awarding a Congressional Gold Medal for the principals of the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* lawsuit that heralded the desegregation in the Nation's schools. Today, we will act on legislation to authorize a commemorative coin, noting the first major test of the Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown*.

The nine African American students who, in the face of violence, were the first to desegregate Little Rock's Central High School, themselves earlier awarded Congressional Gold Medals, took a truly courageous step, later recognized by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. when he attended the first graduation of African American students from the school a year later.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizes the striking in 2007 of as many as 500,000 silver \$1 commemorative coins, at no cost to the taxpayers, with surcharges on the sale of the coins dedicated to site improvements at the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, to development of interpretive and educational programs at the site, to historic preservation projects there, and to the establishment of cooperative agreements to preserve or restore the historic character of the Park Street and Daisy L. Gatson Bates Drive corridors adjacent to the site.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has 321 cosponsors, amply demonstrating its broad bipartisan appeal. I urge immediate adoption.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was a high school senior when the extraordinarily brave African American students entered Little Rock High School, and I very vividly remember the combination of emotions I felt: shame, that the Nation of which I was so proud was allowing the mistreatment of these people who simply sought to get an education equal to

that of their fellow students; admiration, beyond admiration for their courage; frustration at a Federal Government which was hesitant at first in its response; and anger at those who would betray the spirit of America by racially motivated assaults on these brave young people.

This ended happily, but not nearly soon enough. It was an extraordinarily important event in this country, and it reminds us that you cannot correct evil. And we are talking here, in my judgment, about a great social evil that plagued our country. You cannot confront it halfway. You cannot confront it with the hope that if you just close your eyes and wish, things will get better. You have to deal directly with it.

□ 1430

We are a better Nation by far for the events of these past years. And those at Little Rock, these young people, and the adults who guided them and protected them in the Little Rock community, deserve the continuing deep gratitude of this country for what they did.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) who represents Little Rock and has been the main advocate for this legislation.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the committee staff on both sides of the aisle that worked on this bill.

Last week at American University in Cairo, Egypt, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice made some remarks. Part of what she said, "When we talk about democracy, though, we are referring to governments that protect certain basic rights for all their citizens. Among these, the right to speak freely, the right to associate, the right to worship as you wish, the freedom to educate your children, boys and girls, and freedom from the midnight knock of the secret police."

Secretary Rice continues, "Securing these rights is the hope of every citizen, and the duty of every government. In my own country, the progress of democracy has been long and difficult. And given our history, the United States has no cause for false pride, and we have every reason for humility. After all, America was founded by individuals who knew that all human beings and the governments they create are inherently imperfect, and the United States was born half free and half slave. It was only in my lifetime that my government guaranteed the right to vote for all its people.

"Nevertheless, the principles enshrined in our Constitution enable citizens of conviction to move America closer every day to the ideal of democracy." That was Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in Cairo last week.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere was the march toward the ideal of democracy more in

evidence than in the fall of 1957 in Little Rock, Arkansas. In 1957, Little Rock Central High School was the site of the first major national test for the implementation of the historic decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*. President Eisenhower issued an Executive order directing marshals and troops under Federal authority to aid in the compliance of Federal law in Little Rock, Arkansas.

The courage of the "Little Rock Nine," Ernest Green, Elizabeth Eckford, Melba Pattillo, Jefferson Thomas, Carlotta Walls, Terrence Roberts, Gloria Ray, Thelma Mothershed, and Minnijean Brown, who stood in the face of violence, was influential to the civil rights movement and changed American history by providing an example on which to build greater equality.

The desegregation of Little Rock by the nine African American students was recognized by Dr. Martin Luther King as such a significant event in the struggle for civil rights that in May 1958 he attended the graduation of the first African American from Little Rock Central High School, Ernest Green.

The 1957 crisis in Little Rock, brought about by the desegregation of Little Rock Central High School, was a huge part of the march towards freedom and opportunity in America. A 2007 commemorative coin issued by the U.S. Mint to honor the 50th anniversary of this important event will bring national and international attention to its lasting legacy.

As indicated by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) the money raised from the sale of these coins pays for the cost, there is no cost to the taxpayers, and any moneys beyond the cost may be used to support the national historic site.

We all are aware of the difficulties that some of our national parks now have in meeting their basic infrastructure needs, and the intent of this legislation is to provide supplementary funds to the care and maintenance of the Central Little Rock National Historic Site.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend an aye vote on the legislation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for yielding me this time.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) for his introduction of this legislation and the committee for moving it expeditiously to the floor so it, in fact, can be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with great pride to honor the legacy of the courageous Little Rock Nine. Dr. Martin Luther King once said, "The sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate dis-

content will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality."

One September morning in 1957, on the eve of the new school year, the cool winds of change brushed across the city of Little Rock, Arkansas. Nine young men and women decided they would not settle for discontent.

After the landmark case, *Brown v. Board of Education*, which ruled in favor of integrated schools, these nine young men and women attended Little Rock Central High School. Despite the taunts, violence and venomous hatred endured by these youth during their tenure at Central High, they pressed on and pursued a dream for the millions of African Americans that cheered them on across the country.

It is a very meaningful time for me because I too lived at that time in Arkansas. I was born in a little city in the southeastern part of the State. In 1957, and I guess the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and I are kind of in the same age group; I, too, was a college freshman on the campus of the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, which was then known as Arkansas A&M College about 45 miles from Little Rock. This was our daily news, our daily activity, our daily occurrences.

I have been fortunate to know many of the individuals who were intimately involved, such as Ernie Green. Minnijean Brown and I spent part of a weekend together down at Southern Illinois University last year. Melba Pattillo's mother was a teacher at the school where I did student teaching, and I have had a chance to know them. Wallie Branton, who was the attorney intimately involved with the NAACP, I knew him and his family; and Daisy Bates, who was the leader of the NAACP in Arkansas at that time, are all people with whom I have had an opportunity to interact and to get to know. They were indeed a part of me and I am indeed a part of them. So I take great personal pride in knowing that there will be recognition of this historic struggle and the tremendous courage displayed.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) for his legislation which brings into work this commendation which puts a footnote in another chapter of the historic struggle for equality and justice in America.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for those remarks. He noted he was a freshman at college during this time. As a senior in high school, I certainly want to pay deference to my elders and thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I also note for reasons that be of no interest to anybody outside this Chamber, a set of decisions, procedures, and rules that we adopted earlier made it harder to bring this resolution to the

floor than Members might have thought. Had we simply been considering the merits of this resolution, the commemoration for one of the great blows for freedom and against bigotry in America, it would have been easy; but there were a lot of complicating factors. Members should know it was the diligence, the persistence, occasionally annoying, of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SYNDER) that got this bill to the floor. I am happy that we are passing this today commemorating this great event, and I am also happy that it is not a subject I will have to discuss with the gentleman from Arkansas for the next few months, it having occupied a great deal of my time previously. He deserves a great deal of credit for his diligence.

I would just add, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and I remember as contemporaries, I want to say a word about social change. The people who integrated Central High School and the people who supported them, the leaders of the NAACP and the black community in Little Rock and in Arkansas, those who pressed a somewhat hesitant administration in Washington, DC to fully support them, they were not the moderates and centrists of their day. Some thought they were pushing too hard for their rights. Some thought they were being too obtrusive. We are very grateful that they were. I hope people will study this event, and the history that will come in part from this bill, that will be financed in part from this bill, and we hope from additional appropriations, will be something people will pay attention to so they will understand both the depths of the problem that America confronted and the kind of moral and mental and physical courage that it took to dismantle it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2005.

Hon. WILLIAM M. THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Longworth House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I am writing concerning H.R. 358, the "Little Rock Central High School Desegregation 50th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act," which will be scheduled for floor consideration in the near future.

I acknowledge your committee's jurisdictional interest in this bill and request your cooperation in moving the bill to the House floor expeditiously. I agree that your decision to forego further action on this bill will not prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. I would support your request for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction

should this bill be the subject of a House-Senate conference.

I will include a copy of this letter and your response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when this bill is considered by the House. Thank you again for your assistance.

Yours truly,

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2005.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OXLEY: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 358, the "Little Rock Central High School Desegregation 50th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act," which was reported to the House by the Committee on Financial Services on June 17, 2005.

As you noted, the Committee on Ways and Means maintains jurisdiction over matters that concern raising revenue. H.R. 358 contains a provision that establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative coins that are minted under the bill, and thus falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. However, in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation.

I appreciate and agree to your offer to include this exchange of letters on this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last few weeks, culminating in the conviction of an 80-year-old Klansman in the infamous killing of three civil rights workers during 1964's "Freedom Summer," serve as a good reminder that this country has come a long distance in just a few short decades.

It is hard, from today's vantage point, to remember a time—a time when some of today's Members had not yet been born—when schools were segregated, when bathrooms were separate, when "back of the bus" was a place where some had to ride whether they liked it or not.

Of course, tolerance is a job that requires constant attention and improvement, but we should not lose sight of the good progress we have made. And so today, Mr. Speaker, consideration of legislation to commemorate the desegregation of Little Rock Central High School is timely, or perhaps even overdue. Regardless, it is worthwhile for us to think for a minute of the courage of nine African-American youngsters as they stood on the steps of that school. And it is important for us to think of the courage of the idealistic youngsters, white and black, who powered the civil rights movement throughout the 1950s and early 1960s.

The legislation we consider today will go a long way to preserving an historic symbol of that desegregation fight. Surcharges on the sale of as many as half a million commemorative silver dollars will pay for preservation programs, and education programs at the site of the first important test of the Supreme Court's landmark desegregation ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Mr. Speaker, as a testament to the importance of this legislation, it is supported broadly and on a bipartisan basis by 321 Members. I urge its immediate passage.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to be in support of the Little Rock Central High School Desegregation 50th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act. I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman VIC SNYDER, for introducing this important piece of legislation.

In 1957, Little Rock Central High School was the site of the first major national test for the implementation of the U.S. Supreme Court's *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* decision and became the international symbol of the end of racially segregated public schools.

The desegregation of Little Rock Central High by nine African American students was influential to the Civil Rights Movement, and recognized by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as such a significant event in the struggle for civil rights that in May 1958, he attended the graduation of the first African American from Little Rock Central High School. Moreover, it changed American history by providing an example on which to build greater equality, and ultimately a better America.

H.R. 358, the Little Rock Central High School Desegregation 50th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act, will bring national and international attention to the lasting legacy of this important event by creating a commemorative coin for 2007, in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the desegregation of Little Rock Central High School. I am proud to be here today to support this bill and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 358, 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.

MILITARY PERSONNEL FINANCIAL SERVICES PROTECTION ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 458) to prevent the sale of abusive insurance and investment products to military personnel, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 458

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—INSURANCE AND INVESTMENT PRODUCTS

Sec. 101. Congressional findings.

- Sec. 102. Prohibition on future sales of periodic payment plans.
- Sec. 103. Method of maintaining broker/dealer registration, disciplinary, and other data.
- Sec. 104. Filing depositories for investment advisers.
- Sec. 105. State insurance and securities jurisdiction on military installations.
- Sec. 106. Required development of military personnel protection standards regarding insurance sales.
- Sec. 107. Required disclosures regarding life insurance.
- Sec. 108. Improving life insurance product standards.
- Sec. 109. Required reporting of disciplined insurance producers.
- Sec. 110. Reporting barred persons engaging in financial services activities.
- Sec. 111. Sense of Congress.
- Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—LENDING TO ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

- Sec. 201. Requirements applicable to certain loans to military servicemembers.

TITLE I—INSURANCE AND INVESTMENT PRODUCTS

SEC. 101. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

- (1) Our military personnel perform great sacrifices in protecting our Nation in the War on Terror and promoting democracy abroad.
- (2) Our brave men and women in uniform deserve to be offered first-rate financial products in order to provide for their families and to save and invest for retirement.
- (3) Our military personnel are being offered high-cost securities and life insurance products by some financial services companies engaging in abusive and misleading sales practices.
- (4) One securities product being offered to our service members, the contractual plan, has largely disappeared from the civilian market since the 1980s due to its excessive sales charges and the emergence of low-cost products. A 50-percent sales commission is typically assessed against the first year of contributions made under a contractual plan, even though the average commission on other securities products such as mutual funds is less than 6 percent on each sale.
- (5) The excessive sales charge of the contractual plan makes it susceptible to abusive and misleading sales practices.
- (6) Certain life insurance products being offered to our service members are being improperly marketed as investment products. These products provide very low death benefits for very high premiums that are front-loaded in the first few years, making them completely inappropriate for most military personnel.
- (7) Regulation of these securities and life insurance products and their sale on military bases has been clearly inadequate and requires Congressional legislation to address.

SEC. 102. PROHIBITION ON FUTURE SALES OF PERIODIC PAYMENT PLANS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 27 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-27) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) TERMINATION OF SALES.—

- “(1) TERMINATION.—Effective 30 days after the date of enactment of the Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act, it shall be unlawful, subject to subsection (i)—
- “(A) for any registered investment company to issue any periodic payment plan certificate; or

“(B) for such company, or any depositor of or underwriter for any such company, or any other person, to sell such a certificate.

“(2) NO INVALIDATION OF EXISTING CERTIFICATES.—Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to alter, invalidate, or otherwise affect any rights or obligations, including rights of redemption, under any periodic payment plan certificate issued and sold before 30 days after such date of enactment.”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 27(i)(2)(B) of such Act is amended by striking “section 26(e)” each place it appears and inserting “section 26(f)”.

(c) REPORT ON REFUNDS, SALES PRACTICES, AND REVENUES FROM PERIODIC PAYMENT PLANS.—Within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, a report describing—

(1) any measures taken by a broker or dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) to voluntarily refund payments made by military service members on any periodic payment plan certificate, and the amounts of such refunds;

(2) after such consultation with the Secretary of Defense as the Commission considers appropriate, the sales practices of such brokers or dealers on military installations over the past 5 years and any legislative or regulatory recommendations to improve such practices; and

(3) the revenues generated by such brokers or dealers in the sales of periodic payment plan certificates over the past 5 years and what products such brokers or dealers market to replace the revenue generated from the sales of periodic payment plan certificates prohibited under subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 103. METHOD OF MAINTAINING BROKER/DEALER REGISTRATION, DISCIPLINARY, AND OTHER DATA.

Subsection (i) of section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) OBLIGATION TO MAINTAIN REGISTRATION, DISCIPLINARY, AND OTHER DATA.—

“(1) MAINTENANCE OF SYSTEM TO RESPOND TO INQUIRIES.—A registered securities association shall—

“(A) establish and maintain a system for collecting and retaining registration information;

“(B) establish and maintain a toll-free telephone listing, and a readily accessible electronic or other process, to receive and promptly respond to inquiries regarding—

“(i) registration information on its members and their associated persons; and

“(ii) registration information on the members and their associated persons of any registered national securities exchange that uses the system described in subparagraph (A) for the registration of its members and their associated persons; and

“(C) adopt rules governing the process for making inquiries and the type, scope, and presentation of information to be provided in response to such inquiries in consultation with any registered national securities exchange providing information pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii).

“(2) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—Such an association may charge persons making inquiries, other than individual investors, reasonable fees for responses to such inquiries.

“(3) PROCESS FOR DISPUTED INFORMATION.—Such an association shall adopt rules establishing an administrative process for disputing the accuracy of information provided in response to inquiries under this sub-

section in consultation with any registered national securities exchange providing information pursuant to paragraph (1)(B)(ii).

“(4) LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.—Such an association, or an exchange reporting information to such an association, shall not have any liability to any person for any actions taken or omitted in good faith under this subsection.

“(5) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘registration information’ means the information reported in connection with the registration or licensing of brokers and dealers and their associated persons, including disciplinary actions, regulatory, judicial, and arbitration proceedings, and other information required by law, or exchange or association rule, and the source and status of such information.”

SEC. 104. FILING DEPOSITORIES FOR INVESTMENT ADVISERS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 204 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-4) is amended—

(1) by striking “Every investment” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Every investment”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) FILING DEPOSITORIES.—The Commission may, by rule, require an investment adviser—

“(1) to file with the Commission any fee, application, report, or notice required to be filed by this title or the rules issued under this title through any entity designated by the Commission for that purpose; and

“(2) to pay the reasonable costs associated with such filing and the establishment and maintenance of the systems required by subsection (c).

“(c) ACCESS TO DISCIPLINARY AND OTHER INFORMATION.—

“(1) MAINTENANCE OF SYSTEM TO RESPOND TO INQUIRIES.—The Commission shall require the entity designated by the Commission under subsection (b)(1) to establish and maintain a toll-free telephone listing, or a readily accessible electronic or other process, to receive and promptly respond to inquiries regarding information (including disciplinary actions, regulatory, judicial, and arbitration proceedings, and other information required by law or rule to be reported) involving investment advisers and persons associated with investment advisers. Such information shall include information on an investment adviser (and the persons associated with that adviser) whether the investment adviser is registered with the Commission under section 203 or regulated solely by a State as described in section 203A.

“(2) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—An entity designated by the Commission under subsection (b)(1) may charge persons making inquiries, other than individual investors, reasonable fees for responses to inquiries made under paragraph (1).

“(3) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—An entity designated by the Commission under subsection (b)(1) shall not have any liability to any person for any actions taken or omitted in good faith under this subsection.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 203A of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3a) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(2) Section 306 of the National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 80b-10, note; Public Law 104-290; 110 Stat. 3439) is repealed.

SEC. 105. STATE INSURANCE AND SECURITIES JURISDICTION ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF JURISDICTION.—Any law, regulation, or order of a State with respect to regulating the business of insurance

or the offer or sale (or both) of securities shall apply to such activities conducted on Federal land or facilities in the United States and abroad, including military installations, except to the extent that such law, regulation, or order—

(1) directly conflicts with any applicable Federal law, regulation, or authorized directive; or

(2) would not apply if such activity were conducted on State land.

(b) PRIMARY STATE JURISDICTION.—To the extent that multiple State laws would otherwise apply pursuant to subsection (a) to an insurance or securities activity of an individual or entity on Federal land or facilities, the State having the primary duty to regulate such activity and whose laws shall apply to such activity in the case of a conflict shall be—

(1) the State within which the Federal land or facility is located; or

(2) if the Federal land or facility is located outside of the United States, the State in which—

(A) in the case of an individual engaged in the business of insurance, such individual has been issued a resident license;

(B) in the case of an individual engaged in the offer or sale (or both) of securities, such individual is registered or required to be registered to do business or the person solicited by such individual resides;

(C) in the case of an entity engaged in the business of insurance, such entity is domiciled; or

(D) in the case of an entity engaged in the offer or sale (or both) of securities, such entity is registered or is required to be registered to do business or the person solicited by such entity resides.

SEC. 106. REQUIRED DEVELOPMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL PROTECTION STANDARDS REGARDING INSURANCE SALES.

(a) STATE STANDARDS.—The Congress intends that—

(1) the States collectively work with the Secretary of Defense to ensure implementation of appropriate standards to protect members of the Armed Forces from dishonest and predatory insurance sales practices while on a military installation of the United States (including installations located outside of the United States); and

(2) each State identify its role in promoting the standards described in paragraph (1) in a uniform manner within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) STATE REPORT.—It is the sense of the Congress that the NAIC should, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, conduct a study to determine the extent to which the States have met the requirement of subsection (a) and report such study to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 107. REQUIRED DISCLOSURES REGARDING LIFE INSURANCE.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d), no insurer or producer may sell or solicit, in person, any life insurance product to any member of the Armed Forces on a military installation of the United States unless a disclosure in accordance with this section is provided to such member before the sale of such insurance.

(b) DISCLOSURE.—A disclosure in accordance with this section is a written disclosure that—

(1) states that subsidized life insurance may be available to the member of the Armed Forces from the Federal Government;

(2) states that the United States Government has in no way sanctioned, rec-

ommended, or encouraged the sale of the product being offered;

(3) is made in plain and readily understandable language and in a type font at least as large as the font used for the majority of the policy; and

(4) with respect to a sale or solicitation on Federal land or facilities located outside of the United States by an individual or entity engaged in the business of insurance, except to the extent otherwise specifically provided by the laws of such State in reference to this Act, lists the address and phone number where consumer complaints are received by the State insurance commissioner for the State in which the individual has been issued a resident license or the entity is domiciled, as applicable.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—If it is determined by a State or Federal agency, or in a final court proceeding, that any individual or entity has intentionally failed to provide a disclosure required by this section, such individual or entity shall be prohibited from further engaging in the business of insurance with respect to employees of the Federal Government on Federal land, except—

(1) with respect to existing policies; and

(2) to the extent required by the Federal Government pursuant to previous commitments.

(d) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) FEDERAL AND STATE INSURANCE ACTIVITY.—This section shall not apply to insurance activities—

(A) specifically contracted by or through the Federal Government or any State government; or

(B) specifically exempted from the applicability of this Act by a Federal or State law, regulation, or order that specifically refers to this paragraph.

(2) UNIFORM STATE STANDARDS.—If a majority of the States have adopted, in materially identical form, a standard setting forth the disclosures required under this section that apply to insurance solicitations and sales to military personnel on military installations of the United States, after the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on such majority adoption, such standard shall apply in lieu of the requirements of this section to all insurance solicitations and sales to military personnel on military installations, with respect to such States, to the extent that such standards do not directly conflict with any applicable authorized Federal regulation or directive.

(3) MATERIALLY IDENTICAL FORM.—For purposes of this subsection, standards adopted by more than one State shall be considered to have materially identical form to the extent that such standards require or prohibit identical conduct with respect to the same activity, notwithstanding that the standards may differ with respect to conduct required or prohibited with respect to other activities.

SEC. 108. IMPROVING LIFE INSURANCE PRODUCT STANDARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the Congress that the NAIC should, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, conduct a study and submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on ways of improving the quality of and sale of life insurance products sold by insurers and producers on military installations of the United States, which may include limiting sales authority to companies and producers that are certified as meeting appropriate best practices procedures or creating standards for products specifically designed for members of the

Armed Forces regardless of the sales location.

(b) CONDITIONAL GAO REPORT.—If the NAIC does not submit the report to the committees as described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall study any proposals that have been made to improve the quality and sale of life insurance products sold by insurers and producers on military installations of the United States and report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on such proposals within 6 months after the expiration of the period referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 109. REQUIRED REPORTING OF DISCIPLINED INSURANCE PRODUCERS.

(a) REPORTING BY INSURERS.—After the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, no insurer may enter into or renew a contractual relationship with a producer that solicits or sells life insurance on military installations of the United States unless the insurer has implemented a system to report, to the State insurance commissioner of the State of the domicile of the insurer and the State of residence of the insurance producer, disciplinary actions taken against the producer with respect to the producer's sales or solicitation of insurance on a military installation of the United States, as follows:

(1) Any disciplinary action taken by any government entity that the insurer knows has been taken.

(2) Any significant disciplinary action taken by the insurer.

(b) REPORTING BY STATES.—It is the sense of the Congress that within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the States should collectively implement a system to—

(1) receive reports of disciplinary actions taken against insurance producers by insurers or government entities with respect to the producers' sale or solicitation of insurance on a military installation; and

(2) disseminate such information to all other States and to the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 110. REPORTING BARRED PERSONS ENGAGED IN FINANCIAL SERVICES ACTIVITIES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall maintain a list of the name, address, and other appropriate information of persons engaged in financial services activities that have been barred, banned, or otherwise limited in any manner that is not generally applicable to all such type of persons, from any or all military installations of the United States or from patronage by military members.

(b) NOTICE AND ACCESS.—The Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) the appropriate Federal and State agencies responsible for any financial services regulation are promptly notified upon the inclusion or removal of a person under such agencies' jurisdiction; and

(2) the list is kept current and easily accessible—

(A) for use by such agencies; and

(B) for purposes of enforcing or considering any such bar, ban, or limitation by the appropriate Federal personnel, including commanders of military installations.

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue regulations in accordance with this subsection to provide for the establishment and maintenance of the list under this section, including appropriate due process considerations.

(2) TIMING.—

(A) PROPOSED REGULATIONS.—Not later than the expiration of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this

Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate Committees a copy of the regulations under this subsection that are proposed to be published for comment. The Secretary may not publish such regulations for comment in the Federal Register until the expiration of the 15-day period beginning upon such submission to the appropriate Committees.

(B) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate Committees a copy of the regulations under this section to be published as final.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Such regulations shall become effective upon the expiration of the 30-day period beginning upon such submission to the appropriate Committees.

(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section, the term “appropriate Committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

SEC. 111. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Federal and State agencies responsible for insurance and securities regulation should provide advice to the appropriate Federal entities to consider—

(1) significantly increasing the life insurance coverage made available through the Federal Government to members of the Armed Forces;

(2) implementing appropriate procedures to encourage members of the Armed Forces to improve their financial literacy and obtain objective financial counseling before purchasing additional life insurance coverage or investments beyond those provided by the Federal Government; and

(3) improving the benefits and matching contributions provided under the Thrift Savings Plan to members of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) ENTITY.—The term “entity” includes insurers.

(2) INDIVIDUAL.—The term “individual” includes insurance agents and producers.

(3) NAIC.—The term “NAIC” means the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

(4) STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER.—The term “State insurance commissioner” means, with respect to a State, the officer, agency, or other entity of the State that has primary regulatory authority over the business of insurance and over any person engaged in the business of insurance, to the extent of such business activities, in such State.

TITLE II—LENDING TO ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

SEC. 201. REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN LOANS TO MILITARY SERVICEMEMBERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) MILITARY LENDER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “military lender” means—

(i) a person engaged in the business of extending consumer credit that—

(I) targets customers who are active duty members of the Armed Forces; or

(II) knows or has reason to know that more than 10 percent of the person’s customers for consumer credit products are active duty members of the Armed Forces; and

(ii) any assignee of such person with respect to any credit extended to any such customer.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The term “military lender” does not include any insured depository institution, except as provided in paragraph (3)(B).

(C) TREATMENT OF EACH OFFICE AS LENDER.—In the case of any person engaged in the business of extending consumer credit from more than 1 office or at more than 1 location, each office or location at which credit is offered or extended or a credit transaction is consummated shall be treated as a separate person for purposes of this section.

(2) COVERED LOAN.—The term “covered loan”—

(A) means any extension of credit to an active duty member of the Armed Forces by a military lender that has an annual percentage rate that exceeds by more than 5 percentage points the average annual percentage rate for 24-month personal loans, as published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the most recent calendar quarter preceding the quarter in which such extension of credit is made; and

(B) does not include any extension of credit on margin on securities by a broker or dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to the extent such extension of credit complies with the rules and regulations of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and any applicable self-regulatory organization relating to credit on margin on securities.

(3) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “insured depository institution”—

(i) has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

(ii) includes any insured credit union (as defined in section 101(7) of the Federal Credit Union Act).

(B) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this section, the term “insured depository institution” does not include an insured depository institution in any circumstance in which—

(1) such depository institution is extending credit pursuant to a contractual relationship with a third-party agent; and

(ii) such agent would be a military lender, under this section, if the agent made the same loan as a principal.

(4) ACTIVE DUTY MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES.—The term “active duty member of the Armed Forces” means any member of the Armed Forces who is on active duty (as defined in section 101(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code) under a call or order that does not specify a period of 30 days or less.

(5) TARGETS CUSTOMERS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A)(i)(I), the term “targets customers” means to, directly or indirectly, solicit, or engage in other promotional activities explicitly directed at, members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of securing business from the recipients of such solicitations or promotions.

(6) ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE.—The term “annual percentage rate” has the same meaning as in section 107 of the Truth in Lending Act, as implemented by regulations of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(b) PROTECTION OF MILITARY SERVICEMEMBERS.—Any military lender who makes a loan to an active duty member of the Armed Forces (other than a loan described in paragraph (2)(B)) may not, with respect to such loan—

(1) garnish any military salary or wages, or accept any assignment of or institute any allotment of any military salary or wages, to secure payment of the loan, unless any such allotment or assignment is voluntary and may be cancelled at any time by the borrower;

(2) contact, or threaten to contact, the borrower’s commanding officer or any other person in the borrower’s military chain of command in an effort to collect on such loan;

(3) include any provision in the loan agreement, or in any other instrument or agreement made in connection with such loan, that purports to—

(A) waive any rights of the borrower under any Federal or State law, including this section and the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.); or

(B) provide the consent of the borrower for any action prohibited under paragraph (1);

(4) at any time, use oral or written representations, or use any symbols, that suggest, give the appearance, or provide reasonable cause to believe that any component of the Armed Forces, the Department of Defense, or any federal entity sponsors or endorses the military lender, any agent of the lender, or any good, service, commodity, or credit that is sold, provided, or extended by the military lender (unless expressly authorized in writing by such entity); or

(5) if such loan is a covered loan, enter into the loan without disclosing, prior to consummation of the transaction and in conspicuous form, the following notice:

“NOTICE TO MILITARY SERVICEMEMBERS:

“You are not required to complete this agreement merely because you have received these disclosures or even if you have signed an application for an extension of credit. If you obtain this credit to repay other loans, you may get into serious financial difficulties if you use this credit to pay off old debts and then replace them with other new debts. Before you complete this agreement, you should consider applying for credit through other organizations or entities. Interest-free loans or grants may be available from the Army, Air Force, or Navy-Marine Corps Relief Society, the United Service Organizations, or another base or military service organization for military personnel seeking short-term credit in response to a family or other emergency.

“This extension of credit is not sponsored or endorsed by any component of the Armed Forces, the Department of Defense, or any Federal entity.

“Your lender may not garnish your salary or wages, or accept any assignment of or institute an allotment of your salary or wages, to secure repayment of the debt, unless any such allotment or assignment is voluntary and may be cancelled by you at any time. Your lender may not contact your commanding officer or anyone in your chain of command in an effort to collect on the loan.

“You and your dependents may have additional rights and protections under Federal and State law with respect to this loan, including the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, which you cannot waive and which the lender may not ask or require you to waive.”

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—No provision of this section shall be construed as—

(1) authorizing any person that is not a military lender to engage in any activity that is prohibited for military lenders under this section;

(2) creating any inference that any activity described in subsection (b) is a lawful activity for any person or would be a lawful activity for a military lender but for this section; or

(3) creating any inference that any right or protection provided for consumers under any Federal or State law can be waived by any consumer.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—The provisions of this section shall be enforced under section 917 of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, in the manner provided in such section. For the

purposes of any enforcement under such section 917, any violation of a provision or requirement of this section shall be treated as a violation of a provision or requirement of title IX of such Act.

(e) CIRCUMVENTION PROHIBITED.—The Federal Trade Commission shall, with respect to entities and activities under its jurisdiction, prescribe regulations to become effective not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act to prevent a military lender from taking any action in connection with any loan made to an active duty member of the Armed Forces to structure a loan transaction, by structuring any loan as an open-end credit plan (as defined in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act), dividing any loan into separate transactions, using a lower temporary or introductory rate of interest to lower the overall annual percentage rate applicable for any loan, or any similar action, for the purpose of avoiding designation as a covered loan for purposes of this section or otherwise circumventing or evading any requirement of this title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 458.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that there is a long history of certain companies and agents using abusive sales tactics to sell financial products of dubious value to our members of the armed services. Problems have included abusive and coercive sales tactics, outdated and high-cost products, and a lack of uniform regulatory oversight of these practices on our military bases and posts.

The Pentagon has issued directives intended to prevent these abuses. But with the ongoing confusion over regulatory jurisdiction, the lack of communication between government agencies, and lack of sufficient protection standards for certain financial products, it is clear that the abuses will not stop unless Congress enacts the Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act.

Unfortunately, there are a few bad agents in the securities and insurance industry that have been taking advantage of our military personnel by selling them harmful insurance and investment products.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, when I myself was a young officer in the Army, a group of salesmen showed up on post and convinced my fellow soldiers and me that I could begin sav-

ing for my retirement by buying into an investment plan that included insurance and mutual funds. I was so impressed with their infomercial-like presentation that I invested what was a lot of money to me at the time. It was not until I got out of the Army and into the business world that I discovered how uncompetitive these products were compared with other opportunities.

While serving as an officer in the 82nd Airborne Division, I knew many soldiers who fell victim to such "contractual plans."

In my case, I fell for the sales pitch because those agents selling the programs encouraged one of my fellow soldiers to invite me to a presentation. That program included a respected veteran who could show up on post without the post commander's permission. I did not make the decision because I was a financial expert, because I was not, I made the decision because a retired servicemember, whom I respected, working as a salesman, presented this, and he was using referrals from other servicemembers who he convinced it was a good thing.

Because of these types of selling practices, I am pleased to report that today the House will be voting on this reintroduced, bipartisan legislation, H.R. 458, which will protect those preserving our freedom from some unnecessary, high-cost financial products.

This piece of legislation would clarify that State insurance regulators have jurisdiction over insurance sales on military bases within their States. Also, it would ban the sale of contractual mutual funds and require that our military personnel hear about government life insurance programs before buying private life insurance.

This bill would also allow our military post commanders to ban unscrupulous agents from their bases and posts and forward a list of these banned agents to the Department of Defense, and the DOD would compile lists and send them to State departments of insurance for further investigation.

We cannot allow these abusive practices to continue. We must not ask the men and women of our armed services to make sacrifices for our security without doing all that we can to protect their financial futures. You may be pleased to know that in the 108th Congress, this purpose-driven piece of legislation passed overwhelmingly with a vote of 396-2. During this Congress, the Committee on Financial Services reported this bill to protect our servicemen and -women by unanimous vote. This overwhelmingly bipartisan census is the result of strong leadership by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), and subcommittee chairman on capital markets, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) and ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), who led our investigation into abusive practices and bad products.

□ 1445

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL), who worked closely together on the reporting requirements, are to be thanked, as well as the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) for ensuring appropriate SEC oversight of broker-dealer practices on military posts. Also, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for working on new requirements for high-cost lending. Their hard work and bipartisan leadership is well reflected in the legislation.

Today, I urge my colleagues in the 109th Congress to support this bipartisan bill and vote "yes" on the Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act and protect our military from these predatory financial products and sales practices.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Kentucky has quite correctly described both the need for this bill and what it does, and I am very pleased that this is one in a number of genuinely nonpartisan efforts that the Committee on Financial Services has brought forward.

I think there is a consensus in our committee. We have some issues about which we disagree, and we will continue to do so in a good spirit. But we also have a consensus that it is possible to work to make sure that the financial sector, the financial intermediaries in this country, are able to perform their function, which is so important in our capitalist society, but still protect consumers from abusive practices, that is, legitimate protection of consumers need not be seen, should not be seen, as inconsistent with support for the function that the financial intermediaries should perform in our system.

This legislation is a very good example of that. It was introduced previously, as the gentleman from Kentucky mentioned, in a previous Congress. One version of it was also introduced, very similar, by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), who is on our committee. Our committee acted; the House acted. We are hopeful that the Senate will this time, because we are passing it early enough in this 2-year session to get its attention to go along with us.

And I would also note, as the gentleman from Kentucky graciously mentioned, that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) addressed as well at the session when we brought this up, the problem of payday lending, abusive payday lending for members of the military. As we know, members of the military, particularly now that we have mobilized the Guard, we have young, not always young, men and women in the military who may find themselves in economic distress

through no fault of their own because of an unforeseen call-up. They are fully entitled to our protection against those people who would prey on them.

So what we have done in this bill is to protect them from inappropriate sales, given the stressful situation in which they find themselves, the pressures they are under; and we have added, thanks to the initiative of the gentleman from Illinois, protection against abusive payday lending. And I appreciate the majority, the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the committee, in working with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) so that we were able to bring forward a comprehensive bill that we believe will protect members of our military from any kind of financial impositions on them of an inappropriate sort.

So I am delighted to join in what I hope will be an overwhelming, if not unanimous, vote for this bill; and I hope the Senate will act promptly.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his remarks and also heartily agree and hope that the Senate will pass this bill and take it up in an aggressive manner. I thank all the members of the Committee on Financial Services for their support on both sides of the aisle. It was truly a bipartisan effort.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 458, the Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act of 2005.

I congratulate Chairman OXLEY and all the members of the Financial Services Committee for putting forth a bill that seeks to protect our men and women in uniform from certain deceptive practices.

During the Financial Services Committee's consideration of this bill, my colleague Representative GUTIERREZ raised concerns about the issue of pay day loans and offered an amendment to extend the bill's coverage to them.

These are deferred-deposit loans that offer borrowers short-term credit that will be repaid on the person's next pay day.

If the borrower does not repay the loan at the end of the period, it can be rolled over with additional fees and interest assessed. Because of the way these loans work, the annual percentage rates are often 390 percent or more.

Representative GUTIERREZ was rightfully concerned that the high interest rates of such loans cause too much debt for military personnel and this could impede their military readiness.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the bill before us today contains language that places new requirements on military lenders and requires certain disclosures of lenders offering service members loans with higher-than-average rates, including payday loans.

It is time to crack down on unscrupulous lenders who seek to make a quick buck by selling improper loans to our uniformed service members.

I am pleased that the bill requires the Secretary of Defense to create and maintain a registry of banned payday lenders.

The Secretary will be responsible for updating and maintaining the registry, which will provide the name, address, and other identifying information of the banned or barred agent or advisor.

The registry must be accessible and searchable by the public and local installation commanders and appropriate Federal and State financial regulators.

Furthermore, I wish to bring to the House's attention that the Commander's webpage section of the Defense Department's website currently has a section entitled, "Quick Links."

Under this are several tabs the user can click on dealing with such issues as Compensation, Deployment, Benefits, and the like.

I would like to urge the House to stipulate that the Defense Department place another separate tab under this "Quick Links" section and have it be a specific listing of abusive lenders so our service members can know whom to avoid.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all can agree that our soldiers do not deserve to be taken advantage of and the actions taken today are a step in the right direction.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 458, the Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act. This bill, introduced by my good friend Mr. GEOFF DAVIS from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, will go a long way towards protecting the men and women serving in our Nation's military from deceptive financial practices and unsuitable financial products.

Mr. Speaker, since the tragic day of September 11, 2001, our country has been at war. In the prosecution of that war, our armed services have performed heroically. Many have made the ultimate sacrifice for the cause of freedom. Unfortunately, there are a few bad actors in the financial services industry who have been taking financial advantage of our armed forces. These unscrupulous companies and salesmen gain access to military installations and use aggressive, misleading, and often illegal sales tactics, to sell high-cost products of dubious value that are unsuitable for any investor, and are particularly unsuitable for our military personnel.

The Pentagon has issued directives intended to prevent these abuses. But with the ongoing confusion over regulatory jurisdiction, the lack of communication among government agencies, and the lack of sufficient protection standards for certain financial products, it is clear that the abuses will not stop unless Congress enacts this legislation.

H.R. 458 bans bad financial products and sales practices, clarifies regulatory jurisdiction on military installations within the United States and abroad, adds appropriate consumer protections and disclosures for financial products, and ensures proper reporting systems between our military and the financial regulators to ensure bad actors cannot escape. It also makes the process of selecting a financial advisor more transparent for all investors, by providing online access to background information on broker-dealers, including disciplinary actions. Finally, the legislation imposes new requirements on lenders that target a military clientele for high-cost loan products, to ensure that our men and women in uniform are treated fairly when obtaining cred-

it, and are fully informed about the costs and potential consequences of entering into credit arrangements that feature high annual percentage rates.

The House passed similar legislation in the 108th Congress by a vote of 396 to 2. This term, our Committee reported Mr. DAVIS' bill to protect our servicemen and women by a unanimous vote. This overwhelming bipartisan consensus is the result of strong leadership by Mr. DAVIS, the author of this legislation; the chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Mr. BAKER, who led our investigation into abusive practices and bad products; Mr. JIM RYUN and Mr. ISRAEL who worked closely together on the reporting requirements of this bill; Ms. BROWN-WAITE for ensuring appropriate SEC oversight of broker-dealer sales practices on military installations; and Mr. GUTIERREZ for working on new requirements for high cost lending. Their hard work and bipartisan leadership is well-reflected in this legislation.

I urge my colleagues in the full House to support this bipartisan bill and vote "yes" on H.R. 458.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 458, the Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act. H.R. 458 is identical to legislation passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 396 to 2 in the 108th Congress. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on that legislation.

Last year, I worked closely with Financial Services Committee Chairman MICHAEL OXLEY, Ranking Member BARNEY FRANK and Capital Markets Subcommittee Chairman RICHARD BAKER in holding hearings and developing legislation to add new protections for enlisted personnel.

The legislation we produced last session is before us once again today. The Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act will go a long way toward eliminating these abuses and protecting our troops.

First, and most importantly, H.R. 458 bans the sale of contractual mutual funds on military bases. These expensive funds disappeared from the civilian market in the 1980s because their first-year commissions are equal to half of all contributions.

If they are not good enough for civilians, why should we allow them to be sold to our men and women in uniform?

Many of our enlistees are of modest financial means and need to cash in food stamps to feed their families. None of them can afford a 50 percent commission, and often, they do not realize they are paying so much.

If we want to give financial services firms access to military bases, that is one thing. But we cannot allow our young men and women to be used as laboratories for expensive financial products or to be seen as ATM machines, and that is what contractual mutual funds have made them.

This legislation also includes new disclosure requirements for life insurance products, so it is crystal clear what is being sold. H.R. 458 requires companies to provide recruits with a "Plain English" document telling them

subsidized life insurance is available from the Federal Government and that the Government does not endorse, recommend or encourage them to buy the product.

Finally, H.R. 458 clarifies the authority of state insurance regulators to act against bad actors on-base. The States are also directed to create uniform military personnel protection standards and to work with the Department of Defense to carry out those standards.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end a culture on military bases that too often favors financial interests over the interests of our troops, their families, and their futures.

I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 458, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. 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.

SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THERE SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED A CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) expressing the sense of Congress that there should be established a Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 71

Whereas people of Caribbean heritage are found in every State of the Union;

Whereas emigration from the Caribbean region to the American Colonies began as early as 1619 with the arrival of indentured workers in Jamestown, Virginia;

Whereas during the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, a significant number of slaves from the Caribbean region were brought to the United States;

Whereas since 1820, millions of people have emigrated from the Caribbean region to the United States;

Whereas much like the United States, the countries of the Caribbean faced obstacles of slavery and colonialism and struggled for independence;

Whereas also like the United States, the people of the Caribbean region have diverse racial, cultural, and religious backgrounds;

Whereas the independence movements in many countries in the Caribbean during the 1960's and the consequential establishment of

independent democratic countries in the Caribbean strengthened ties between the region and the United States;

Whereas Alexander Hamilton, a founding father of the United States and the first Secretary of the Treasury, was born in the Caribbean;

Whereas there have been many influential Caribbean-Americans in the history of the United States, including Jean Baptiste Point du Sable, the pioneer settler of Chicago; Claude McKay, a poet of the Harlem Renaissance; James Weldon Johnson, the writer of the Black National Anthem; Shirley Chisholm, the first African-American Congresswoman and first African-American woman candidate for President; and Celia Cruz, the world renowned queen of Salsa music;

Whereas the many influential Caribbean-Americans in the history of the United States also include Colin Powell, the first African-American Secretary of State; Sidney Poitier, the first African-American actor to receive the Academy Award for best actor in a leading role; Harry Belafonte, a musician, actor, and activist; Marion Jones, an Olympic gold medalist; Roberto Clemente, the first Latino inducted into the baseball hall of fame; and Al Roker, a meteorologist and television personality;

Whereas Caribbean-Americans have played an active role in the civil rights movement and other social and political movements in the United States;

Whereas Caribbean-Americans have contributed greatly to education, fine arts, business, literature, journalism, sports, fashion, politics, government, the military, music, science, technology, and other areas in the United States;

Whereas Caribbean-Americans share their culture through carnivals, festivals, music, dance, film, and literature that enrich the cultural landscape of the United States;

Whereas the countries of the Caribbean are important economic partners of the United States;

Whereas the countries of the Caribbean represent the United States third border;

Whereas the people of the Caribbean region share the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States for peace and prosperity throughout the Western Hemisphere and the rest of the world; and

Whereas June is an appropriate month to establish a Caribbean-American Heritage Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a Caribbean-American Heritage Month should be established; and

(2) the people of the United States should observe the month with appropriate ceremonies, celebrations, and activities.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 71, a resolution that recognizes the Caribbean-American community. This is a meaningful resolution to many Americans of Caribbean heritage, and I trust my colleagues will join me in support.

Mr. Speaker, America and the islands of the Caribbean have been eternal neighbors, and our pasts and futures are inexorably connected. The first permanent European settlement in the Caribbean was established by Spain on Hispaniola, the island that is now Haiti and the Dominican Republic, in 1496. The first native Caribbean people came to mainland North America as indentured servants at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1619.

Since the birth of our Nation, the United States has greatly benefited from the contributions of those of Caribbean descent. From Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, and founder of the First Bank of the United States, who was born on the island of Nevis, through Secretary of State Colin Powell, who was born to Jamaican immigrants, Caribbean-Americans have impacted all aspects of our Nation in tremendous ways.

Mr. Speaker, without question America greatly values its Caribbean-American population. This concurrent resolution is one important way that Congress can express its appreciation of the patriotism and honor of Caribbean-Americans. In addition, the United States Government enjoys great relationships with many island countries in the Caribbean as we work together on many issues including drug trafficking and trafficking in persons.

This concurrent resolution enjoys strong bipartisan support, of course, of the Caribbean-American Cultural Association and the Caribbean Diaspora Empowerment Foundation, not to mention the 81 cosponsors here in the House. I support the concurrent resolution as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in consideration of H. Con. Res. 71, which expresses the sense of Congress that June should be designated as National Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

This concurrent resolution, introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), recognizes that emigration from the Caribbean region to the American colonies began as early as 1619 with the arrival of indentured workers in Jamestown, Virginia. During the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, a significant number of slaves from the Caribbean region were brought to the United States.

This concurrent resolution also recognizes that millions of people have

emigrated from the Caribbean region to the United States since 1820 and points out that Alexander Hamilton, a Founding Father of the United States, was born in the Caribbean. Other influential Caribbean-Americans include Jean Baptiste Point du Sable, the pioneer settler of Chicago; Celia Cruz, the world renowned queen of Salsa music; James Weldon Johnson, the writer of the Black National Anthem; Shirley Chisolm, the first African American Congresswoman and first African American woman candidate for President; Colin Powell, the first African American Secretary of State; and Al Roker, a meteorologist and television personality.

Caribbean-Americans have played active roles in the civil rights movement and other social and political movements in the United States; and they have contributed greatly to education, fine arts, business, literature, journalism, sports, fashion, politics, government, the military, music, science, and technology. This concurrent resolution will increase national awareness of contributions made by Caribbean-Americans to U.S. culture, history, and politics.

I am also pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that Ambassador Sidney Williams is an ambassador to the Bahamas and is also a spouse of a Member of this body, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

I know that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) had wanted to be here to speak to her resolution; but, unfortunately, her flight was such that she could not make it.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 71, expressing the sense of Congress that there should be established a Caribbean-American Heritage Month and urge my colleagues to support its adoption. As a Caribbean-American myself, it gives me great pride to have been an original cosponsor of this resolution as well as to see it on the verge of passage in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions of the people and islands of the Caribbean in the fields of sports, entertainment, politics and culture in the 20th century alone more than makes this resolution worthwhile.

In the fight for emancipation and liberation, my fellow Virgin Islander Edward Blyden, along with George Padmore, Marcus Garvey and Claude McKay were among the first West Indian Americans to become well known and well respected in the African American's struggle for racial equality.

Other famous West Indian Americans include former U.S. Representative Shirley Chisolm; Franklin Thomas, former head of the Ford Foundation; Federal Judge Constance Baker Motley, the first black woman appointed to the Federal Judiciary; activists Stokely Carmichael—Kwarne Toure—Roy Innis, Malcolm X and Louis Farrakhan; world renowned actor Sidney Poitier; civil rights activist and singer, Harry Belafonte; Earl Greaves, philanthropist, businessman and publisher of Black Enterprise; and now Colin Powell the first black U.S. Secretary of State, have all made impressive contributions on behalf of African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the small nations of the Caribbean wield a cultural influence that has spread to the remote corners of the world. Our culture, notably the music—calypso, reggae, Afro-Cuban and their derivatives—which was created by-and-large by a people who long considered themselves marginalized, has spread far and wide and enjoys unheard of popularity today.

But more than just our musical influence, Nobel prizes for literature have gone to poets St. Jean Perse of Guadeloupe and Derek Walcott of St. Lucia from among a number of highly regarded Caribbean writers. Moreover, internationally admired painters Wifredo Lam of Cuba and Leroy Clarke of Trinidad and Tobago and Haiti's "naive" artists took inspiration from a complex cosmology born from West African religions and Christianity. And Trinidad and Tobago's carnival was the basis for the breathtaking costumed parades designed by Peter Minshall of Guyana and Trinidad for the Barcelona, Atlanta and Salt Lake City Olympics.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting and proper that we honor the contributions of the people of the Caribbean to our history and culture. Indeed, if providence had not made it possible for our founding father Alexander Hamilton to travel to New York from my home island of St. Croix to further his education, we might not be celebrating the founding of this Nation next week and instead have remained a colony of the United Kingdom even today.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of H. Con. Res. 71.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 71, supporting the establishment of a Caribbean American Heritage Month. I urge the approval of this resolution to support the Caribbean Americans who have contributed immensely to American society throughout our history. They overcame slavery and colonialism to fight for their independence, and emigrated to American colonies as early as 1619.

The countless number of influential figures in American history who are of Caribbean heritage indicates the need to set aside a designated time to celebrate their contribution to our country. Alexander Hamilton, a founding father of the United States and the first Secretary of the Treasury, James Weldon Johnson, the writer of the Black National Anthem, Colin Powell, the first African-American Secretary of State, Marion Jones, an Olympic gold medalist, Shirley Chisolm, the first African-American Congresswoman and first African-American woman candidate for President are only a few. These key figures in our history have left their marks on an array of fields; politics, art, music, business, government, and more.

A large number of my constituents are of Caribbean heritage, including Haitian, Jamaican, Dominican, and others. Our community has benefited greatly from their presence and involvement. I advocate establishing a Caribbean-American Heritage month to highlight my own constituents as well as Caribbean Americans all over the United States. I support a month with appropriate ceremonies, celebrations, and activities for a people who have suffered through years of slavery in past centuries and who have come to America to share with the rest of the world their dreams of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important resolution and I therefore strongly urge its passage.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 71, to provide for the establishment of a Caribbean-American Heritage Month. Congresswoman LEE's resolution represents a nonpartisan appeal to honor the millions of Caribbean-Americans who have contributed greatly to the social, political, and economic life of the United States. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and urge my fellow colleagues to lend their support to this important measure.

Caribbean Americans are becoming an increasingly integral part of the American fabric. Though the total Caribbean-American population is approximately 3 million, the Department of Homeland Security estimates 4 million Caribbean people have immigrated to the United States since the 1820s. As a representative of New York City, where Caribbean Americans account for over 25% of the population, I can attest first-hand to the size and impact of this community.

Many Americans do not know the extent of the Caribbean-American contribution to the United States. Indeed, the Capitol Building in which we stand today was designed by a man from the British Virgin Islands. Alexander Hamilton, one of our country's founding fathers and the first U.S. Secretary of the Treasury was from the Caribbean island of Nevis.

The founder of Chicago, Jean Baptiste Point du Sable, was born in Haiti, and Shirley Chisolm, the first African American woman elected to Congress, was also of Caribbean ancestry. Colin Powell, the first African American Secretary of State, is of Jamaican heritage. One could go on and on with the names of Caribbean Americans who have made significant contributions to our history and society, and that just serves to validate why this resolution is long overdue.

In addition to their contribution inside the U.S., individuals of Caribbean descent have contributed directly to the United States even when they did not actually reside in the country. Many are not aware that the United States utilized the skill and labor of thousands of English speaking Caribbean workers in the construction of the Panama Canal in the early 1900s. So large was this group that many of their descendants remain in Panama, and throughout Central America, to this day. The immense contribution that the Canal has made to the American economy, and global trade in general, serves as another reminder of what people of Caribbean decent have given to our country.

Caribbean-Americans also help to maintain the economic vitality of the region. As we all know the United States provides significant financial assistance to the Caribbean. However, this amount is dwarfed by the \$1.6 billion that Caribbean Americans send to the region in the form of remittances to family members. This is needed more than ever as the nations of the Caribbean continue to face many obstacles related to their small economies, and frequent natural disasters.

As we reflect on the contributions of the Caribbean community, there is much that we can learn from them. The Caribbean is quite arguably the most diverse region in the Western Hemisphere. With a population consisting of Asians, East Indians, Africans, Europeans, Native Americans, and even Middle Easterners, the Caribbean has thrived in its diversity, and Caribbean Americans have brought this culture of tolerance and inclusion with

them as they have integrated into American society.

As we now find ourselves with the passage of this resolution appropriately recognizing the Caribbean American community, I find it appropriate to point out a little-known, but ironic, fact. The first country to recognize the fledgling United States in 1776 was the Caribbean island of St. Eustatius. At a time when the odds were stacked against our Nation, the Caribbean was the first to extend the hand of friendship. Now we have the opportunity to return the favor with H. Con. Res. 71. I thank the gentlewomen from California for her introduction of this resolution, and I am confident that my colleagues will follow her lead.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor to H. Con. Res. 71, which expresses the sense of Congress that there should be the institution of a Caribbean-American Heritage Month. Persons of Caribbean descent played a fundamental role in the establishment of our Nation—these same Diasporic communities continue to contribute to the well being of the United States today.

Beginning with the emigration of indentured servants from the Caribbean to Jamestown, Virginia in 1619—through the slave trade the following three centuries, it is not surprising to find people of Caribbean heritage in every State of the Union. It is upon these first individual's works and merits that a large part of this country was built.

Although the countries of the Caribbean faced obstacles of slavery and colonialism, their struggles for independence prevailed. This racially, culturally, and religiously diverse region of the world contributes greatly to the economy of our own Nation. While the Caribbean is a vital supplier to the sugarcane, coffee, cocoa, gold, tobacco, and banana industries, their contributions exceed monetary value.

There have been many influential Caribbean-Americans in the history of the United States, including: Colin Powell, the first African-American Secretary of State. Shirley Chisholm, the first African-American Congresswoman and first African-American woman candidate for President. Sidney Poitier, the first African-American actor to receive the Academy Award for the best actor in a leading role. Harry Belafonte, a musician, actor, and activist. Claude McKay, a poet of the Harlem Renaissance. Celia Cruz, world renowned queen of Salsa music. Roberto Clemente, the first Latino inducted into the baseball hall of fame; and Al Roker, meteorologist and television personality.

From this short list, we see that Caribbean-Americans shared not only their culture, and expertise in education, fine arts, business, literature, journalism, politics, and science, but the people of the Caribbean region also share the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States for peace and prosperity throughout the world. Given their contributions to our Nation, it would only be appropriate for the people of the United States to observe the month of June with fitting ceremonies, activities, and celebrations. It is on these grounds that I request that Congress honor the establishment of Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support House Concurrent Resolution 71, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 71.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN J. HAINKEL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2346) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 105 NW Railroad Avenue in Hammond, Louisiana, as the "John J. Hainkel Post Office Building," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 2346

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

SECTION 1. JOHN J. HAINKEL, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 105 NW Railroad Avenue in Hammond, Louisiana, shall be known and designated as the "John J. Hainkel, Jr. Post Office Building".

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation salutes the life of an extraordinary member of the Louisiana legislature, the late John Hainkel, Jr. John Hainkel served 20 years in the Louisiana State house and another 25 years in the State senate until he passed away on April 15 this year. I know he was a tremendous representative of his many constituents and supporters.

The State of Louisiana has mourned the loss of Senator Hainkel for several weeks, but I appreciate the House lead-

ership's selecting this bill for consideration so the entire Nation can acknowledge the life of this highly respected man. I also want to especially thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) for his work on this bill and his commitment to recognizing Senator Hainkel.

Prior to his passing, Senator Hainkel had served in Baton Rouge since 1968, when he was first elected to the State house. He clearly earned the great respect of his colleagues because he became speaker of the house in 1980, and he held that post through 1984. In 1988, New Orleans voters elected him to be their State senator. He ultimately became president of the senate from 2000 through last year. He remained in the senate until his passing in April.

Mr. Speaker, I support this post office designation on behalf of John J. Hainkel, Jr. and urge all Members to do the same. It seems clear his contributions to the State of Louisiana will be long lasting. I look forward to the words of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL), sponsor of this legislation.

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

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join with my colleague in consideration of H.R. 2346, legislation naming a postal facility in Hammond, Louisiana, after the late John J. Hainkel, Jr. This measure, which was introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) on May 12, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on June 16, 2005, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Louisiana delegation.

John Hainkel was first elected to the Louisiana legislature in 1968. He held that position for 20 years, also serving as speaker of the house from 1980 to 1984.

□ 1500

The voters in uptown New Orleans elected him in 1988 to the State senate, where he served until his death representing the Sixth District. While serving in the senate, his colleagues elected him president of the senate in the Year 2000, a position he held until 2004. He is the only legislator in Louisiana history to hold the leadership position in both houses.

Senator Hainkel supported the arts, was pro-business, worked hard to clean up Lake Pontchartrain, and loved to hold legislative meetings over the barbecue pit. He loved his district and State and served 38 years in politics working to improve the lives of his constituents. Sadly, John Hainkel passed away this past April.

Mr. Speaker, designating the post office in Hammond, Louisiana, is an excellent way to honor the memory of

one of Louisiana's political legends, John Hainkel, Jr. I commend my colleague for sponsoring this measure and urge swift passage.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL), the author of H.R. 2346.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise both with a grateful and also a heavy heart. I rise with a grateful heart and I want to thank my colleagues for their speedy consideration of this resolution. I rise with a heavy heart because of the untimely passing of not only a colleague, but a friend.

I first met John Hainkel well over a decade ago, and at that point he had already been involved in elected politics for well over three decades. Senator Hainkel, as you already heard, accomplished many significant things in his public career. Indeed, he was the only person in Louisiana's history to be elected both speaker of the house and president of our senate.

His broad-based appeal, however, extended beyond party lines. He was elected as speaker of the house, serving as a Democrat, with the active support of Louisiana's first Republican Governor elected in modern times. He then went on to serve, when I first met him, as chairman of the senate budget committee as a Republican, even though two-thirds of the senate at that time was comprised of Democrats. Indeed, when he served as president of the senate as a Republican, two-thirds of the senate in Louisiana at the time was comprised of Democratic members. I think that fact alone shows his bipartisan support, his broad appeal to many senators and representatives.

The reason he commanded such respect was the fact that he brought integrity, the fact he brought humor, wit, the fact that he brought fashion to the daily legislative tasks.

But John was more than just a senator, he was more than just a legislator. Indeed, he was very accomplished in those arenas. Senator Hainkel not only worked with Pat Taylor to bring about Louisiana's TOPS bill, which provides access for students to higher education, but he championed many budget reforms, helping to turn deficits into surpluses, helping to reform our State's health care system and helping to revive our State's economy.

But his accomplishments outside the legislature were almost as noteworthy as his accomplishments inside the legislature. John was also not only a dedicated senator, a dedicated representative, he was also a dedicated Tulane fan. I know that he watched from above as his Green Wave served him well in Omaha and went on to do so well in the College World Series. I know that he will still be watching

them season after season, just with slightly better seats than he had before.

Indeed, Senator Hainkel was known for his friendship and was known for reaching out to new members of the bodies in which he served, to new members of the administration. He truly brought a passion and an attitude of public servant leadership that too often is missing from our elected halls. He brought a spirit of bipartisanship, a spirit of love for his home State of Louisiana.

Several things have been said about Senator Hainkel and the years of service he offered my State. I also want to note that he is survived by his son, John J. Hainkel, III, his daughter, Juliet Hainkel Holton, his other daughter, Alida Hainkel Furr, and by five grandchildren. I know his family brought him much joy. I know they, like I, am very saddened by his untimely and his early departure.

It is hard, it would be really impossible, to overstate the amount of affection and respect that Senator Hainkel engendered not only in his home district, but the home State of Louisiana. Whether you were with him or against him on a particular legislation, and I was in both places, whether you were with him or against him in a particular election, and I was in both places, he was always a worthy friend and a worthy opponent.

I can certainly think of nothing that would be more appropriate than naming, at least as a small tribute to him, this post office in Hammond, Louisiana, that was within the district he represented in the senate. Indeed, there is a spirited election to replace him now. Two very distinguished women are seeking that post. Though either one of them will serve well, neither of them will be truly able to succeed and replace the giant that was John Hainkel.

I want to thank my colleagues again for their support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 2436.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2346, 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 105 NW Railroad Avenue in Hammond, Louisiana, as the 'John J. Hainkel, Jr. Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAYOR JOSEPH S. DADDONA MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2490) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 West Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Mayor Joseph S. Daddona Memorial Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2490

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

SECTION 1. MAYOR JOSEPH S. DADDONA MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 West Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the "Mayor Joseph S. Daddona Memorial Post Office".

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2490.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2490 honors Joseph S. Daddona for his respected service to the community, my hometown, Allentown, Pennsylvania. Mr. Daddona was born in 1933, the son of Italian American immigrants. He grew up in the Second Ward of Allentown, in an ethnically diverse neighborhood.

Too poor to attend college after graduating from what was then Allentown High School, he enlisted in the United States Navy and served his country during the Korean War. After safely returning from overseas, Mr. Daddona put himself through Lehigh University and received an engineering degree.

Although he began his career as a planning engineer for the Western Electric Company, he found himself increasingly drawn to politics in the City of Allentown. In the mid-1960s, as a member of the Allentown Jaycees, Joe Daddona spearheaded the effort to create a Charter Study Commission for the city. He subsequently won a seat on that commission, helped draft the city's strong mayor form of government, and later served a term as an Allentown city councilman.

In 1973, Daddona was elected mayor for the first time. During his tenure,

Allentown was designated an All-American City, one of his proudest accomplishments and something he spoke of often. He stood for reelection in 1977, but lost by 121 votes. Undeterred, Joe Daddona ran again in 1981 and won. He also triumphed in 1985 and 1993, making him the longest serving mayor in the city's history, along with Malcolm W. Gross.

Mayor Daddona's other endeavors include establishing parks, fire stations, and high-rise apartments for the elderly. He also improved environmental conditions at the local sewage treatment facility and was responsible for numerous modifications to local traffic patterns.

Daddona was a relentless booster for the city of Allentown. He was constantly in touch with his constituents and worked tirelessly to solve neighborhood problems. He loved to show off the city during Super Sunday and May-fair events.

After his political career ended, he appeared on various local television and radio shows, in part to extol the virtues of the city. Daddona died after a long battle with cancer on June 5, 2004. He is survived by his wife Ann and their children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2490 in recognition and memory of my friend, the late Mayor Joe Daddona.

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

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 2490, legislation naming the postal facility in Allentown, Pennsylvania, after the late Joseph S. Daddona, the former mayor of Allentown.

This measure, which was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) on May 19, 2005 and unanimously reported by our committee on June 16, 2005, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Pennsylvania delegation.

Born and raised in Allentown, Joseph Daddona served 8 years in the U.S. Navy during and after the Korean War. From 1966 to 1994, he served as the mayor of Allentown, the longest serving mayor in the town's history. As mayor, Joseph worked hard to improve the lives of his constituents. He established parks, housing for seniors, and improved environmental conditions.

Sadly, he passed away last June.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the legacy of Joseph Daddona and urge swift passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank all my colleagues for their support of this effort to honor my late friend, Joe Daddona.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2490.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATING MYSTIC SEAPORT: THE MUSEUM OF AMERICA AND THE SEA IN RECOGNITION OF ITS 75TH YEAR

Mr. FORTUNA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 152) commemorating Mystic Seaport: the Museum of America and the Sea in recognition of its 75th year, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Con. Res. 152

Whereas Mystic Seaport: the Museum of America and the Sea was founded as the Marine Historical Association on December 29, 1929, to preserve, protect, and honor the legacy of America's great maritime tradition and culture;

Whereas Mystic Seaport has grown into the largest, most diverse maritime museum, and the fourth largest history museum, in the Nation;

Whereas the mission of Mystic Seaport is to create a greater awareness and deeper appreciation of America's relationship to the sea and the impact of that relationship upon us as individuals and as a Nation;

Whereas the collections of Mystic Seaport include four National Historic Landmark vessels including the CHARLES W. MORGAN, the last wooden whaling ship in the world; the LA DUNTON, one of the few remaining fishing schooners of its era; the SABINO, one of the last coal-fired, steam ships still in operation; and the EMMA C. BERRY, an 1866 wooden fishing vessel;

Whereas Mystic Seaport also maintains the largest collection of watercraft in the nation with more than 500 vessels representing sail, oar, paddle and engine-powered boats spanning 2 centuries of history;

Whereas Mystic Seaport also features the Henry B. duPont Preservation Shipyard as a live working facility that showcases and interprets the art of shipbuilding and restoration, including the restoration of its iconic National Historic Landmark vessels;

Whereas Mystic Seaport put the Preservation Shipyard to its highest and best use in replicating the schooner AMISTAD in full public view, demonstrating its claim that Mystic Seaport is the only museum in the world that can build a large wooden vessel from the keel up and launch it as part of a comprehensive museum experience;

Whereas the Collections Research Center of Mystic Seaport houses 75,000 maritime artifacts, more than one million photographs, and 1.5 million feet of film, and is a dynamic national maritime research facility;

Whereas the G.W. Blunt White Library is one of the largest and most thoroughly catalogued and accessible collections of marine and maritime research material in the world;

Whereas Mystic Seaport also features a representative 19th-century New England coastal village featuring skilled tradesmen and live interpretation to engage, educate, and entertain its visitors;

Whereas Mystic Seaport maintains educational and outreach programs for all levels including accredited graduate and undergraduate programs through the Munson Institute and Williams-Mystic, the cooperative Maritime Studies Program of Williams College and Mystic Seaport;

Whereas Mystic Seaport continues to attract more than 300,000 visitors each year and millions of other individuals through its interactive internet web site, demonstrating its role as a vital cultural and educational center;

Whereas more than 1,500 volunteers each year assist 300 professional and support staff in preserving and interpreting the collections of the Mystic Seaport and in delivering its unique programs; and

Whereas Mystic Seaport has recently completed a comprehensive self-study and a strategic program and master plan, and has recommitted itself to its mission with an effort to strengthen its endowment and make its programs more cohesive and compelling: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) commemorates Mystic Seaport: the Museum of America and the Sea in recognition of its 75th year and commends the staff, volunteers, and trustees of the Museum and encourages them in their efforts to create greater awareness of America's relationship to the sea and the profound impact of maritime transportation and commerce upon our Nation's economic growth;

(2) supports Mystic Seaport's presentation of our Nation's Merchant Mariners and shipbuilders whose efforts promoted the expansion of maritime transportation and commerce;

(3) asks all Americans to join in celebrating this milestone for Mystic Seaport and its mission of preserving and interpreting the legacy of American maritime transportation and tradition; and

(4) encourages Mystic Seaport in its efforts to secure the future of its collections and programs and supports its efforts to make those programs even more compelling and engaging.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. Fortuño) and the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. Fortuño).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORTUÑO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 152.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 152 was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS), and commemorates Mystic Seaport, the Museum of America and the Sea, in recognition of its 75th year. Mystic Seaport was founded in 1929 to preserve, protect, and honor the legacy of America's great tradition and culture.

Mystic Seaport is the largest maritime museum and fourth largest history museum in the Nation and attracts more than 300,000 visitors annually.

The mission of Mystic Seaport is to create a greater awareness and deeper appreciation of America's relationship to the sea and to highlight the impact of that relationship upon us as individuals and as a Nation.

Both the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) and I represent districts in which maritime activities play an important role in the lives of many of our constituents and are an important part of the history of our States.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and join in celebrating this 75-year milestone for Mystic Seaport.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of H. Con. Res. 152 commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Mystic Seaport, Museum of America and the Sea. Many Americans do not appreciate their U.S. maritime history and the legacy of the sea.

The Mystic Seaport Museum was established in 1929 to protect that history and legacy. The Mystic Seaport Museum is the largest and most diverse maritime museum in the United States. Its collections include many types of ships from our past, including a whaling ship, a fishing schooner, a coal-fired steamship, and a wooden shipping vessel built in 1866.

Mystic Seaport is providing a valuable service to our Nation by teaching Americans about our Nation's maritime history, promoting research in their vast collections of artifacts, photographs and books, and conducting outreach programs to students of all ages.

□ 1515

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of Mystic Seaport, and I hope that they will continue their programs to continue to grow and flourish in the years ahead. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 152 which acknowledges the 75th anniversary of Mystic Seaport: the Museum of America and the Sea. This resolution recognizes the efforts of the staff, volunteers, and trustees of the museum in preserving America's great maritime tradition. Mystic Seaport is also one of the jewels of my home state of Connecticut.

Since the 1600's, the Mystic Seaport has been a center for shipbuilding. Between 1784 and 1919, Mystic Seaport contributed more than 600 vessels to the American maritime enterprise. After the advent of steam power and railroads, wooden shipbuilding began to decline. Three Mystic, Connecticut residents, Edward Bradley, Dr. Charles Stillman, and Carl

Cutler created the Marine Historical Association on December 29, 1929 to prevent the disappearance of the American maritime tradition. Today, the Marine Historical Association is known as Mystic Seaport: the Museum of America and the Sea. Since the inception of the Mystic Seaport Museum, it has become the largest maritime museum, and the fourth largest history museum in the nation. The Seaport's membership represents 25,000 people from all 50 states and 30 countries. More than 1,500 volunteers assist Mystic Seaport's 300 employees each year.

Mystic Seaport has helped increase awareness and appreciation of America's maritime tradition. The museum features the largest collection of watercraft in the nation, which includes four National Historic Landmark vessels. The vessels include the *Charles W. Morgan*, the last wooden whaling ship in the world, and the *Sabino*, the last coal-fired steam ship still in operation. The Mystic Seaport Museum's Collections Research Center functions as a dynamic resource for maritime research. The G.W. Blunt White Library is one of the leading collections of maritime research material in the world. Recently, the library has assembled a virtual run of the earliest published American ship registers. The Mystic Seaport Museum has made significant contributions in maintaining the cultural integrity of our nation's maritime legacy.

Mystic Seaport was also involved in the construction of a replica of the freedom schooner *Amistad*, which serves as a floating classroom and monument to those who lost their freedom or their lives due to the transatlantic slave trade. I was privileged to attend the launch of the *Amistad* in March 2000 at Mystic Seaport with a delegation from the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in honoring Mystic Seaport's role in preserving America's maritime culture. For the past 75 years, Connecticut has been proud to be the home of the Mystic Seaport Museum, which continues to be a vital protector of the Nation's nautical history.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. FORTUÑO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 152, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELAWARE RIVER PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1412) to amend the Ports and Waterways Safety Act to require notification of the Coast Guard regarding obstructions to navigation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1412

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Delaware River Protection Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO NOTIFY COAST GUARD OF RELEASE OF OBJECTS INTO THE NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Ports and Waterways Safety Act (33 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 15. REQUIREMENT TO NOTIFY COAST GUARD OF RELEASE OF OBJECTS INTO THE NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"(a) REQUIREMENT.—As soon as a person has knowledge of any release from a vessel or facility into the navigable waters of the United States of any object that creates an obstruction prohibited under section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899, popularly known as the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of 1899 (chapter 425; 33 U.S.C. 403), such person shall notify the Secretary and the Secretary of the Army of such release.

"(b) RESTRICTION ON USE OF NOTIFICATION.—Any notification provided by an individual in accordance with subsection (a) shall not be used against such individual in any criminal case, except a prosecution for perjury or for giving a false statement."

SEC. 3. LIMITS ON LIABILITY.

(a) ADJUSTMENT OF LIABILITY LIMITS.—

(1) TANK VESSELS.—Section 1004(a)(1) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2704(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) with respect to a single-hull vessel, including a single-hull vessel fitted with double sides only or a double bottom only—

"(i) \$1,550 per gross ton for an incident that occurs in 2005;

"(ii) \$1,900 per gross ton for an incident that occurs in 2006; or

"(iii) \$2,250 per gross ton for an incident that occurs in 2007 or in any year thereafter; or

"(B) with respect to a double-hull vessel (other than any vessel referred to in subparagraph (A))—

"(i) \$1,350 per gross ton for an incident that occurs in 2005;

"(ii) \$1,500 per gross ton for an incident that occurs in 2006; and

"(iii) \$1,700 per gross ton for any incident that occurs in 2007 or in any year thereafter; or";

and

(C) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph—

(i) in clause (i) by striking "\$10,000,000" and inserting "\$14,000,000"; and

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking "\$2,000,000" and inserting "\$2,500,000".

(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—In the case of an incident occurring before the date of the enactment of this Act, section 1004(a)(1) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2704(a)(1)) shall apply as in effect immediately before the effective date of this subsection.

(b) ADJUSTMENT TO REFLECT CONSUMER PRICE INDEX.—Section 1004(d)(4) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2704(d)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) ADJUSTMENT TO REFLECT CONSUMER PRICE INDEX.—The President shall, by regulations issued no later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Delaware River Protection Act of 2005 and no less than every 3 years thereafter, adjust the limits on liability specified in subsection (a) to reflect significant increases in the Consumer Price Index."

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT TO UPDATE PHILADELPHIA AREA CONTINGENCY PLAN.

The Philadelphia Area Committee established under section 311(j)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)(4)) shall, by not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less than annually thereafter, review and revise the Philadelphia Area Contingency Plan to include available data and biological information on environmentally sensitive areas of the Delaware River and Delaware Bay that has been collected by Federal and State surveys.

SEC. 5. SUBMERGED OIL REMOVAL.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Title VII of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 is amended—

(1) in section 7001(c)(4)(B) (33 U.S.C. 2761(c)(4)(B)) by striking “RIVERA,” and inserting “RIVERA and the T/V ATHOS I;”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 7002. SUBMERGED OIL PROGRAM.

“(a) PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Undersecretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, in conjunction with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall establish a program to detect, monitor, and evaluate the environmental effects of submerged oil. Such program shall include the following elements:

“(A) The development of methods to remove, disperse or otherwise diminish the persistence of submerged oil.

“(B) The development of improved models and capacities for predicting the environmental fate, transport, and effects of submerged oil.

“(C) The development of techniques to detect and monitor submerged oil.

“(2) REPORT.—The Secretary of Commerce shall, no later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Delaware River Protection Act of 2005, submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the activities carried out under this subsection and activities proposed to be carried out under this subsection.

“(3) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 to carry out this subsection.

“(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

“(1) REMOVAL OF SUBMERGED OIL.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard, in conjunction with the Undersecretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, shall conduct a demonstration project for the purpose of developing and demonstrating technologies and management practices to remove submerged oil from the Delaware River and other navigable waters.

“(2) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Commandant of the Coast Guard \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 to carry out this subsection.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 2 of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7001 the following:

“Sec. 7002. Submerged oil program.”

SEC. 6. DELAWARE RIVER AND BAY OIL SPILL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Delaware River and Bay Oil Spill Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the “Committee”).

(b) FUNCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall, by not later than 1 year after the date the Commandant of the Coast Guard (in this section referred to as the “Commandant”) completes appointment of the members of the Committee, make recommendations to the Commandant, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on methods to improve the

prevention of and response to future oil spills in the Delaware River and Delaware Bay.

(2) MEETINGS.—The Committee—

(A) shall hold its first meeting not later than 60 days after the completion of the appointment of the members of the Committee; and

(B) shall meet thereafter at the call of the Chairman.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall consist of 15 members who have particular expertise, knowledge, and experience regarding the transportation, equipment, and techniques that are used to ship cargo and to navigate vessels in the Delaware River and Delaware Bay, as follows:

(1) Three members who are employed by port authorities that oversee operations on the Delaware River or have been selected to represent these entities, of whom—

(A) one member must be an employee or representative of the Port of Wilmington;

(B) one member must be an employee or representative of the South Jersey Port Corporation; and

(C) one member must be an employee or representative of the Philadelphia Regional Port Authority.

(2) Two members who represent organizations that operate tugs or barges that utilize the port facilities on the Delaware River and Delaware Bay.

(3) Two members who represent shipping companies that transport cargo by vessel from ports on the Delaware River and Delaware Bay.

(4) Two members who represent operators of oil refineries on the Delaware River and Delaware Bay.

(5) Two members who represent environmental and conservation interests.

(6) Two members who represent State-licensed pilots who work on the Delaware River and Delaware Bay.

(7) One member who represents labor organizations that load and unload cargo at ports on the Delaware River and Delaware Bay.

(8) One member who represents the general public.

(d) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—The Commandant shall appoint the members of the Committee, after soliciting nominations by notice published in the Federal Register.

(e) CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—The Committee shall elect, by majority vote at its first meeting, one of the members of the Committee as the Chairman and one of the members as the Vice Chairman. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence of or incapacity of the Chairman, or in the event of vacancy in the Office of the Chairman.

(f) PAY AND EXPENSES.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON PAY.—Members of the Committee who are not officers or employees of the United States shall serve without pay. Members of the Committee who are officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay on account of their service on the Committee.

(2) EXPENSES.—While away from their homes or regular places of business, members of the Committee may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem, in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(g) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate one year after the completion of the appointment of the members of the Committee.

SEC. 7. MARITIME FIRE AND SAFETY ACTIVITIES.

The Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-295) is amended—

(1) in section 407—

(A) in the heading by striking “LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER”; and

(B) by striking “\$987,400” and inserting “\$1,500,000”; and

(2) in the table of contents in section 1(b) by striking the item relating to section 407 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 407. Maritime fire and safety activities.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1412.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1412, the Delaware River Protection Act, makes several amendments to current law to enhance the Coast Guard's and the Federal Government's capability to prevent and respond to future oil spills in U.S. waters.

On November 26 of 2004, the ATHOS I struck a submerged object and released more than 260,000 gallons of heavy crude oil into the Delaware River. I commend the excellent work of the Coast Guard, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, to minimize the impact of the spill. However, this incident has brought several issues to light that are needed to enhance our capabilities to prevent and to respond to future oil spills.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1412 would require persons to notify the Coast Guard in the event that an object is released into U.S. waters that could cause the obstruction to navigation or, in the case of the ATHOS I, rip open the bottom of a ship. Mr. Speaker, let me give an example of why this provision is necessary. Under current regulations, an individual must report the creation of an obstruction only when the obstruction is caused by a sunken vessel. In other words, you must notify the Coast Guard when a vessel, whether a dinghy or a cruise ship, is sunk in a navigable waterway, but you need not report the loss of a large object such as a 7-foot anchor which, in this case, ripped the hull of the ATHOS I.

The notification requirement included in this bill will provide the Coast Guard with the information necessary to mark the location of potential obstructions on nautical charts until those obstructions can be removed. This provision will improve maritime safety and will protect the environment and economies of our local communities by further preventing similar mishaps in the future.

H.R. 1412 also directs the President to adjust liability limits for vessel owners to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index since 1990 and establishes a research program to develop and test technologies to detect and remove submerged oil from our waterways.

This bill will provide the Federal Government with authorities that will

enhance our capabilities to prevent and respond to future oil spills in U.S. waters. I would like to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), for their help, participation, and cosponsoring this bill.

I urge the House to support H.R. 1412.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1412, the Delaware River Protection Act of 2005. On November 26, 2004, the tanker ATHOS I hit a piece of pipe and an anchor that had been dumped into the Delaware River, spilling oil into the Delaware River near Paulsboro, New Jersey. The Coast Guard immediately began coordinating the response to this large spill.

On January 18, 2005, the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation conducted a field hearing in Philadelphia to see what policy changes should be made to help prevent this type of accident from happening again. H.R. 1412 was written as a result of that hearing.

No one seems to know where the pipe and anchor came from that the ATHOS I hit, but H.R. 1412 will require a person to notify the Coast Guard and the Army Corps of Engineers if they know of any object that has been dumped into the water that creates an obstruction to navigation.

As the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) pointed out at the hearing, the limit of liability of tank vessel owners has not been increased since the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 was enacted in response to the Exxon Valdez. OPA granted the Coast Guard the authority to increase the limits of liability for tank vessel owners based on the increase in the Consumer Price Index. However, they have never increased those limits. H.R. 1412 will increase the liability limits for oil spills up to a more modern amount and require these amounts to be adjusted not less than every 3 years.

One of the significant problems facing the agencies trying to clean up this spill is the fact that much of the heavy oil is sitting on the bottom of the river. H.R. 1412 will establish a program to monitor and evaluate the environmental effects of submerged oil.

H.R. 1412 also establishes the Delaware River and Bay Oil Spill Advisory Committee to make recommendations on methodologies to improve the prevention and response to future oil spills on the Delaware River and Delaware Bay.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman LOBIONDO) for the bipartisan approach that he has used to develop this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the en-

actment of H.R. 1412, the Delaware River Protection Act of 2005.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and I thank him again for his participation and help.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of this important legislation, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) for working on this bill for the past several months. He has worked extraordinarily hard on it and deserves a lot of credit. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, he is a fierce defender of our environmental resources, and specifically the Delaware River; and we all appreciate it in that neck of the woods.

I do share his goal of protecting the viability of the Delaware River as a valued environmental resource, and I also believe that the commerce channel is a top priority for the surrounding States.

Last November, a tragic oil spill, which has been referred to by the previous speakers, in the Delaware River set off a course of events which has led to the important legislation here before us today, the Delaware River Protection Act. Beginning with a congressional hearing in January, it has been a top priority to not only address the cleanup of the oil spill but how we can look to the future. One clear outcome is prevention, working together as a region to learn from this accident.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman LOBIONDO) has worked hard to draft legislation that I believe will make a real difference in protecting the Delaware River from another spill and in protecting the Delaware River as a valued natural resource.

I support the bill, which will establish the Delaware River and Bay Oil Spill Advisory Committee. A regional committee will be paramount to addressing issues facing the Delaware River, both environmental and industrial, and will serve as a sounding board for issues concerning the Delaware River.

Some of the committee's responsibilities will include developing recommendations for Congress on the prevention of and response to future oil spills on the Delaware River and bay; reporting to Congress regarding important issues affecting the health of the Delaware River, while ensuring that there is a balanced approach to the issues.

The committee will be made up of appointed experts in many different areas, from the operators of oil refineries to environmental advocates. As a result, this committee will be able to examine the breadth of issues facing the river. The recommendations need not be unanimous, allowing representation of transparent and likely divergent viewpoints.

In the coming years, our States will face numerous proposed industrial and

government activities that have potential safety, environmental, and economic consequences. This bill will help our region to be prepared and assure that important steps are taken to preserve the Delaware River.

Again, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the others who worked on this, and I sincerely encourage my colleagues' support for this legislation. I hope that, with the cooperation of the Senate, this will become law shortly to protect the Delaware River.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) and again thank her for her participation.

Mr. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the opportunity to make a few remarks on this legislation.

On November 26, 2004, the ATHOS I oil tanker struck a submerged object near Paulsboro, New Jersey, and spilled 265,000 gallons of oil into the Delaware River. The spill, the largest to occur in the Delaware River in the last 16 years, struck at the heart of our region, occurring in the Port of Philadelphia.

Two months after the spill, on my 15th day as a Member of Congress, my 15th day on the job, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) convened a hearing in Philadelphia to examine the damage of the spill, the ongoing cleanup effort, and what else might be needed to be done, either now or in the future. I appreciated the chairman's willingness to have me participate in that hearing as a very new member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

We all found, and we heard from the testimony, that this spill had caused millions of dollars in damages and affected more than 100 miles of shoreline in three States. Moreover, it impeded trade, temporarily shut down a nuclear power plant, put area drinking water at risk, and injured and killed wildlife. Unfortunately, many regional environmental experts testified that the impact of the oil spill would continue to linger, further damaging critical species such as oysters and horseshoe crabs. The devastating multiplier effect of the spill and the expert testimonies made clear that action was needed, not just for the cleanup, but for prevention.

As a consequence of what we found, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and I coauthored this bill, a bill that would protect the environmental integrity and economic vitality of the Delaware River and the greater Philadelphia area.

Mr. Speaker, the Delaware River Protection Act will take several very important steps to help prevent future oil

spills. It will require mandatory reporting to the Coast Guard of overboard objects in order to facilitate their recovery and will impose civil or criminal penalties for those who fail to give prompt notification. It will encourage shippers to use double-hull tankers, which are safer and less susceptible to the damage caused by the single hull tankers. It will hold shippers accountable for damages caused by a spill by phasing in an increased liability standard, the first increase since 1990. And it will establish a River and Bay Advisory Committee which will be comprised of representatives from shipping, oil, labor, environment, and the general public to report to Congress on how best to prevent and respond to future incidences along the Delaware River.

I also want to note that in addition to these actions, the Water Resources Development Act, which will be considered by the full House later this week, includes a key provision that was originally part of this legislation. Specifically, it will provide the Army Corps of Engineers with the authority to remove debris along the Delaware River, a vital authority as we increase efforts to keep our waterways clear of dangerous debris. It is my hope that the Water Resources Development Act will be received in an equally bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, the Delaware River Protection Act represents a true collaborative effort. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) for his leadership on this bill, as well as his office staff, Geoff Gosselin, and the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation staff John Cullather, Eric Nagel and John Rayfield for their hard work on this important issue and working so closely with my staff.

Undoubtedly, implementation of this legislation will help to prevent future oil spills along the river, while also preserving the Port of Philadelphia as the regional resource that it is. That is why I urge my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

□ 1530

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1412, 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.

SAND CREEK MASSACRE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE TRUST ACT OF 2005

Mr. FORTUÑO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 481) to further the purposes of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2000, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 481

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Trust Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) *FACILITY.*—The term "facility" means any structure, utility, road, or sign constructed on the trust property on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) *IMPROVEMENT.*—The term "improvement" means—

(A) a 1,625 square foot 1-story ranch house, built in 1952, located in the SW quarter of sec. 30, T. 17 S., R. 45 W., sixth principal meridian;

(B) a 3,600 square foot metal-constructed shop building, built in 1975, located in the SW quarter of sec. 30, T. 17 S., R. 45 W., sixth principal meridian;

(C) a livestock corral and shelter; and

(D) a water system and wastewater system with all associated utility connections.

(3) *SECRETARY.*—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) *TRIBE.*—The term "Tribe" means the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(5) *TRUST PROPERTY.*—The term "trust property" means the real property, including rights to all minerals, and excluding the improvements, formerly known as the "Dawson Ranch", consisting of approximately 1,465 total acres presently under the jurisdiction of the Tribe, situated within Kiowa County, Colorado, and more particularly described as follows:

(A) The portion of sec. 24, T. 17 S., R. 46 W., sixth principal meridian, that is the Eastern half of the NW quarter, the SW quarter of the NE quarter, the NW quarter of the SE quarter, sixth principal meridian.

(B) All of sec. 25, T. 17 S., R. 46 W., sixth principal meridian.

(C) All of sec. 30, T. 17 S., R. 45 W., sixth principal meridian.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF OKLAHOMA.

(a) *LAND HELD IN TRUST FOR THE CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF OKLAHOMA.*—On conveyance of title to the trust property by the Tribe to the United States, without any further action by the Secretary, the trust property shall be held in trust for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) *TRUST.*—All right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the trust property, except any facilities constructed under section 4(b), are declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Tribe.

SEC. 4. IMPROVEMENTS AND FACILITIES.

(a) *IMPROVEMENTS.*—The Secretary may acquire by donation the improvements in fee.

(b) *FACILITIES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary may construct a facility on the trust property only after consulting with, soliciting advice from, and obtaining the agreement of, the Tribe, the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, and the Northern Arapaho Tribe.

(2) *OWNERSHIP.*—Facilities constructed with Federal funds or funds donated to the United States shall be owned in fee by the United States.

(c) *FEDERAL FUNDS.*—For the purposes of the construction, maintenance, or demolition of improvements or facilities, Federal funds shall be expended only on improvements or facilities that are owned in fee by the United States.

SEC. 5. SURVEY OF BOUNDARY LINE; PUBLICATION OF DESCRIPTION.

(a) *SURVEY OF BOUNDARY LINE.*—To accurately establish the boundary of the trust property, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall cause a survey to be conducted by the Office of Cadastral Survey of the Bureau of Land Management of the boundary lines described in section 2(5).

(b) *PUBLICATION OF LAND DESCRIPTION.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—On completion of the survey under subsection (a), and acceptance of the survey by the representatives of the Tribe, the Secretary shall cause the full metes and bounds description of the lines, with a full and accurate description of the trust property, to be published in the Federal Register.

(2) *EFFECT.*—The description shall, on publication, constitute the official description of the trust property.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST PROPERTY.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The trust property shall be administered in perpetuity by the Secretary as part of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site, only for historical, traditional, cultural, and other uses in accordance with the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 106-465).

(b) *ACCESS FOR ADMINISTRATION.*—For purposes of administration, the Secretary shall have access to the trust property, improvements, and facilities as necessary for management of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site in accordance with the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 106-465).

(c) *DUTY OF THE SECRETARY.*—The Secretary shall take such action as is necessary to ensure that the trust property is used only in accordance with this section.

(d) *SAVINGS PROVISION.*—Nothing in this Act supersedes the laws and policies governing units of the National Park System.

SEC. 7. ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.

Section 6(a)(2) of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 106-465) is amended by inserting "or exchange" after "only by donation".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. FORTUÑO) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. FORTUÑO).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORTUÑO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 481, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 481, introduced by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to hold 1,465 acres in trust, thereby allowing the National Park Service to formally establish the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site. The Park Service has worked in partnership with the State of Colorado, the Cheyenne tribe, and the Arapaho tribe to establish this site which was originally authorized in 2000

and recognizes the national significance of the Sand Creek Massacre in American History.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, as the majority has explained, H.R. 481 will further the purposes of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site by enabling a significant parcel of land to be added to the site.

The Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site was authorized in 2000 to preserve, commemorate and interpret the location of the 1864 massacre of Cheyenne and Arapaho people camped along the banks of the Big Sandy Creek in southeastern Colorado. The effort to establish the historic site has been a cooperative one. The inclusion of the land authorized by H.R. 481 will be a significant step leading to the formal establishment of the site by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 481 will help advance the preservation and interpretation of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site and we support adoption of the legislation by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the staff of the Resources Committee, both the minority and majority staff, and especially Rick Healy, who worked diligently on this bill.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, to offer my bill H.R. 481, the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Act. I want to thank Chairman POMBO of the Committee on Resources for the expeditious way in which this bill moved through committee and onto the floor.

This bill is not only important to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indian tribes, the citizens of the 4th district of Colorado and the entire state, but it is also important to help secure a permanent reminder in America of the tragic event that forever altered the course of Western frontier history.

On November 29, 1864, 700 Colorado Volunteers commanded by Colonel John Chivington attacked a village of Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians who were camped along Big Sandy Creek in what is now Kiowa County, Colorado—part of the district that I represent today. More than 150 Indian people were killed in the attack, the majority of whom were woman and children. This event is now known as the Sand Creek Massacre.

On March 13, 1865, this event was addressed in Congress by the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War. Today, 141 years after the Massacre and 140 years after the first congressional hearings, Congress is again discussing this tragedy. This time we are here to honor the victims and preserve a historic parcel of land in Southeastern Colorado where this event took place.

In 1998, Congress authorized a study to investigate the suitability and feasibility of designating the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site in the State of Colorado as a unit of

the National Park System. In November 2000, after the completion of the site location study, Congress passed the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Establishment Act. This Act instructs the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site as a unit of the National Park System once sufficient land is acquired to interpret and commemorate the massacre.

Today, we consider H.R. 481, to place 1,465 acres of tribally owned land inside the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site boundary into Tribal Trust. This would allow the Cheyenne and Arapaho tribal property within the Historic Site to be managed by the National Park Service in partnership with the Northern and Southern Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes and consistent with the purposes of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2000.

The passage of H.R. 481 is an important step in establishing this National Historic Site. With passage of this bill, the National Park Service would be given management responsibility over an additional 1,465 acres and would bring the total acreage of the managed site to almost 2,400 acres. Many involved in this project believe the addition of 1,465 highly important acres to the Park Service's previous holdings will amount to a "sufficient portion" to complete the establishment of this National Historic Site. When the Secretary of Interior finally designates this site an official National Historic Site, the Northern and Southern Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes, the State of Colorado, Kiowa County and other stakeholders can begin the planning necessary to open this massacre site to the public.

I truly believe my bill will help heal the wounds of the past. I ask for the support of my colleagues on this bill.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I congratulate my Colorado colleague, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, for introducing it and thank the leadership of the Resources Committee for making it possible for the House to consider it today.

Enactment of the bill is a vital step toward formal establishment of the Sand Creek National Historic Site, as authorized in 2000 by Public Law 106-465.

The purpose of the Historic Site will be to recognize the national significance of what we now recognize as a permanent stain on the history of our State of Colorado—the Sand Creek massacre—and its ongoing significance to the Cheyenne and Arapaho people and descendants of the massacre victims.

The Act authorizes establishment of the national historic site once the National Park Service has acquired sufficient land to preserve, commemorate, and interpret the massacre site.

The National Park Service has acquired approximately 920 acres, but the majority of land within the authorized boundary is privately owned and is not open to the public. The National Park Service has been working in partnership with the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes and the State of Colorado towards establishment of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site.

This bill will authorize the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma to convey approximately 1,465 acres to the Secretary of the Interior to be held in trust for the tribes. Once these lands are conveyed, the National Park Service will be able to formally establish

the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site.

Sand Creek was the site of an attack with terrible and long-lasting effects. Its history speaks to what can happen when military force is misused for political purposes.

The leader of the attack was John M. Chivington, who earlier had been hailed as the hero of the battle at La Glorieta Pass—sometimes called the "Gettysburg of the West"—which ended the efforts of the Confederacy to seize New Mexico and other western territories.

As history records, Chivington seemed destined for even greater prominence. He was a leading advocate of quick statehood for Colorado, and spoken of as a likely candidate for Congress. At the same time, tensions between Colorado's growing white population and the Cheyenne Indians reached a feverish pitch. The Denver newspaper printed a frontpage editorial advocating the "extermination of the red devils" and urging its readers to "take a few months off and dedicate that time to wiping out the Indians." Chivington took advantage of this public mood, attacking the territorial governor and others who counseled a policy of conciliation and treaty-making with the Cheyenne.

Finally, during the early morning hours of November 29, 1864, he led a regiment of Colorado Volunteers to where the band led by Black Kettle, a well-known "peace" chief, was encamped. Federal army officers had promised Black Kettle safety if he would return to this location, and he was in fact flying the American flag and a white flag of truce over his lodge, but Chivington ordered an attack on the unsuspecting village nonetheless.

After hours of fighting, the Colorado volunteers had lost only 9 men in the process of murdering between 200 and 400 Cheyenne, most of them women and children. After the slaughter, they scalped and sexually mutilated many of the bodies, later exhibiting their trophies to cheering crowds in Denver.

Chivington was at first widely praised for the "battle" at Sand Creek, and honored with a widely-attended parade through the streets of Denver.

Attitudes began to change as tales circulated of drunken soldiers butchering unarmed women and children. At first, these rumors seemed confirmed when Chivington arrested six of his men and charged them with cowardice in battle.

But the six, who included Captain Silas Soule, were in fact militia members who had refused to participate in the massacre and now spoke openly of the carnage they had witnessed. Shortly after their arrest, the U.S. Secretary of War ordered the six men released and Congress began preparing for a formal investigation.

Soule himself could not be a witness at any of the investigations, because less than a week after his release he was shot from behind and killed on the streets of Denver.

Although Chivington was eventually brought up on court-martial charges for his involvement in the massacre, he was no longer in the U.S. Army and could therefore not be punished. No criminal charges were ever filed against him. An Army judge, however, publicly stated that Sand Creek was "a cowardly and cold-blooded slaughter, sufficient to cover its perpetrators with indelible infamy, and the face of every American with shame and indignation."

The massacre remains a matter of great historical, cultural and spiritual importance to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes, and is a pivotal event in the history of relations between the Plains Indians and Euro-American settlers.

The effort to establish the Sand Creek National Historic Site was led by former Senator Ben Campbell of Colorado. It has gone through several stages:

The Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Study Act (Public Law 105-243) directed the National Park Service, in consultation with the State of Colorado, the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, and the Northern Arapaho Tribe, to complete two tasks. First, the Act directed the Park Service to "identify the location and extent of the massacre area." Second, the Act directed the Park Service to prepare a report that assessed the national significance of the Sand Creek Massacre site, the suitability and feasibility of designating it as a unit of the National Park System, and a range of alternatives for the management, administration, and protection of the area.

Following completion of these studies, Senator Campbell introduced legislation to authorize the establishment of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site as a unit of the National Park System. Enactment of this bill is an important step toward completing that effort. I urge its approval by the House.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. FORTUÑO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 481, 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.

AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT AT ANTIETAM NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD OF NEW HAMPSHIRE MEMORIAL

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1084) to authorize the establishment of a memorial to the officers and enlisted men of the Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry Regiments and the First New Hampshire Light Artillery Battery who fought in the Battle of Antietam on September 17, 1862, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1084

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE MEMORIAL, ANTIETAM NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD, MARYLAND.

(a) MEMORIAL AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Interior shall authorize the establish-

ment, at a suitable location approved by the Secretary within the boundaries of Antietam National Battlefield, of a memorial to the officers and enlisted men of the Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry Regiments and the First New Hampshire Light Artillery Battery who fought in the Battle of Antietam on September 17, 1862.

(b) AUTHORIZED ENTITY.—The Secretary shall select the persons who will be permitted to establish the memorial authorized by subsection (a).

(c) DESIGN APPROVALS.—The size, design, and inscriptions of the memorial authorized by subsection (a) shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary.

(d) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR ESTABLISHMENT.—No Federal funds may be expended to design the memorial authorized by subsection (a), to acquire the memorial, to prepare the site selected for the memorial, or to install the memorial.

(e) SUSPENSION FOR MISREPRESENTATION IN FUNDRAISING.—The Secretary may suspend the authority of the persons selected under subsection (b) to establish the memorial authorized by subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that fundraising efforts relating to the memorial have misrepresented an affiliation with the memorial or the Federal Government.

(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—Until the memorial authorized by subsection (a) is installed, the persons selected under subsection (b) to establish the memorial shall submit to the Secretary an annual report of operations related to fundraising efforts for the memorial and progress on the establishment of the memorial.

(g) MAINTENANCE.—Upon installation of the memorial authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary shall assume responsibility for the maintenance of the memorial. The Secretary may accept contributions for the maintenance of the memorial from the persons selected under subsection (b) to establish the memorial and from other persons. Amounts accepted under this subsection shall be merged with other funds available to the Secretary for the maintenance of the memorial and credited to a separate account with the National Park Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1084, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1084 introduced by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) would authorize the construction of a memorial at the Antietam National Battlefield to members of the New Hampshire Infantry that fought in the Battle of Antietam. The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to select persons responsible for the establishment of the me-

morial and prohibits the use of Federal funds in the design, acquisition, preparation, and installation of the memorial. Additionally, the Secretary must approve the size, design, and inscriptions placed on the monument. Once the memorial is in place, the Secretary will accept responsibility for maintenance, but will be permitted to accept donations into a specific account for the New Hampshire memorial.

I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, as the majority has explained, H.R. 1084 authorizes the establishment of a Civil War Memorial to New Hampshire soldiers who fought at the Battle of Antietam in 1862.

Evidently, New Hampshire is the only State that participated in the Battle of Antietam that does not have a memorial to its soldiers at the site. The citizens of New Hampshire are proud of their ancestors' participation in the battle and would like to commemorate their participation.

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the adoption of H.R. 1084, as amended, by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the majority and minority staff of the House Resources Committee, and especially Rick Healy of the Resources Committee, for their diligent work on this bill.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I also thank the staffs from both majority and minority to get this bill through.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1084, 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.

NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1428) to authorize appropriations for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1428

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 10(a)(1) of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3709(a)(1)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2001 through 2005” and inserting “fiscal years 2006 through 2010”.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENT LIMITED TO GRANTS MADE WITH FEDERAL FUNDS.

Section 4(i) of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3703(i)) is amended by striking “grant of funds” and inserting “grant of Federal funds in an amount greater than \$10,000”.

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO USE FEDERAL FUNDS TO MATCH CONTRIBUTIONS MADE TO RECIPIENTS OF NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION GRANTS.

Section 10(a)(3) of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3709(a)(3)) is amended by inserting “, or to a recipient of a grant provided by the Foundation,” after “made to the Foundation”.

SEC. 5. REPEAL.

Effective September 30, 2015, section 10(a)(1) of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3709(a)(1)) is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1428, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 1428 introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the distinguished chairman of the House Resources Committee, which extends the existing authorization levels for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

Since its creation in 1984, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation has funded more than 6,420 conservation projects. These efforts have been coordinated with more than 1,800 different conservation organizations. The fundamental goal of these projects has been to increase resources for fish and wildlife conservation, develop innovative conservation solutions, respect private property rights, and sustain healthy ecosystems.

Unlike most conservation groups, this organization requires its grantees to sign an agreement stipulating that no Federal funds will be used for lobbying or litigation purposes. Instead of simply talking about conserving critical habitat, the foundation has accom-

plished that effort by taking their limited Federal dollars, and, through its challenge grant approach, generating over \$900 million in private matching funds. This is a remarkable achievement.

H.R. 1428 is a simple, noncontroversial and bipartisan bill. I urge an aye vote.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. As stated by my friend and colleague the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), the overall purpose of this legislation is to reauthorize the appropriations and to make minor technical and clarifying changes to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act.

H.R. 1428 will help ensure that this important congressionally chartered foundation continues its successful work in supporting effective on-ground conservation partnerships, not only in my State of New Mexico, but also across the country.

I urge Members to support this noncontroversial bill, and I thank the majority and minority staff of the Resources Committee, and especially Dave Jansen.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1084, a bill I introduced regarding a defining historical event for my State of New Hampshire, and indeed, all of the United States. The American Civil War was the deadliest war in all of American history with casualties totaling more than all other American Wars combined. The bloodiest day of the bloodiest war came on September 17, 1862 just outside the small town of Sharpsburg, Maryland. This battle involved 93,000 men and resulted in 23,000 American casualties on the fields surrounding Antietam Creek. The battle of Antietam, even today, is the single most deadly day in all of American history. Among the soldiers fighting that day were men of the Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry Regiments and the First New Hampshire Light Artillery Battery. Unfortunately, these brave men who fought and died in the Battle of Antietam do not have a marker on the field to signify their sacrifice. Although there are over 400 monuments, tablets and markers on the field of battle, none are dedicated to the brave men who fought and died that early fall day. As the 150th anniversary of the Civil War is approaching, I ask that the House help correct an unfortunate oversight and bring deserving recognition to these soldiers.

In this effort, Congressman BASS and I have introduced H.R. 1084, which would authorize the establishment of a Memorial at Antietam National Battlefield for the New Hampshire soldiers who fought in the historic battle. Importantly, this bill does not authorize any Federal appropriations, nor require any local municipality in Maryland to help finance the costs of the construction or maintenance of the monument. Any monument built and main-

tained at the Antietam National Battlefield Park would be entirely paid for by private sources. Additionally, the design, size, and location of any monument authorized under this bill would be at the total discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and any proposals that do not meet their desires may be rejected. Citizens of New Hampshire have passionately expressed to me, through both direct conversations as well as State passed legislation, that they would relish the opportunity to at last place a deserving monument on the battleground at Antietam.

In closing, I would like to call to mind an excerpt from a report issued by a correspondent of the Manchester Daily Mirror on September 20, 1862, three days after the horrific battle:

For two hours there was never sharper musketry heard or seen, and New Hampshire blood flowed freely in the contest. The Ninth suffered terribly but never flinched, and every man stood before the awful carnage without one thought of yielding.

Mr. Speaker, these men exemplified the steadfast bravery that is a hallmark of American soldiers across generations. On behalf of the citizens of New Hampshire, I ask for the assistance of the House in helping to furnish a proper monument to these commendable Americans.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1428, 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.

NATIONAL GEOLOGIC MAPPING REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2362) to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to such section or other provision of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31a et seq.).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Section 2(a) (43 U.S.C. 31a(a)) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) although significant progress has been made in the production of geologic maps

since the establishment of the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program in 1992, no modern, digital, geologic map exists for approximately 75 percent of the Nation;”.

(2) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C) by inserting “homeland and” after “planning for”;

(B) in subparagraph (E) by striking “predicting” and inserting “identifying”;

(C) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (I);

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

“(J) recreation and public awareness; and”.

(3) Paragraph (9) is amended by striking “important” and inserting “available”.

SEC. 4. PURPOSE.

Section 2(b) (43 U.S.C. 31a(b)) is amended by striking “protection” and inserting “management”.

SEC. 5. DEADLINES FOR ACTIONS BY THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Section 4(b)(1) (43 U.S.C. 31c(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking “not later than” and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting “not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2005;”;

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking “not later than” and all that follows through “in accordance” and inserting “not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2005 in accordance;” and

(3) in subparagraph (C) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking “not later than” and all that follows through “submit” and inserting “submit biennially”.

SEC. 6. GEOLOGIC MAPPING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.

Section 4(c)(2) (43 U.S.C. 31c(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “geophysical-map data base, geochemical-map data base, and a”; and

(2) by striking “provide” and inserting “provides”.

SEC. 7. GEOLOGIC MAPPING PROGRAM COMPONENTS.

Section 4(d)(1)(B)(ii) (43 U.S.C. 31c(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of subclause (I);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subclause (II) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(III) the needs of Department of the Interior land management agencies.”.

SEC. 8. GEOLOGIC MAPPING ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 5(a) (43 U.S.C. 31d(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or a designee” and inserting “Secretary of the Interior or a designee from a land management agency of the Department of the Interior”;

(B) by inserting “and” after “Energy or a designee;” and

(C) by striking “, and the Assistant to the President for Science and Technology or a designee;” and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “Not later than” and all that follows through “consultation” and inserting “In consultation”;

(B) by striking “Chief Geologist, as Chairman” and inserting “Associate Director for Geology, as Chair”; and

(C) by striking “one representative from the private sector” and inserting “two representatives from the private sector”.

SEC. 9. FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL GEOLOGIC MAP DATABASE.

Section 7(a) (43 U.S.C. 31f(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “geologic map” and inserting “geologic-map”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by inserting “information on how to obtain” after “that includes”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A) by striking “under the Federal component and the education component” and inserting “with funding provided under the national cooperative geologic mapping program authorized by section 4(a)”.

SEC. 10. BIENNIAL REPORT.

Section 8 (43 U.S.C. 31g) is amended by striking “Not later” and all that follows through “biennially” and inserting “Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 2005 and biennially”.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ALLOCATION.

Section 9 (43 U.S.C. 31h) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$64,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “2000” and inserting “2005”;;

(B) by striking “48” and inserting “50”; and

(C) by striking “2” and inserting “4”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2362, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2362, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992, introduced by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Geologic maps are important in identifying the Nation’s water, energy, and mineral resources. Knowing where our resources are located is important in developing a sound national energy and minerals program that will allow us to become more energy independent, providing for a stronger, more secure economy and homeland.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation that gets real results by producing new geologic maps on an annual basis.

I urge adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, as my friend and colleague the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) has stated, H.R. 2362 would reauthorize the Geologic Mapping Act of 1992.

The U.S. Geological Survey and the State geological authorities carry out the geologic mapping program jointly. Under this program, Federal and State geologists develop comprehensive geological maps of the United States and a related database of environmental and scientific information.

The mapping program contributes significantly to our understanding of geologic information such as the distribution of mineral energy and groundwater resources.

Mr. Speaker, we should support H.R. 2362 and I urge its passage.

I would also at this time like to thank the entire Resources staff, including especially Debra Lanzone.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS). (Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and also the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), for allowing me time to speak on this very important bill which I introduced along with my very good friend and colleague the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

H.R. 2362 demonstrates a commitment, a commitment by not only this body, but by our country, to provide timely geologic information in a digital format to a variety of users, including our county health departments, State environmental agencies, Federal agencies, and even the private sector, Mr. Speaker. To date, no modern digital geologic map exists for approximately 75 percent of this country.

Geologic mapping has a variety of important uses as we have already heard. And understanding the subsurface soil, geology soil profiles through the use of geologic mapping can facilitate better planning, better planning for a variety of community projects including housing developments, schools and hospitals, septic systems for rural and urban communities and water treatment facilities and the construction of even highways and roadways as well.

Now, siting these types of facilities in appropriate geologic settings is important to avoid or mitigate for geologic hazards such as landslides, earthquakes, subsiding soils or swelling soils, sinkholes, volcanic eruptions and even floodplains.

H.R. 2362 authorizes the cooperative matching grant program between the State geologic surveys and the United States Geological Survey through the fiscal year 2010.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues, understanding the

value of this important piece of legislation, to vote in the affirmative for its passage.

□ 1545

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2362, 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.

UPPER WHITE SALMON WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 38) to designate a portion of the White Salmon River as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 38

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Upper White Salmon Wild and Scenic Rivers Act".

SEC. 2. UPPER WHITE SALMON WILD AND SCENIC RIVER.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"() WHITE SALMON RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The 20 miles of river segments of the main stem of the White Salmon River and Cascade Creek, Washington, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classifications:

"(A) The approximately 1.6-mile segment of the main stem of the White Salmon River from the headwaters on Mount Adams in section 17, township 8 north, range 10 east, downstream to the Mount Adams Wilderness boundary as a wild river.

"(B) The approximately 5.1-mile segment of Cascade Creek from its headwaters on Mount Adams in section 10, township 8 north, range 10 east, downstream to the Mount Adams Wilderness boundary as a wild river.

"(C) The approximately 1.5-mile segment of Cascade Creek from the Mount Adams Wilderness boundary downstream to its confluence with the White Salmon River as a scenic river.

"(D) The approximately 11.8-mile segment of the main stem of the White Salmon River from the Mount Adams Wilderness boundary downstream to the Gifford Pinchot National Forest boundary as a scenic river."

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 38.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 38, as introduced by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), would designate 20 miles of the Upper White Salmon River as a component of the Wild and Scenic Rivers system.

This legislation would designate four different segments of the Upper White Salmon River and Cascade Creek, totaling 20 miles, as "wild and scenic." The segments are limited to Federal land, located in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, and include 6.7 miles in the Mt. Adams Wilderness.

This designation is supported by the local community as well as the Forest Service. I urge support for this important measure.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 38 designates the main stem of the Upper White Salmon River and Cascade Creek, totaling 20 miles, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Congress added the lower White Salmon River to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System in 1986.

The White Salmon River originates in the glaciers of Mt. Adams and flows through south central Washington to the Columbia River. The river is known for its remarkable scenery and abundant wildlife and is popular with white water enthusiasts.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) should be recognized for his leadership on H.R. 38. My good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), is one of our strong conservation leaders in the Northwest and has worked very hard in showing strong leadership in getting this bill to the point that it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and my other colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO); the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) of the Committee on Resources; the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WAL-

DEN); and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, for their guidance. And I certainly appreciate the help of their staff throughout this process.

I also want to acknowledge the work of my good friend and colleague, Senator CANTWELL, who has introduced the companion legislation in that Chamber.

A number of people locally in our region deserve credit, including among them Phyllis Clausen of the Friends of the White Salmon River, Connie Kelleher from American Rivers, the SDS Lumber Company, the U.S. Forest Service, and local county commissioners from the region as well. This process has taken several years and represents a true collaborative local effort.

The Upper White Salmon River is literally a world-famous river. Located in south central Washington, it is known for its great white water, stunning scenery, and fish and wildlife resources. The designation before us today will preserve the river's free-flowing status as well as the natural values and rural lifestyle in the surrounding area.

In 1986, the river's outstanding quality received national recognition when Congress designated the lower 8 miles of the White Salmon as a National Wild and Scenic River. Congress directed the Forest Service to study the Upper White Salmon for possible designation into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 38 seeks to protect 20 miles of Upper White Salmon River segments within the Gifford Pinchot Forest as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System by designating them wild and scenic. This designation has broad public support within the local community and throughout the region. It has been endorsed by a wide variety of environmental and recreational organizations, local community and business leaders.

The land to be designated as wild and scenic consists entirely of public land, no private land is included; the area is currently being managed as if it is already part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

I want to reiterate my gratitude to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the chairman of the overall committee. I thank Members for their support and urge passage of this valuable piece of legislation.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the entire Committee on Resources staff and especially Meghan Conklin for her work on this bill.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would recognize the staff of both the majority and minority and also congratulate the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) on not only his performance in submitting this bill but his stellar performance in the congressional baseball game last Thursday night.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 38, 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.

TAUNTON, MASSACHUSETTS SPECIAL RESOURCES STUDY ACT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1512) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1512

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Taunton, Massachusetts Special Resources Study Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The city of Taunton, Massachusetts, is home to 9 distinct historic districts, with more than 600 properties on the National Register of Historic Places. Included among these districts are the Church Green Historic District, the Courthouse Historic District, the Taunton Green Historic District, and the Reed and Barton Historic District.

(2) All of these districts include buildings and building facades of great historical, cultural, and architectural value.

(3) Taunton Green is the site where the Sons of Liberty first raised the Liberty and Union Flag in 1774, an event that helped to spark a popular movement, culminating in the American Revolution, and Taunton citizens have been among the first to volunteer for America's subsequent wars.

(4) Robert Treat Paine, a citizen of Taunton, and the first Attorney General of Massachusetts, was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

(5) Taunton was a leading community in the Industrial Revolution, and its industrial area has been the site of many innovations in such industries as silver manufacture, paper manufacture, and ship building.

(6) The landscaping of the Courthouse Green was designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, who also left landscaping ideas and plans for other areas in the city which have great value and interest as historical archives and objects of future study.

(7) Main Street, which connects many of the historic districts, is home to the Taunton City Hall and the Leonard Block building, 2 outstanding examples of early 19th Century American architecture, as well as many other historically and architecturally significant structures.

(8) The city and people of Taunton have preserved many artifacts, gravesites, and important documents dating back to 1638 when Taunton was founded.

(9) Taunton was and continues to be an important destination for immigrants from Europe and other parts of the world who have helped to give Southeastern Massachusetts its unique ethnic character.

SEC. 3. STUDY.

The Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate State historic preservation officers, State historical societies, the city of Taunton, and other appropriate organizations, shall conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System. The study shall be conducted and completed in accordance with section 8(c) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)) and shall include analysis, documentation, and determinations regarding whether the historic areas in Taunton—

(1) can be managed, curated, interpreted, restored, preserved, and presented as an organic whole under management by the National Park Service or under an alternative management structure;

(2) have an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that together represent distinctive aspects of American heritage worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use;

(3) reflect traditions, customs, beliefs, and historical events that are valuable parts of the national story;

(4) provide outstanding opportunities to conserve natural, historic, cultural, architectural, or scenic features;

(5) provide outstanding recreational and educational opportunities; and

(6) can be managed by the National Park Service in partnership with residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and State and local governments to develop a unit of the National Park System consistent with State and local economic activity.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 3 fiscal years after the date on which funds are first made available for this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study required under section 3.

SEC. 5. PRIVATE PROPERTY.

The recommendations in the report submitted pursuant to section 4 shall include discussion and consideration of the concerns expressed by private landowners with respect to designating certain structures referred to in this Act as a unit of the National Park System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1512.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1512, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts

(Mr. FRANK), would direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas of the City of Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System. It was in the City of Taunton where the Sons of Liberty first raised the Liberty and Union Flag in 1774, an event that helped to spark the American Revolution.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Taunton area to be included in the study authorized by H.R. 1512 is rich in cultural and historic resources. A comprehensive study of these resources will help determine if inclusion within the National Park System is appropriate.

The sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), is to be commended for his tenacity and resolve in pursuing this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the committee who have brought this bill forward.

This is a bill that has particular meaning to me. The City of Taunton has been in the district I have been privileged to represent for just a couple of years. Prior to that, it was represented by one of our late colleagues; and when you talk about history, which this bill does, building as it does on the history of the City of Taunton, you could not talk about the history of this institution without some reference to the man who represented Taunton before me and that is our late colleague, Joe Moakley.

Joe Moakley represented Taunton for years. He was the one under whose representation the discussion of a national park began. I was privileged to take this over actually from his immediate successor, my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH). It is on behalf of both of us that we present this, and we do want to invoke the memory of Joe Moakley when we go forward with this bill.

The City of Taunton, Massachusetts, is a wonderful place. I am lucky enough to have one of my congressional district offices right in the heart of this area. I have checked and I do not believe I will derive any particular benefit from it, so I do not have to vote "present" on the bill. What I do have is a chance right now to really be a part of this great history.

The Sons of Liberty Flag was first raised here. The Sons of Liberty raised

the flag Liberty Union in 1774. There were buildings that played an important role in the Revolution. They were there in Taunton. Taunton Green is a major place in our history. We would include here the Church Green Historic District. It has the Church Green National Register district.

One of the original settlers, and I think this is particularly relevant to talk about, the modern impact of this, Elizabeth Pole was the first woman we believe to found a community in America, and on the seal of the city of Taunton the phrase "Dux Femina Facti" is included. That translates, I am reliably informed by better Latin scholars than myself, into "the person responsible for this was a woman."

It was in early recognition of what we are still dealing with, namely, that we make a great mistake when we refuse to give individuals the full opportunity to engage their talents, no matter what their gender or whatever other characteristics that they have.

I realize that this does not mean that we get a park immediately. It begins the process of study. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that an objective study of the sort we get from the excellent staff that we have at the National Park Service will document the importance to the history of this country of this area of Taunton and the importance of making it a part of our National Park System. I thank the two gentlemen from New Mexico for their energy and work in this.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a list of some of the salient points of the City of Taunton.

The city of Taunton has a history of equality, patriotism, commerce and innovation that make the areas ideal candidates for inclusion within the National Park System. The area to be included within the study includes the Church Green Historic District, which includes the Church Green National Register District, Main Street, and the Taunton Green National Register District.

Among the original settlers of Taunton, Elizabeth Pole is credited as being the first female to found a community in America. Her legacy is preserved at the Old Colony Historical Society Museum on Church Green. The role that Elizabeth Pole, a woman, played in founding Taunton is an important aspect of our colonial history that should be emphasized as part of the study. The National Park System has devoted many resources to the role of women in our nation and history. However, no other site presently in the National Park System matches the unique circumstances surrounding Ms. Pole and her role as a pioneering colonial female. The phrase "Dux femina facti" which translates into "the person responsible for the deed or accomplishment was a woman" adorns the Seal of the City of Taunton.

A statue of Robert Treat Paine symbolically faces away from the Church Green National Registered District down Main Street towards the Taunton Green National Registered District. With the transformation from English colony towards independent nation, the center of the city moved towards the Taunton Green. Robert Treat Paine, a Taunton resident, was as a signer of the Declaration of Independence. He along with John Adams served as members of the First Continental Congress in 1774. Paine and

Adams' careers were linked again as Paine served as an Associate Prosecutor at the trial of the Boston Massacre. Paine went on to become the first Attorney General of Massachusetts and was a member of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court. While serving in the Continental Congress in October of 1774, Paine was not a party to the historic event that occurred near his home when the Sons of Liberty raised the "Liberty & Union" or "Taunton Flag" on October 21, 1774 over Taunton Green on a 112-foot Liberty Pole. The Liberty and Union flag that still flies over the Taunton Green is recognized as the first flag of open defiance to the crown.

In addition to Robert Treat Paine, Taunton's General David Cobb left his mark on the Revolutionary War. General Cobb served as aide-de-camp to General Washington and was entrusted with the duty of negotiating the evacuation of New York. After the war, General Cobb served as Judge of the Court of Common Pleas for Bristol County and was instrumental in preventing bloodshed in Bristol County during Shay's Rebellion.

As such, the history of the revolutionary war as symbolized by Robert Treat Paine, General Cobb, the Sons of Liberty and the Taunton Green are an important component of the study. The distance down Main Street from Church Green to Taunton Green past the homes of Paine and Cobb and Elizabeth Pole to the Liberty & Union Flag are symbolic of our transformation from colony to independent nation.

The anchor for the U.S.S. *Constitution* was forged in Taunton, as was the anchor for the Civil War's *Monitor*. The Taunton River served as a catalyst for industry and trade. At one point, Taunton was one of the busiest inland ports on the Atlantic coast.

The prime industry throughout Taunton history has been silver. To this day Taunton is known by many as the "Silver City." As with Taunton's political, cultural and religious legacy, the silver industry was born on Main Street, between Church Green and Taunton Green. In 1824, Isaac Babbitt invented and manufactured a new alloy that resulted in pewter ware of a greater quality than ever before manufactured. Two employees, Henry G. Reed and Charles E. Barton went on to found Reed and Barton, one of the oldest privately held companies in the nation and set a standard of excellence known throughout the world. The standards established by Reed & Barton are evident to this day; in 1994 Reed & Barton was selected to produce all of the victory medals for the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the entire staff of the Committee on Resources, especially Dave Watkins, for their work on this bill.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the staff, both majority and minority; and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for submitting this valuable legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1512, 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.

HONORING UNITED STATES AIR FORCE MEMBERS KILLED IN KHOBAR TOWERS BOMBING

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 188) honoring the members of the United States Air Force who were killed in the June 25, 1996, terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers United States military housing compound near Dhahran, Saudi Arabia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 188

Whereas June 25, 2005, marks the ninth anniversary of the terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers United States military housing compound in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, on June 25, 1996;

Whereas 19 members of the United States Air Force were killed in the bombing and 300 other Americans were injured;

Whereas the 19 airmen killed while serving their country were Captain Christopher Adams, Staff Sergeant Daniel Cafourek, Sergeant Millard Campbell, Senior Airman Earl Cartrette, Jr., Technical Sergeant Patrick Fennig, Captain Leland Haun, Master Sergeant Michael Heiser, Staff Sergeant Kevin Johnson, Staff Sergeant Ronald King, Master Sergeant Kendall Kitson, Jr., Airman First Class Christopher B. Lester, Airman First Class Brent Marthaler, Airman First Class Brian McVeigh, Airman First Class Peter Morgera, Technical Sergeant Thanh Nguyen, Airman First Class Joseph Rimkus, Senior Airman Jeremy Taylor, Airman First Class Justin Wood, and Airman First Class Joshua Woody;

Whereas the families of these brave airmen still mourn their loss;

Whereas three months after that terrorist bombing, on September 24, 1996, the House of Representatives agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 200 of the 104th Congress, honoring the victims of that terrorist bombing, and on the fifth anniversary of that bombing, on June 25, 2001, the House of Representatives agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 161 of the 107th Congress, concurred in by the Senate on July 12, 2002, further honoring the victims of that bombing;

Whereas those guilty of the attack have yet to be brought to justice; and

Whereas terrorism remains a constant and ever-present threat around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That on the occasion of the ninth anniversary of the terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers United States military housing compound near Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, the Congress—

(1) recognizes the service and sacrifice of the 19 members of the United States Air Force who died in that attack;

(2) calls upon every American to pause and pay tribute to those brave airmen;

(3) extends its continued sympathies to the families of those who died; and

(4) assures the members of the Armed Forces serving anywhere in the world that their well-being and interests will at all times be given the highest priority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 188.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1600

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of this resolution which reminds us that brave American service men and women willingly risk their lives to defend the United States' interests and the freedom and values that we all enjoy as citizens. Such commitment imposes on the rest of us an obligation, an obligation to ensure that we do not break faith with those who serve, and that we respond to such commitment by resolving to provide the necessary resources for our military forces to successfully carry out the missions assigned to them.

Nine years ago this past Saturday, a truck bomb exploded outside the fence around the Khobar Towers compound in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. The bomb, estimated at more than 3,000 pounds, detonated about 85 feet from a residential housing unit that housed U.S. troops, killing 19 U.S. Air Force servicemen, and wounding hundreds of other Americans.

The force of that explosion destroyed or damaged six high-rise apartment buildings and shattered windows throughout the residential compound. Today, we honor the 19 airmen who gave their lives, the supreme sacrifice, at the hands of terrorists 20 miles away from Dhahran. This Congress joins me in paying tribute to those men who are individually recognized in H. Con. Res. 188.

Mr. Speaker, I thought when I was drafting this resolution that it is ironic that just a month ago we celebrated Memorial Day, where we honored the men and women who have died in the pursuit, and subsequently the defense, of freedom in wars, domestic and foreign, since the founding of our country. One week from today, we will be celebrating the founding of America, our birthday, the Declaration of Independence, upon which our Founding Fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

As we celebrate our Fourth of July or Memorial Day on their designated day, they are a constant reminder of the sacrifice of these men. Twelve of the 19 men killed were based at Eglin Air Force Base in my district and several, along with their families, were constituents. It is my hope that all of America will pause and give thanks to their sacrifice.

This week in Washington, D.C., the parents and loved ones of many of those who sacrificed their lives are the

guests of the FBI, and some of them are here today in the House gallery as we present this resolution. I want to personally pay a word of deepest appreciation to the families of these heroes.

We can never undo the tragedy that they have lived. We can never alleviate the pain that I know is with each of them every day, but I would hope and I know my colleagues join me in this hope, that with the adoption of this resolution, they will take from our action some solace in the fact that we do not forget the contributions and sacrifices of their loved ones. They are much more than men in uniform to them; they were their lives.

Bridget Brooks, mother of Airman First Class Joseph E. Rimkus, is a constituent of mine and works at Eglin even today. I regret that she is not able to be here today, so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the kind of man who was lost, in his mother's own words.

"When Joseph joined the military, he told me that now he could have a flag on his coffin like his grandfather. He knew I worried about his safety and had not allowed him to join when he was 17, but he was so devoted to the military that in his last letter to me, he told me that I was his hero and he was going to make a career out of serving his country. He was so proud to be in the Air Force.

"As for his youth, he became the man of the house when his father abandoned us while serving a tour in Korea, and Joseph was my biggest supporter as I put myself through college. He called me the day he died, and his last words to me were that he loved me.

"He was the tenth firstborn son to be named Joseph. He did not talk about being a father because that was a done deal. Instead, he talked in great length of what kind of grandfather he would be.

"My family may never recover from this loss. Joseph was one of those rare souls who gave all. Before he left, he made sure that I knew he was a Christian and he would be a Catholic all of his life. Can you imagine how that knowledge has comforted me? There is no amount of money to pay for that. Even to this day, people still tell me how wonderful he was.

"In the court case against Iran, one airman, who I did not know, testified that while they were all huddled in mass after the bombing, and they knew the boys who were killed, it was Joseph's presence that he felt. That does not surprise me. Joseph was there for his friends. That is just what he would do."

Mr. Speaker, our action on this resolution is a message to those who died, their family members, our Nation and the rest of the world that we honor the sacrifices of these 19 airmen and the families that they left behind. They served with the highest and best military traditions. No one could have served better or given more.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me and the 47 original cosponsors in support of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 188 introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER). I appreciate all the work he has done on the Committee on Armed Services on which we both serve. He has been a valiant supporter of our men and women in uniform, our veterans, and our national security.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) outlined well the terrible tragedy that occurred at Khobar Towers. This was really brought home to me several years ago when I had the honor of participating in a Purple Heart ceremony at the Little Rock Air Force Base, a C-130 base in my district, one of those things that all of us Members at some point get the honor of doing.

During this ceremony, previous Purple Heart winners were introduced, and several of them were survivors of Khobar Towers, and it really brought home for me that for many of us Americans we hear these names, they sound exotic, they sound foreign, and yet for the families that are here with us today and the families of these men and women who died and were wounded, those names, those places, mean very much to them and their family.

We are also reminded by the tragedy at Khobar Towers, the attack on Khobar Towers, of the other sacrifices that our men and women in uniform have made at places that are not all that well known to many Americans.

We recall the attack on Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, at the U.S. military headquarters, November 13, 1995, in which we lost five servicemembers.

Then 2 years following the Khobar Towers attack, we had the attack against two of our embassies on August 7, 1998, one in Nairobi, Kenya, and the other in Tanzania. The two truck bombs killed 11 Americans, including three servicemembers, and hundreds of Kenyans and nearly a dozen Tanzanians.

Then we had the attack October 12, 2000, on the USS *Cole* and finally the attacks on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania.

So this is a very important reminder today of the sacrifice that our men and women in uniform are called on to make, but also the sacrifice that their family and friends and all of us make when we lose such fine, fine Americans.

Once again, I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) for introducing this resolution, and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 25th, marked 9 years since the terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers, the U.S. military housing facility in Saudi Arabia where 19 American servicemen were killed and hundreds wounded.

Four years ago, on June 21st, 2001, the United States indicted some of those who were responsible for those murders. While a few of these individuals have been identified, not one has been brought to trial yet. However long it takes, our country must continue to pursue and bring to justice all of those indicted and all those responsible for this murderous, terrorist act against our servicemen and our country. We must not rest until this has been accomplished.

Florida and our Nation lost too many innocent victims for this matter to be brushed aside.

Master Sergeant Michael G. Heiser, of Palm Coast, and Airman First Class Brian W. McVeigh, of DeBary, are 2 of the 19 heroes who left behind loved ones and families in my Congressional District. Their young lives were cut short when they made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. The United States must never rest until those responsible for these deaths are brought to justice.

We know that these surviving relatives and all the others who lost their loved ones continue to feel the pain of great loss. We know that they cannot rest—until justice prevails.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 608 which recognizes the 9th anniversary of the terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers United States military housing compound near Dhahran, Saudi Arabia.

On the evening of June 25th, 1996, a truck bomb exploded in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. This terrorist attack killed 19 servicemen of the U.S. Air Force and wounded 300 other Americans. The bomb tore away an entire wall of a high-rise apartment building, part of the Khobar Towers complex housing U.S. Air Force men and women assigned to nearby Dhahran Air Base.

Although their mission was to patrol the skies of southern Iraq and prevent Iraqi planes from threatening the peace of the Middle East, this terrorist attack was a painful demonstration and reminder of the risks Americans in uniform are faced with every day around the world.

Therefore, it is our duty to recognize the service and sacrifice of these men and women and to extend that duty upon our fellow Americans. We ask that all Americans pause and pay tribute to those 19 brave airmen and airwomen who have given their lives so that others throughout the world may live in a free and democratic society. Together, as Americans, we offer our continued sympathies to the families affected by this tragedy. We know that because their loved ones could never be replaced; we will never forget the values they so valiantly died for, nor will we stop until those who are responsible for such a heinous act are brought to justice. Furthermore, it is our responsibility to assure our servicemen and women that wherever in the world they are—we, the Members of Congress, will make them, the defenders of liberty and justice, our highest priority.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, again, I have no more speakers and I would suffice to say that we urge passage of this resolution and the fact that these nomads will forever be protecting us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 188.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE MASSACRE AT SREBRENICA IN JULY 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 199) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July 1995, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 199

Whereas in July 1995 thousands of men and boys who had sought safety in the United Nations-designated "safe area" of Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the protection of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) were massacred by Serb forces operating in that country;

Whereas beginning in April 1992, aggression and ethnic cleansing perpetrated by Bosnian Serb forces, while taking control of the surrounding territory, resulted in a massive influx of Bosniaks seeking protection in Srebrenica and its environs, which the United Nations Security Council designated a "safe area" in Resolution 819 on April 16, 1993;

Whereas the UNPROFOR presence in Srebrenica consisted of a Dutch peacekeeping battalion, with representatives of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the humanitarian medical aid agency Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors Without Borders) helping to provide humanitarian relief to the displaced population living in conditions of massive overcrowding, destitution, and disease;

Whereas Bosnian Serb forces blockaded the enclave early in 1995, depriving the entire population of humanitarian aid and outside communication and contact, and effectively reducing the ability of the Dutch peacekeeping battalion to deter aggression or otherwise respond effectively to a deteriorating situation;

Whereas beginning on July 6, 1995, Bosnian Serb forces attacked UNPROFOR outposts, seized control of the isolated enclave, held captured Dutch soldiers hostage and, after skirmishes with local defenders, ultimately took control of the town of Srebrenica on July 11, 1995;

Whereas an estimated one-third of the population of Srebrenica, including a relatively small number of soldiers, made a desperate attempt to pass through the lines of Bosnian Serb forces to the relative safety of Bosnian-held territory, but many were killed by patrols and ambushes;

Whereas the remaining population sought protection with the Dutch peacekeeping battalion at its headquarters in the village of Potocari north of Srebrenica but many of these individuals were randomly seized by Bosnian Serb forces to be beaten, raped, or executed;

Whereas Bosnian Serb forces deported women, children, and the elderly in buses,

held Bosniak males over 16 years of age at collection points and sites in northeastern Bosnia and Herzegovina under their control, and then summarily executed and buried the captives in mass graves;

Whereas approximately 20 percent of Srebrenica's total population at the time—at least 7,000 and perhaps thousands more—was either executed or killed;

Whereas the United Nations and its member states have largely acknowledged their failure to take actions and decisions that could have deterred the assault on Srebrenica and prevented the subsequent massacre;

Whereas Bosnian Serb forces, hoping to conceal evidence of the massacre at Srebrenica, subsequently moved corpses from initial mass grave sites to many secondary sites scattered throughout parts of northeastern Bosnia and Herzegovina under their control;

Whereas the massacre at Srebrenica was among the worst of many horrible atrocities to occur in the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina from April 1992 to November 1995, during which the policies of aggression and ethnic cleansing pursued by Bosnian Serb forces with the direct support of the Serbian regime of Slobodan Milosevic and its followers ultimately led to the displacement of more than 2,000,000 people, an estimated 200,000 killed, tens of thousands raped or otherwise tortured and abused, and the innocent civilians of Sarajevo and other urban centers repeatedly subjected to shelling and sniper attacks;

Whereas Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (done at Paris on December 9, 1948, and entered into force with respect to the United States on February 23, 1989) defines genocide as "any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group";

Whereas on May 25, 1993, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 827 establishing the world's first international war crimes tribunal, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), based in The Hague, the Netherlands, and charging the ICTY with responsibility for investigating and prosecuting individuals suspected of committing war crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity and grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions on the territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991;

Whereas nineteen individuals at various levels of responsibility have been indicted, and in some cases convicted, for grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, violations of the laws or customs of war, crimes against humanity, genocide, and complicity in genocide associated with the massacre at Srebrenica, three of whom, most notably Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, remain at large; and

Whereas the international community, including the United States, has continued to provide personnel and resources, including through direct military intervention, to prevent further aggression and ethnic cleansing, to negotiate the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (initiated in Dayton, Ohio, on November 21, 1995, and signed in Paris on December 14, 1995), and to help ensure its fullest implementation, including cooperation with the

International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the thousands of innocent people executed at Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina in July 1995, along with all individuals who were victimized during the conflict and genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995, should be solemnly remembered and honored;

(2) the policies of aggression and ethnic cleansing as implemented by Serb forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995 meet the terms defining the crime of genocide in Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide;

(3) foreign nationals, including United States citizens, who have risked and in some cases lost their lives in Bosnia and Herzegovina while working toward peace should be solemnly remembered and honored;

(4) the United Nations and its member states should accept their share of responsibility for allowing the Srebrenica massacre and genocide to occur in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995 by failing to take sufficient, decisive, and timely action, and the United Nations and its member states should constantly seek to ensure that this failure is not repeated in future crises and conflicts;

(5) it is in the national interest of the United States that those individuals who are responsible for war crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity, and grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, should be held accountable for their actions;

(6) all persons indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) should be apprehended and transferred to The Hague without further delay, and all countries should meet their obligations to cooperate fully with the ICTY at all times; and

(7) the United States should continue to support the independence and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina, peace and stability in southeastern Europe as a whole, and the right of all people living in the region, regardless of national, racial, ethnic or religious background, to return to their homes and enjoy the benefits of democratic institutions, the rule of law, and economic opportunity, as well as to know the fate of missing relatives and friends.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 199, the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in consideration of H. Res. 199, today the House of Representatives brings honor to the men, women

and children of Srebrenica in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In a little over 2 weeks, it will have been 10 years since the massacre of approximately 8,000 men and boys from that small town.

Mr. Speaker, renewed attention is focused on this event in light of the recently released video showing members of the Serb paramilitary group, the Scorpions, executing young Bosniak men from Srebrenica. Many Members of this House saw the news coverage of this video, including an interview of a woman who never knew what actually happened to her young son at Srebrenica in July 1995 until she saw the footage on television that he was among those executed. In passing this resolution, we are expressing solidarity with the thousands of women like her, and others, who a decade ago witnessed something so evil that it defies comprehension.

There are four basic motivations, Mr. Speaker, for passing this resolution today. First, there are those who, despite being indicted for genocide, continue to evade justice. Second, some continue to deny that the atrocity even occurred or they contend it was something other than genocide. Third, the international community must learn from its failure to stop slaughter from taking place in a declared safe area, and let us all remember Srebrenica was called a safe haven, especially as we look at similar situations around the globe. Finally, 10 years after Srebrenica, Srebrenica survivors, including many who came to this country as refugees and are now American citizens, still feel the excruciating pain of losing so many of their innocent loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that the resolution notes the direct support that came from the Serbian regime of Slobodan Milosevic and its followers. This is no small circle of Milosevic henchmen, as some in Belgrade have claimed. We are referring to an entire regime, albeit an undemocratic one, and not just a few individuals in positions of authority. Moreover, followers of the regime existed in the military, the police and other state institutions, and when it appeared that he was succeeding in a conflict against neighboring peoples, Milosevic actually garnered popular support.

Milosevic has rightfully been in The Hague, as we all know, Mr. Speaker, since 2001, but why have others like Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic remained at large? Why until recently, if not to today, have they benefited from the protection not only from criminal networks but perhaps by segments of the military and the police? To me, that shows broader involvement than has been alleged.

The reference to the followers of the Milosevic regime clearly indicates that we are not referring to those in Serbia, including those in positions of authority today, who had no role in what was happening when they put themselves at risk in opposing Milosevic and his policies in the 1990s.

I would just point out to my colleagues that on the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, which I chaired for several years through the 1990s, we did hold hearings, and many of us made trips to the former Yugoslavia.

In one of those hearings, we heard from Hasan Nuhapovic, a former translator of the U.N. peacekeeping forces in Srebrenica. Hasan was one of those who lost his family and I would just quote very briefly from that testimony that he gave to our committee. He said, "My family, just like thousands of others, was simply handed over to the Serbs in the village of Potocari, 6 kilometers north of Srebrenica on 13 July 1995. They have never been seen since. The Dutch peacekeepers threw my family out of the camp right in front of my eyes. The people, especially the men and boys who were inside the camp, didn't want to leave the relative safety of it."

It goes on to say, "The Dutch refused to tell the refugees inside the camp what was going on with the people outside." He says, "They lied, saying that everything was all right and that the people from inside the camp were also going to be evacuated to the federation territory. The Dutch lied to the refugees inside the camp," he goes on. "The Dutch knew that the men and boys outside the camp were being separated from the women and children and that some of them were even killed right on the spot. They watched the Serbs take away and kill civilians. They did nothing to prevent it."

Mr. Speaker, this resolution remembers those 7- to 8,000 men and boys who were slaughtered in Srebrenica, and it says in a collective voice of the House of Representatives, Democrats and Republicans alike, that we care, we care deeply. We are sorrowful for those who lost their lives, and hopefully never again.

I will insert a Chronicle of Genocide in the RECORD at this point.

CHRONICLE OF GENOCIDE PROLOGUE

The town of Srebrenica is located in eastern Bosnia's Drina River Valley, about 15 kilometers from the Serbian border. In 1991, the town was home to 37,000 inhabitants, including roughly 27,000 Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks) and 9,000 Serbs. Prior to the outbreak of Yugoslavia's civil war, members of Srebrenica's different ethnic groups lived together for decades without major conflict.

After the end of the Cold War, Srebrenica had its first encounter with conflict in April 1992 when Serb paramilitary forces gained control of the city for several weeks. One month later, Srebrenica was recaptured by Bosnian Muslim fighters from the Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina. By September, Bosnian Muslim forces had succeeded in uniting Srebrenica with the neighboring town of Zepa and increasing the size of the territory under their control to 900 square kilometers. However, the enclave remained isolated from the main Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina and strategically vulnerable to advancing Serb forces.

In January 1993, Bosnian Serb troops (which logistically and financially were not

entirely independent from and were supported by Serbian military and police forces) from the self-proclaimed Republika Srpska launched an offensive to retake the Muslim-controlled areas around Srebrenica. After months of fighting, the villages of Konjević Polje and Cerska were captured, severing the connection between Srebrenica and Zepa and reducing the size of the Srebrenica enclave to 150 square kilometers. Bosnians from neighboring areas streamed into the town of Srebrenica, increasing the population to as many as 60,000 people.

When the Commander of the U.N. Protection Force (UNPROFOR), French General Philippe Morillon, visited Srebrenica in March 1993, he discovered an overcrowded city beset by siege conditions. The Bosnian Serb troops had destroyed the town's water supply and the population was running short on food, medicine, and other necessities. Before his departure, General Morillon promised residents that Srebrenica was under U.N. protection and that he would never abandon the city's inhabitants.

On April 16, 1993, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution declaring that "all parties and others treat Srebrenica and its surroundings as a 'safe area' that should be free from armed attack or any other hostile act."

The first group of UNPROFOR soldiers arrived in Srebrenica on April 18, 1993 and fresh troops were rotated into the city every six months after that. In January 1995, a battalion from the Netherlands rotated into the enclave. By this time, few supply convoys were reaching the city. In March and April, the Dutch soldiers defending the city observed a build-up of Bosnian Serb troops in the surrounding area. The Drina Corps of the Army of the Republika Srpska (VRS) was preparing for a major attack on Srebrenica.

CHRONOLOGY OF GENOCIDE

March 1995—Radovan Karadžić, President of the self-proclaimed Republika Srpska, issues a directive to the Bosnian Serb Army ordering the VRS to "complete the physical separation of Srebrenica from Žepa as soon as possible" and block aid convoys on their way to Srebrenica.

July 2, 1995—Republika Srpska Army General Milenko Živanović signs two orders outlining plans for attacking the enclave and issues the order to various units of the Drina Corps to prepare for combat. The operation is code-named "Krivaja 95."

July 6, 1995—Bosnian Serb forces launch their attack on Srebrenica. The Commander of the city's Dutch battalion, Colonel Karremans, contacts the U.N. General Staff in Sarajevo requesting NATO air support after refugee camps and U.N. monitoring posts are shelled.

July 9, 1995—Forces from the VRS Drina Corps surround the town of Srebrenica. President Karadžić issues a new order in which he approves the capture of Srebrenica.

July 10, 1995—The Bosnian Serbs shell Srebrenica and residents flee toward the U.N. base at Potočari.

Colonel Karremans makes an urgent request for NATO air support when Bosnian Serb forces shell his soldiers' positions. The Commander of the U.N. forces, French General Bernard Janvier, initially rejects the request, but ultimately approves the use of air strikes. In the meantime, the VRS forces stop attacking U.N. soldiers and the air attacks are postponed.

Colonel Karremans assures Bosnian Muslims that NATO airplanes will execute a major attack on Bosnian Serb troops if VRS forces are not withdrawn from the Protection Zone by 6:00 a.m. the next morning.

July 11, 1995—Bosnian Serb forces conduct extensive shelling of Srebrenica.

9:00 a.m.: Colonel Karremans is notified that his request for air support was not sub-

mitted on the correct form. At 10:30 a.m., the re-issued request reaches General Janvier. However, the NATO warplanes that have been circling Srebrenica since 6:00 a.m. are low on fuel and have to return to their base in Italy.

2:30 p.m.: NATO planes bomb Republika Srpska army tanks. The Bosnian Serb forces threaten to kill captured Dutch soldiers and shell the U.N. base in Potočari. Plans for further NATO air strikes are abandoned.

General Ratko Mladić, together with General Krstić (then Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff of the Drina Corps), General Živanović (then Commander of the Drina Corps) and other VRS officers enter Srebrenica.

8:00 p.m.: Representatives of the Bosnian Serb forces meet UNPROFOR leaders at the Hotel Fontana in the neighboring city of Bratunac. General Ratko Mladić chairs the meeting, and the two sides discuss the mounting refugee crisis.

Around 10:00 p.m.: In Srebrenica, military leaders of the Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina and local civilians decide to form a column of men—about two thirds of which were Bosnian Muslim civilians—with the goal of escaping from Srebrenica through the mountains toward Tuzla. The column starts moving north around midnight.

11:00 p.m.: A second meeting at the Hotel Fontana results in a plan to transport Bosnian Muslim civilians out of the enclave.

July 12, 1995.—VRS General Milenko Živanović signs an order directing the Drina Corps to secure all buses and mini-buses belonging to the VRS. The Republika Srpska Defense Ministry sends three orders to its local secretariats directing them to procure buses and to send them to Bratunac.

10:00 a.m.: A third and final meeting is held at the Hotel Fontana to discuss the fate of the Srebrenica Muslims. Ratko Mladić issues an order to transport Bosnian Muslim refugees out of Potočari, stating that it is the only way to guarantee their survival. He also informs those present that all males between the ages of 16 and 70—essentially all military-aged men, (which however did not prevent boys of much younger age as well as much older men to be included in this group) must be separated from the others and screened to prevent the escape of possible "war criminals."

1:00 p.m.: Dozens of buses arrive in Potočari. Women, children, and the elderly are driven by bus from Potočari toward Tuzla, which is under the control of the Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Military-aged men are systematically separated out and detained in Potočari before being transferred to Bratunac.

Bosnian Serbs forces, including some military and municipal police, take positions along the Bratunac-Milići road with the intention of intercepting the column. Equipped with heavy armor and artillery, the Bosnian Serb forces open fire on the column as it crosses the road between Konjević Polja and Nova Kasaba. Many survivors of the attack are taken prisoner.

The U.N. Security Council declares that the international community is "[g]ravelly concerned at the deterioration in the situation in and around the safe area of Srebrenica, Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and at the plight of the civilian population there."

July 13, 1995.—The evacuation of women, children, and the elderly continues. Military-aged men are separated from the refugees and transferred to Bratunac.

As many as 6,000 men from the column headed from Srebrenica to Tuzla are captured and detained by Bosnian Serb forces. Several thousand of them are brought to a field close to Sandići and to the soccer stadium in Nova Kasaba.

Bosnian Serbs begin the mass execution of Muslim detainees at sites near the Jadar River, the Cerska valley, and a warehouse in Kravica.

8:00 p.m.: The removal of the Bosnian Muslim population from Potočari is completed.

July 13-14, 1995.—Executions continue in Tišća.

July 14, 1995.—Executions continue in Orahovac.

July 14-15, 1995.—Executions continue at the Petkovići Dam.

July 16, 1995.—Executions continue at Branjevo Military Farm and the Pilića Cultural Center.

The front of the decimated column of Bosnian Muslims succeeds in reaching territory controlled by the Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

July 17-18, 1995.—Executions continue at Kozluk and other locations.

September-October 1995—The Bosnian Serb forces engage in a concerted effort to conceal the mass killings by exhuming bodies from mass graves, turning over the ground, and reburying human remains in smaller, remote gravesites.

EPILOGUE

Evidence presented at The Hague in the trial of Bosnian Serbs accused of war crimes established that during the month of July 1995, Bosnian Serb forces executed between seven and eight thousand Bosnian men and boys. The International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) found "beyond any reasonable doubt that a crime of genocide was committed in Srebrenica".

Immediately after the massacre, Republika Srpska President Radovan Karadžić and VRS Chief Ratko Mladić, the highest political and military leaders of the Bosnian Serbs, were indicted by the Tribunal for their roles in the Srebrenica genocide. To date, they have successfully avoided arrest. The crimes in Srebrenica are also included in the indictment against former Yugoslav leader Slobodan Milošević.

Radislav Krstić and Vidoje Blagojević, high ranking officers of the Bosnian Serb Army, have been convicted of complicity in genocide. Dragan Jokić, Deputy Commander of the Zvornik Brigade, has been convicted of crimes against humanity. General Radislav Krstić, deputy commander of the VRS Drina Corps, has been convicted of genocide. Officers Momir Nikolić and Dragan Obrenović, and the soldier Dražen Erdemović, have admitted their guilt and been convicted of crimes against humanity. Those convicted in connection with the genocide have received prison sentences ranging from five to 35 years. Dražen Erdemović, sentenced to five years in prison for the murder of at least 75 men from Srebrenica, has already been released.

Ljubiša Beara, Head of Security at the General Headquarters of the Bosnian Serb Army, has been charged with genocide and is awaiting trial.

Army and police officers Drago Nikolić, Ljubomir Borvčanin, Vinko Pandurević, and Vujadin Popović, also indicted for genocide, have surrendered to the Tribunal in The Hague and are awaiting trial. Radivoje Miletić and Milan Gvero, Generals of the Bosnian Serb Army, have surrendered to the Tribunal and are charged with expelling Bosnian Muslims from Srebrenica. General Zdravko Tolimir, who is accused of the same crimes, is still at large.

The Appeals Chamber of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia used strong language to describe the Srebrenica genocide during the trial of General Radislav Krstić: "By seeking to eliminate a part of the Bosnian Muslims, the Bosnian Serb forces committed genocide. They

targeted for extinction the forty thousand Bosnian Muslims living in Srebrenica, a group which was emblematic of the Bosnian Muslims in general. They stripped all the male Muslim prisoners, military and civilian, elderly and young, of their personal belongings and identification, and deliberately and methodically killed them solely on the basis of their identity. The Bosnian Serb forces were aware, when they embarked on this genocidal venture, that the harm they caused would continue to plague the Bosnian Muslims. The Appeals Chamber states unequivocally that the law condemns, in appropriate terms, the deep and lasting injury inflicted, and calls the massacre at Srebrenica by its proper name: genocide. Those responsible will bear this stigma, and it will serve as a warning to those who may in future contemplate the commission of such a heinous act."

To date, several thousand bodies and parts of bodies from victims of the genocide have been exhumed from mass graves. So far, 1,327 of these bodies have been identified and buried in the Memorial Centre in Potočari near Srebrenica.

Of the 27,000 Bosnian Muslims who inhabited Srebrenica before the war, only a few hundred have returned to live in the city.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my good friend and distinguished colleague, an indefatigable fighter for human rights across the globe, for introducing this resolution.

It is vitally important that we recall the brutal and tragic events that took place at Srebrenica in July of 1995, and seek justice as long as those responsible are still at large.

Mr. Speaker, in early July 1995, Bosnian Serb forces laid siege to the town of Srebrenica in eastern Bosnia where tens of thousands of Muslim civilians had taken refuge from earlier Serb offenses in the northeast.

□ 1615

The United Nations attempted to extend protection to the area, and some 600 lightly armed Dutch troops were dispatched there to establish a United Nations presence.

Serbian troops stepped up shelling the town, and thousands of Muslim refugees fled ahead of the advancing Serb forces. Serb soldiers then attacked the Dutch U.N. troops and took 30 of them hostage. The Dutch commander requested NATO air strikes against the Serbian troops, but these were quickly stopped after the Serbian commander threatened to kill the Dutch captives.

The Serbs occupied the area and began separating the civilians, men to one side, women and children to the other. Women and children were transported, terrified, to Muslim territory; but all the males between the ages of 12 and 77 were held for what the Serbs cynically termed interrogation for suspected war crimes. Over the next 5 days, Bosnian Serb soldiers systematically killed over 7,000 unarmed men

and boys in the fields, schools, and warehouses around Srebrenica.

Mr. Speaker, this was the worst massacre in the bloody Bosnian war, and it was ethnic cleansing of the most horrible sort. It is important that we note not only that 10 years have passed since that horrendous crime, but what is more, that those who are guilty of this mind-boggling atrocity have not been brought to justice.

The Bosnian Serb general who commanded Serbian forces at Srebrenica, Ratko Mladic, has been indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal, but he remains at large in Serbian-controlled areas of Bosnia or in Serbia itself. Another Bosnian Serb indicted by the tribunal who also bears responsibility for the atrocities is also free in Bosnia or in Serbia. He is Radovan Karadzic, the former leader of the self-styled Republika Srpska, or the Serb-controlled territories in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, it is an outrage that such war criminals continue to be sheltered and protected by Serbian officials in Bosnia and in Serbia. As we solemnly mark the passage of a decade since this horrific massacre at Srebrenica, it is essential that we recommit ourselves to seek justice for the victims, well-deserved punishment for the perpetrators, and commit ourselves to take all possible action to assure that such atrocities do not again occur in Bosnia or in Rwanda or in Darfur, or indeed any place on this small planet.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to do so.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As we consider this resolution, I want to thank those who have worked hard to craft the text that meets various concerns and reflects the realities of Srebrenica as we know them. In particular, I want to thank the Congress of North American Bosniaks and its members for stressing the need for the United States Congress to address this issue at this time, not only for their sake but for the sake of humanity.

I also want to thank the Coalition for International Justice for providing us with background on who was indicted for crimes relating to Srebrenica by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia located at the Hague, as well as their current status.

Finally, I want to thank the chairman of the International Relations Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and especially the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who is one of the cosponsors of this resolution and a great friend of human rights; and also for our friends on the Subcommittee on Europe and Emerging Threats, to which it was also referred, for working with us on helping to craft this regulation. And to the

39 cosponsors, including the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), who is the ranking member on the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which I chair in the House.

Let me say, finally, Mr. Speaker, that Article 2 of the Genocide Convention, quoted in the text of this resolution, defines genocide as, "Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, such as: A, killing members of the group; B, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; C, deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; E, forcibly transferring children of the group to another group."

Genocide is defined as the commission of acts with that intention, whether or not the acts succeed or are completed. The word "prevention" is also in the title of the Genocide Convention. While not specifying what to be done or obligating countries to do anything specific, clearly genocides must be defined as something taking place and not as something necessarily accomplished. If accomplished, it is too late to prevent it.

When I look at this definition, Mr. Speaker, and then hear what happened in Srebrenica 10 years ago, I, and I know others, can only agree with the Appeals Chamber at the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, which confirmed in April 2004 that the crime of summarily executing almost 8,000 men and boys at Srebrenica alone meets the legal definition of genocide.

The Appeals Chamber, in which an American is the presiding judge, concluded in its decision appealing a conviction that "the law must not shy away from referring to the crime committed by its proper name. The Appeals Chamber states unequivocally that the law condemns, in appropriate terms, the deep and lasting injury inflicted and calls the massacre," and I continue this quote, "at Srebrenica by its proper name: genocide. Those responsible will bear the stigma, and it will serve as a warning to those who may in the future contemplate the commission of such a heinous act."

The court got it right, Mr. Speaker. This resolution gets it right.

And, finally, I just want to thank the gentleman to my left, Bob Hand, who has been with the Commission on Security and Cooperation now since 1983 and who first came as an intern, for his diligence in crafting major portions of this legislation. I want to thank him for his work and his attention to detail. He is also the staff specialist for the commission on all the areas of the former Yugoslavia and Albania, and I am deeply grateful for his work as well.

And Dan Freeman, our expert parliamentarian, to my rear, I want to thank him for his work as well.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and urge my colleague to vote for its passage.

Article 2 of the Genocide Convention, quoted in the text of this resolution, defines genocide as “any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, such as: (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group”. Genocide is defined as the commission of acts with that intention whether or not the acts succeed or are completed. The word “prevention” is also in the title of the Genocide Convention. While not specifying what could be done or obligating countries to do any specific thing, clearly genocide must be defined as something taking place and not as something necessarily accomplished. If accomplished, it is too late to prevent it.

When I look at this definition and then hear what happened in Srebrenica 10 years ago, I can only agree with the Appeals Chamber at the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, which confirmed in April 2004 that the crime of summarily executing almost 8,000 men and boys at Srebrenica alone meets the legal definition of genocide. The Appeals Chamber, in which an American is the presiding judge, concluded in a decision appealing a conviction that “the law must not shy away from referring to the crime committed by its proper name The Appeals Chamber states unequivocally that the law condemns, in appropriate terms, the deep and lasting injury inflicted, and calls the massacre at Srebrenica by its proper name: genocide. Those responsible will bear this stigma, and it will serve as a warning to those who may in the future contemplate the commission of such a heinous act.”

Twenty-three people have been indicted for genocide by the Hague. Regardless of individual guilt or innocence, the acceptance of the legitimacy of the charges is a recognition that genocide occurred. Indeed, if it is accepted that Srebrenica itself was genocide, then we must consider the 20–30,000 non-Serbs killed in the Prijedor region, which gets less attention mostly because it took place over a 6-month period rather than a week, especially given that the crime was committed perhaps by some of the same people and certainly under the same command. Similarly, we must consider the more than 10,000 killed and 50,000 wounded by the sniper fire and an average of over 300 shells per day fired into the city Sarajevo in the more than 3-year siege of that city—a crime again committed by perhaps some of the same people and certainly under the same command. We must consider what happened in Foca and Brcko. When we add all these and other places together, we must conclude that genocide occurred.

This, of course, does not mean that Serbs were not also victimized, nor does it mean that all Serbs are somehow guilty for what has been done in their name. But today, it is entirely appropriate that we focus on what happened in Srebrenica, and to put Srebrenica in the context of the larger Bosnian conflict. It is also an important time to urge the authorities in Belgrade, who have made considerable progress this year, to finally complete their cooperation with the tribunal. Serbia must trans-

fer Ratko Mladic and other at-large indictees to the Hague immediately, so that this issue no longer holds Serbia back from taking on a more prominent role in Europe.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this important resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this important Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July 1995.

This summer is the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, which established principles to be followed by participating states that include respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Helsinki Final Act and the conference it established have since been institutionalized in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, or OSCE. This multilateral diplomatic effort was taken seriously by both Republican and Democratic Administrations over the years, and it helped tremendously in ending the Cold War division of Europe and in giving millions upon millions of people freedom from communist repression.

Those of us who have had the privilege to serve on the U.S. Helsinki Commission can recall the powerful impact the Helsinki Final Act had, as well as the hard work and sacrifice that helped bring its ideals so much closer to reality. Some of us, indeed, will be commemorating the OSCE's achievements in about 1 week when the Organization's Parliamentary Assembly convenes here in Washington.

One cannot honestly and credibly assess the accomplishments of the Helsinki Final Act, however, without taking note of the greatest single violation of its provisions in those three decades. Srebrenica undoubtedly is that single greatest violation. Eight thousand men and boys, maybe more, were executed and thrown into mass graves. Their bodies continue to be exhumed and identified to this day. The surviving victims continue to feel the pain from the loss of their loved ones.

This tragedy is compounded by the truly horrifying fact that it could have been prevented. Indeed, it should have been prevented. For 2 years, Srebrenica was designated by the United Nations as a “safe area.” Attacks upon it were not to be tolerated. It was protected by U.N. peacekeepers. Yet, for months Serb forces prevented humanitarian convoys from entering Srebrenica; even the Dutch peacekeeping contingent was rendered ineffective by its isolation. When the Serb forces attacked, the air strikes necessary to repel them never came. The United Nations and its member states were not at all helpless, but they were indecisive and feckless in the face of clear aggression.

Many of us in the Congress at the time appealed for decisive action. Even after documenting the policy of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia since 1992, we admittedly did not know the scale and horrific nature of the acts to follow, but we certainly knew something evil was about to occur in Srebrenica. And it did occur, due to the simple fact that it was allowed to occur.

We can, if we choose, find some silver linings in that experience. For the first time since World War II, individuals have been held to account for their crimes, including genocide, before an international tribunal. NATO operated “out of area,” setting a stage for broadening the scope of the alliance to support the

interests of its members in Afghanistan and elsewhere. Within months of Srebrenica, the international community under U.S. leadership at least restored a peace to Bosnia that, despite problems, has lasted to this day.

It is, however, with deep regret that such advances in international relations came at such a heavy price to so many innocent people. It is a price which Srebrenica survivors continue to pay as Ratko Mladic and Radovan Karadzic remain at large and as so many people continue to deny the massacre even took place. The least that the international community can do to ease their pain is to ensure that the realities of Srebrenica are acknowledged as genocide, to vow that they never happen again, and this time to mean it.

I therefore call upon my colleague to support this important resolution.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Congressional Serbian Caucus, and a long-time champion of human rights, I was pleased to work with Chairman SMITH to bring this important resolution to the House Floor; and I thank the Chairman and his staff, particularly Bob Hand, for their hard work. Nevertheless, despite all of our efforts, at the end of the day I still have a few small concerns over the resolution's wording.

Let me be perfectly clear though. The Srebrenica Massacre was a horrible event in world history that should never have occurred, should never be condoned, and should never be accepted by the international community. It was a truly horrifying experience and scarring for all those involved, from those directly participating in the slaughter, to those who sat idly by while the killing took place. Now, almost 10 years later, it is only appropriate for this House to pause and remember the victims of this horrendous crime and pledge anew that such atrocities will never happen again.

But, this Resolution misses the mark by singling out only one group for condemnation. This House, as well as the leaders of the Balkans, should speak unequivocally and with one voice to condemn all the atrocities that occurred during the Balkan Wars of the 1990s on all sides; whether committed by Serb, Croat or Bosnian. Furthermore, this House should encourage all parties in the region to renew their commitments to fully comply with all international treaties and regulations, such as the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, by handing over all outstanding war criminals. For only then can the region, as a whole, move forward to a more peaceful, stable, and democratic Trans-Atlantic future, with eventual membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union.

Once again, I commend my colleague, Chairman SMITH for bringing this issue before the House. I wish we had been able to strike an understanding on some of the broader issues but I still believe that House Resolution 199 has great merit and I vote “aye.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 199, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of

those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

—————

URGING ALBANIA TO ENSURE ELECTIONS TO BE HELD ON JULY 3, 2005, ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 155) urging the Government of the Republic of Albania to ensure that the parliamentary elections to be held on July 3, 2005, are conducted in accordance with international standards for free and fair elections.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 155

Whereas the United States maintains strong and friendly relations with the Republic of Albania and appreciates the ongoing support of the people of Albania;

Whereas the President of Albania has called for elections to Albania's parliament, known as the People's Assembly, to be held on July 3, 2005;

Whereas Albania is one of 55 participating States in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), all of which have adopted the 1990 Copenhagen Document containing specific commitments relating to the conduct of elections;

Whereas these commitments, which encourage transparency, balance, and impartiality in an election process, have become the standard by which observers determine whether elections have been conducted freely and fairly;

Whereas, though improvements over time have been noted, the five multiparty parliamentary elections held in Albania between 1991 and 2001, as well as elections for local offices held between and after those years, fell short of the standards in the Copenhagen Document to varying degrees, according to OSCE and other observers;

Whereas with OSCE and other international assistance, the Government of Albania has improved the country's electoral and legal framework and enhanced the capacity to conduct free and fair elections;

Whereas subsequent to the calling of elections, Albania's political parties have accepted a code of conduct regarding their campaign activities, undertaking to act in accordance with the law, to refrain from inciting violence or hatred in the election campaign, and to be transparent in disclosing campaign funding; and

Whereas meeting the standards in the Copenhagen Document for free and fair elections is absolutely essential to Albania's desired integration into European and Euro-Atlantic institutions, including full membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), as well as to Albania's progress in addressing official corruption and combating organized crime: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) welcomes the opportunity for the Republic of Albania to demonstrate its willingness and preparedness to take the next steps in European and Euro-Atlantic integration by holding parliamentary elections on July 3, 2005, that meet the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) standards for free and fair elections as defined in the 1990 Copenhagen Document;

(2) firmly believes that the citizens of Albania, like all people, should be able to choose their own representatives in parliament and government in free and fair elections, and to hold these representatives accountable through elections at reasonable intervals;

(3) supports commitments by Albanian political parties to adhere to a basic code of conduct for campaigning and urges such parties and all election officials in Albania to adhere to laws relating to the elections, and to conduct their activities in an impartial and transparent manner, by allowing international and domestic observers to have unobstructed access to all aspects of the election process, including public campaign events, candidates, news media, voting, and post-election tabulation of results and processing of election challenges and complaints;

(4) supports assistance by the United States to help the people of Albania establish a fully free and open democratic system, a prosperous free market economy, and its rightful place in European and Euro-Atlantic institutions, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); and

(5) encourages the President to communicate to the Government of Albania, to all political parties and candidates, and to the people of Albania the high importance attached by the Government of the United States to this parliamentary election as a central factor in determining the future relationship between the United States and Albania.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 14 years ago, Albania was just emerging from decades of brutal isolation from Europe when they held their first genuinely contested elections in 1991. Not surprisingly, they fell short of the standards for free and fair elections as defined by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, or OSCE, as did subsequent elections for parliament and local government. The United States and other friends of Albania, however, remained engaged with the Albanian people throughout their turbulent transition.

Today, Albania is at the point where the country can actually hold free and fair elections, something the citizens of that country deeply deserve. Parliamentary elections have been scheduled, as Members of this House know, for July 3, and the campaign period is well underway. Staff in the U.S. Helsinki Commission, which I co-chair, will be serving on the international observation mission. Albania has come far in reforming its election process and through these elections has the opportunity to jump a major hurdle not

only towards completion of its transition to democracy, but in preparing for integration into European and Euro-Atlantic institutions.

There is good reason to remain concerned, however, that the elections will fall short of international standards. The good things that have been adopted, such as the Code of Conduct adopted by key political parties, may not be carried out. The OSCE's election observer mission has reported receiving an increased number of allegations of legal misuse of state resources and personnel for campaign purposes. If found to be true, those engaged in this activity would be responsible for what would be regarded as a tremendous setback for the country.

Hopefully, by passing this resolution, we can encourage Albanian authorities to respect the rule of law, to abide by their Code of Conduct, and respect the results of the upcoming election. When my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), and I first introduced this resolution, it was with the expectation the U.S. Congress could constructively make a difference by calling on the authorities, political parties, and others to do the right thing so that the real winners in the elections will be the people of Albania who make the effort to vote.

Finally, I am hopeful these elections will meet international standards, because that is one of the first steps Albania will need to take on the path to full Euro-Atlantic integration.

The new Albanian government will also need to tackle problems relating to official corruption and organized crime. Fortunately, beyond a good election process, we must see the development of civil society in Albania, with the youth groups and others pressing elected officials to address the every day problems that plague the lives of Albanian citizens.

I hope my colleagues will support this resolution.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, (Mr. SMITH), and our colleague on the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), for introducing this excellent resolution urging free and fair elections in Albania. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it was 15 years ago this month that I had the privilege of being the first American Government official to set foot in Albania after a 44-year hiatus. At that time, Albania was taking its first halting steps to end a half a century of Communist dictatorship and self-imposed international isolation.

Wherever I traveled throughout the country, from formal meetings with

top government officials to casual chats with students at the University of Tirana, crowds of Albanians gathered, looking on curiously and apprehensively, but hopefully. They were anxious to join the world community, but they were fearful of the consequences of transforming the political and economic system that they knew, despite its profound failings.

□ 1630

Since 1990, Albania has worked with the United States and has participated in NATO's Partnership for Peace program. The Albanian Government has made it clear that it is very anxious to join NATO and to strengthen its relations with our Nation. Albania has indicated its desire to become a full member of the European Union with all of the economic and political obligations that that implies.

Albania's road to democracy and full international participation has not been easy. The country's parliamentary and local elections during the 1990s were marred by electoral irregularities and fraud. This hampered its desire for closer links with the Euro-Atlantic community.

The Albanian election now scheduled for July 3 provides a new opportunity for the people of Albania to demonstrate their readiness for closer ties with the United States and the democratic nations of Europe.

I have been encouraged by the commitment of Albania's leaders, Prime Minister Fatos Nano of the Socialist Party, and former President Sali Berisha of the Democratic Party, to see that this election will meet international standards for free, fair, open, and democratic elections.

The July 3 election is one of the most important in Albania since the end of the Communist era. The United States and the international community will be watching this election very carefully to determine whether Albania truly meets international standards. For Albania to make the progress that it seeks in becoming a full member of the Euro-Atlantic community within NATO and the European Union, these elections must be free and fair beyond a doubt.

Our resolution expresses the support of the Congress and the American people for open and democratic elections in Albania. It also urges our President to express to the people and the political leadership of Albania the great importance our Nation attaches to the July 3 elections. It is certainly accurate to say that the way the upcoming Albanian elections are conducted will be a central factor in determining the future relationship between the United States and Albania.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to conclude.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for this partnership resolution, as well as the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and others. We had 27 cosponsors of this resolution.

Last July in the Commission on Security Cooperation in Europe, we held a hearing in Albania. We heard from a number of important and prominent witnesses, including representatives of MJAFT! which is the youth organization that is doing some important pioneering and important work in Albania today. I want to thank them for their work as well.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 155, urging Albania to hold its July 3 parliamentary elections in accordance with international standards. I would also like to thank the lead sponsor, CHRIS SMITH, for his work on this legislation. These elections are not only important as Albania works to develop its democratic system, but they will set the tone for the Balkan nation in the months and years ahead.

The United States and Albania have strong ties that go well beyond government relations. For that reason, we believe it is very important to support the people of Albania and their right to choose their elected representatives freely and fairly.

In the 15 years since Albania's brutal communist dictatorship came to an end, the country has struggled in its transition. While some elections have been problematic, there have been improvements over time, and now the country has a real chance to achieve the same international election standards that the United States, Canada and all of Europe adopted in 1990. Between now and election day, the real issue is whether the authorities, political parties and other stakeholders have the will to abide by the laws, regulations and a code of conduct. The active U.S. congressional interest expressed in this resolution can encourage all involved to do the right thing.

A good election process will have enormous benefits for Albania. Domestically, it will enable the next government to take stronger measures to address the official corruption and combat the organized crime which together thwart stronger economic recovery. Internationally, it will enable Albania to take the next steps to joining NATO and the European Union. Supporting Albanian elections today will only strengthen our relations in the future.

I will be in Albania for the July 3rd elections and will lead a National Albanian American Council delegation which will monitor that the polling and counting will be done in accordance with international standards. This resolution will help make the case for a good election.

As the lead Democratic sponsor of this resolution, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 155.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution urging the Government of the Republic of Albania to ensure that the parliamentary elections to be held on July 3, 2005, are conducted in accordance with international standards for free and fair elections. This is an important piece of legislation that will notify the people of Albania that the United States is

dedicated to safe, free, and open democracy in Albania and the region. It will let the people of Albania know that we are at their side as they strive for a more free and open society.

As the nation of Albania approaches its July 3rd parliamentary elections we must stand steadfast in our support of free, fair, and transparent elections. As a participating member of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and a signatory of the 1990 Copenhagen Document containing specific commitments relating to the conduct of elections, Albania must maintain its commitment to these democratic ideals. Indeed, the Copenhagen Document, which encourages transparency, balance, and impartiality in the election process, is so sound that it has become the standard by which elections are judged.

Although Albanian democracy has strengthened over the past several years, it has nonetheless failed to live up to the standards of the Copenhagen Document. Over the past 10 years, Albanian elections have not been as free, fair, and open as the Albanian people deserve. As nations around Europe and the world have made considerable strides towards democracy, meeting the standards in the Copenhagen Document for free and fair elections is absolutely essential to Albania's desired integration into Euro-Atlantic institutions, including membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO. Additionally, transparent democratic elections will inexorably lead to a more free and open society and government able to combat Albania's problems with organized crime.

The Republic of Albania must demonstrate its willingness and preparedness to take the next steps towards strong and stable democracy. This can only be achieved when the people of Albania choose their own representatives in parliament in free and fair elections. The Albanian government, political parties, and politicians must conduct this election in adherence to the laws that regulate all free and fair elections; transparency, free press, and unfettered access to electoral procedures by international and domestic observers.

I commend all the Albanian political parties for their commitment to adhere to campaign and election laws. If Albania is to become an active member of both the European and Euro-Atlantic community it must conduct elections that meet international standards. Failure to meet these requirements could have disastrous effects. Europe and the United States must play an active role in helping Albania move towards stable, transparent, and free democracy. This legislation will take a great step towards that goal.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 155.

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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 155.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1833

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2864, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2005

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has announced that it may meet this week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2864, the Water Resources Development Act of 2005. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure ordered the bill reported on June 22, 2005 and filed its report with the House on June 24, 2005.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 of the Capitol by 11 a.m. on Wednesday, June 29, 2005. Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Members are reminded that earlier in the year the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure set forth a specific process regarding the submission of projects for inclusion in the Water Resources Development Act. The Rules Committee does not intend to accord priority to amendments that have not gone through the aforementioned process.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the

appropriate format. Members are also advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3057, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-155) on the resolution (H. Res. 341) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at a meeting with BRAC Commissioner Chairman Anthony Principi at the 130th Airlift Wing of the West Virginia Air National Guard in my district, I missed roll call votes 308 through 321 on June 24.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall 308, no; rollcall 309, yes; rollcall 310, no; rollcall 311, yes; rollcall 312, yes; rollcall 313, no; rollcall 314, no; rollcall 315, yes; rollcall 316, yes; rollcall 317, no; rollcall 318, no; rollcall 319, no; rollcall 320, no; rollcall 321, yes.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3058, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-156) on the resolution (H. Res. 342) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3058) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent 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.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BRITISH-AMERICAN INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the British-American Inter-parliamentary Group:

Mr. PETRI, Wisconsin, Chairman,
Mr. BOOZMAN, Arkansas, Vice Chairman.

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. Res. 199, by the yeas and nays;
H. Con. Res. 155, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H.R. 458 will resume on a later day.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE MASSACRE AT SREBENICA IN JULY 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 199, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 199, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 370, nays 1, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

YEAS—370

Ackerman	Brown-Waite,	Deal (GA)
Aderholt	Ginny	DeFazio
Akin	Burgess	DeGette
Alexander	Butterfield	Delahunt
Allen	Buyer	DeLauro
Andrews	Calvert	DeLay
Baca	Camp	Dent
Bachus	Cannon	Dicks
Baird	Cantor	Dingell
Baker	Capito	Doggett
Baldwin	Capps	Doolittle
Barrett (SC)	Capuano	Doyle
Barrow	Cardoza	Drake
Bartlett (MD)	Carnahan	Dreier
Barton (TX)	Carter	Duncan
Bass	Case	Edwards
Bean	Castle	Ehlers
Beauprez	Chabot	Emanuel
Becerra	Chandler	Emerson
Berkley	Chocola	Engel
Berman	Clay	English (PA)
Berry	Cleaver	Eshoo
Biggert	Clyburn	Evans
Bilirakis	Coble	Everett
Bishop (GA)	Cole (OK)	Farr
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Feeney
Blackburn	Conyers	Ferguson
Blumenauer	Cooper	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Blunt	Costa	Flake
Boehner	Costello	Foley
Bonilla	Cox	Forbes
Bonner	Cramer	Fortenberry
Bono	Crenshaw	Fox
Boozman	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Boren	Cubin	Franks (AZ)
Boswell	Cuellar	Frelinghuysen
Boucher	Cummings	Gallely
Boustany	Cunningham	Garrett (NJ)
Boyd	Davis (AL)	Gerlach
Bradley (NH)	Davis (CA)	Gibbons
Brady (TX)	Davis (IL)	Gilchrest
Brown (OH)	Davis (KY)	Gillmor
Brown (SC)	Davis (TN)	Gingrey
	Davis, Jo Ann	Gohmert

Goode Matheson Ros-Lehtinen LaTourette Rohrabacher Strickland Drake Larson (CT) Putnam
 Goodlatte McCarthy Rothman Matsui Ross Sweeney Dreier Latham Radanovich
 Granger McCaul (TX) Roybal-Allard McHugh Roppersberger Taylor (MS) Duncan Leach Ramstad
 Graves McCollum (MN) Royce Michaud Shimkus Terry Edwards Lee Rangel
 Green, Al McCotter Rush Oxley Ehlers Lewis (CA) Levin Regula
 Green, Gene McCrery Ryan (OH) Payne Slaughter Walden (OR) Emanuel Lewis (GA) Reichert
 Grijalva McDermostt Ryan (WI) Pryce (OH) Sodrel Emerson Lewis (KY) Renzi
 Gutknecht McGovern Ryun (KS) Rahall Souder Weiner Engel Linder Reyes
 Hall McHenry Sabo Salazar Reynolds Stark Young (FL) English (PA) Eshoo Rogers (AL)
 Harman McIntyre Salazar Reynolds Stark Young (FL) English (PA) Eshoo Rogers (AL)
 Hart McKeon Sánchez, Linda T. Sanchez, Loretta Sanders Rogers (KY)
 Hastings (FL) McKinney T. Sanchez, Loretta Sanders Rogers (MI)
 Hastings (WA) McMorris McNulty Sanders Rothman
 Hayes McNulty Sanders Roybal-Allard
 Hayworth Meehan Sanders Royce
 Hefley Meek (FL) Saxton Schakowsky Rush
 Hensarling Meeks (NY) Schiff Schakowsky Ryan (OH)
 Herger Melancon Schwartz (PA) Schwartz (PA) Sherman Ryan (WI)
 Hereth Menendez Schwarz (MI) Schwarz (MI) Sherwood Ryun (KS)
 Hinchey Mica Sessions Serrano Foxx Marchant Sabo
 Hinojosa Millender-Scott (GA) Scott (VA) Frank (MA) Markey Salazar
 Hoekstra McDonald Scott (VA) Franks (AZ) Marshall Sánchez, Linda
 Holden Miller (FL) Sessions Serrano Foxx Marchant Sabo
 Holt Miller (MI) Shadegg Shaw Shays Sherman T.
 Hooley Miller (NC) Shadegg Shaw Shays Sherman Sánchez, Linda
 Hostettler Miller, Gary Shays Sherman Shuster Schwartz (PA)
 Hoyer Miller, George Shays Sherman Shuster Schwarz (MI)
 Hulshof Mollohan Sherman Shuster Scott (GA)
 Hyde Moore (KS) Sherwood Shuster Scott (VA)
 Inglis (SC) Moore (WI) Shuster Shuster Sensenbrenner
 Insole Moran (KS) Simmons Skelton Sensenbrenner
 Issa Moran (VA) Skelton Smith (NJ) Serrano Sessions
 Jackson (IL) Murphy Smith (TX) Snyder Shadegg Shaw
 Jackson-Lee Murtha Smith (TX) Solis Spratt Shays Sherman
 (TX) Myrick Smith (WA) Solis Spratt Shuster
 Jindal Nadler Snyder Solis Spratt Shuster
 Johnson (CT) Nadler Snyder Solis Spratt Shuster
 Johnson (IL) Napolitano Solis Spratt Shuster
 Johnson, E. B. Neal (MA) Stearns Stupak Sullivan
 Johnson, Sam Neugebauer Stupak Sullivan
 Jones (NC) Ney Sullivan Tancredo Tanner
 Kanjorski Northup Tancredo Tanner
 Kaptur Norwood Tanner Tauscher
 Keller Nunes Tauscher Taylor (NC)
 Kelly Nussle Thomas
 Kennedy (MN) Oberstar Thompson (CA)
 Kennedy (RI) Obey Thompson (MS)
 Kildee Oliver Thornberry
 Kind Ortiz Tiahrt
 King (IA) Osborne Tiberi
 King (NY) Otter Tierney
 Kline Owens Tierney
 Knollenberg Pallone Towns
 Kolbe Pascrell Udall (CO)
 Kuhl (NY) Pastor Udall (NM)
 LaHood Pearce Upton
 Langevin Pelosi Van Hollen
 Lantos Pence Velázquez
 Larsen (WA) Peterson (MN) Vislosky
 Larson (CT) Peterson (PA) Walsh
 Latham Petri Wamp
 Leach Pickering Wasserman
 Lee Pitts Schultz
 Levin Platts Waters
 Lewis (CA) Poe Watson
 Lewis (GA) Pombo Watt
 Lewis (KY) Pomeroy Waxman
 Linder Porter Waxman Ackerman
 Lipinski Price (GA) Weldon (FL) Aderholt Boozman
 LoBiondo Price (NC) Weldon (PA) Akin Boren
 Lofgren, Zoe Putnam Weller Alexander Boswell
 Lowy Radanovich Allen Boucher Conaway
 Lucas Ramstad Wexler Andrews Boustany Conyers
 Lungren, Daniel Ramstad Wexler Andrews Boyd Cooper
 E. Rangel Whitfield Bradley (NH) Costello Costa
 Lynch Rehberg Wicker Brady (TX) Cox Cramer
 Mack Reichert Wilson (NM) Brown (OH) Crenshaw
 Maloney Wolf Wilson (SC) Brown (SC) Crowley
 Manzullo Renzi Wolf Brown-Waite, Cubin
 Marchant Reyes Woolsey Barrow Burgess
 Markey Rogers (AL) Wu Bartlett (MD) Butterfield
 Marshall Rogers (KY) Wynn Barton (TX) Buyer
 Marshall Rogers (MI) Young (AK) Barton (TX) Buyer

NAYS—1

Paul
 NOT VOTING—62

Abercrombie Diaz-Balart, M. Hobson
 Bishop (NY) Etheridge Honda
 Boehlert Fattah Hunter
 Brady (PA) Filner Israel
 Brown, Corrine Ford Istook
 Burton (IN) Fossella Jefferson
 Cardin Gonzalez Jenkins
 Carson Gordon Jones (OH)
 Culberson Green (WI) Kilpatrick (MI)
 Davis (FL) Gutierrez Kingston
 Davis, Tom Harris Kirk
 Diaz-Balart, L. Higgins Kucinich

Boozman
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Boyd
 Bradley (NH)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Burgess
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carter
 Case
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chandler
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonner
 Bono

□ 1856

Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 322, on H. Res. 199, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

URGING ALBANIA TO ENSURE ELECTIONS TO BE HELD ON JULY 3, 2005, ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 155.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 155, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 1, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]
 YEAS—369

Coble
 Cole (OK)
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Cox
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cubin
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis (TN)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 DeLay
 Dent
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doolittle
 Doyle

Emerson
 Engel
 English (PA)
 Eshoo
 Evans
 Everett
 Farr
 Feeney
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick (PA)
 Flake
 Foley
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gingrey
 Gohmert
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves
 Green (WI)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutknecht
 Hall
 Harman
 Hart
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hereth
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Hooley
 Hostettler
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hyde
 Inglis (SC)
 Insole
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jindal
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kline
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Emanuel
 Emerson
 Engel
 English (PA)
 Eshoo
 Evans
 Everett
 Farr
 Feeney
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick (PA)
 Flake
 Foley
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gingrey
 Gohmert
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves
 Green (WI)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutknecht
 Hall
 Harman
 Hart
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hereth
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Hooley
 Hostettler
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hyde
 Inglis (SC)
 Insole
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jindal
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kline
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Latham
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowy
 Lucas

Cardin	Hunter	Reynolds
Carson	Israel	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Istook	Ross
Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Ruppersberger
Davis, Tom	Jenkins	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	Jones (OH)	Simpson
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kilpatrick (MI)	Slaughter
Etheridge	Kingston	Sodrel
Fattah	Kirk	Souder
Filner	Kucinich	Stark
Ford	LaTourette	Strickland
Fossella	Matsui	Sweeney
Gonzalez	McHugh	Taylor (MS)
Gordon	Michaud	Terry
Gutierrez	Murtha	Turner
Harris	Oxley	Walden (OR)
Higgins	Payne	Weiner
Hobson	Pryce (OH)	Wynn
Honda	Rahall	Young (FL)

□ 1915

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:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 323, on H. Con. Res. 155, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Monday, June 27th and missed the rollcall votes ordered. Had I been present, I would have voted as noted below:

Rollcall vote 322: "yea"; rollcall vote 323: "yea".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to illness I was regrettably delayed in my return to Washington, DC, and therefore unable to be on the House floor for rollcall votes 322 and 323. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" for rollcall vote 323, and "yea" with reservation for rollcall vote 322 on House Resolution 199, which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July 1995.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, personal business prevents me from being present for legislative business scheduled for today, Monday, June 27, 2005. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H. Res. 199, a resolution expressing the sense of the House regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July 1995 (Rollcall No. 322); and "yea" on H. Con. Res. 155, a resolution urging the Government of the Republic of Albania to ensure that the parliamentary elections to be held on July 3, 2005, are conducted in accordance with international standards for free and fair elections (Rollcall No. 323).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House floor during rollcall votes on H. Res. 199 (Expressing the sense of the United States House of Representatives regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July

1995) and H. Con. Res. 155 (Urging the Government of the Republic of Albania to ensure that the parliamentary elections to be held July 3, 2005, are conducted in accordance with international standards for free and fair elections). I was giving a presentation on the 179th Airlift Wing of the Ohio National Guard in Mansfield, OH at the Base Realignment and Closure Commission hearing in Buffalo, New York. Had I been present for the votes I would have voted "yea" for both measures.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 322 and 323.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the fifth amendment to the Constitution states that "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

However, that was then.

Thanks to the recent Supreme Court ruling on eminent domain, the fifth amendment has been vastly expanded.

As one Supreme Court Justice stated in the dissent, "Nothing is to prevent the State from replacing a Motel 6 with a Ritz Carlton, any home with a shopping mall, or any farm with a factory."

Property rights? There is nothing right about this decision. Now, tax revenues are more important than neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, with this decision, the rights of our citizens are now competing with tax revenue and private developments. The Constitution is meant to protect the rights of our citizens, not compete with the bottom line.

What is clear at this moment is that the Supreme Court has thrown the protection of individual property rights right out the window. These Justices need to be reined back in by both State action and loud condemnation of this outrageous finding.

Public use has been redefined so boldly by this Supreme Court decision that it's no wonder citizens are concerned about their homes and property.

In the short term, all states are encouraged to adopt strict and narrow definitions of "public use."

In the long term, we in Congress must determine whether more clarity needs to be brought to the court on this matter.

Remember Jefferson's principle: "The true foundation of republican government is the equal right of every citizen in his person and property and in their management."—Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval, 1816.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court acted today, but if any of us want to know what real religious freedom and religious liberty is all about, I rise today to pay tribute to the Reverend Billy Graham.

Though many have said that the series of evangelistic sermons this past weekend in New York may be his last, he is a symbol of what America stands for and appreciates in freedom of religion. He spoke to all people.

I understand that in the early 1960s when it was not appropriate, he invited Dr. Martin Luther King to open one of his evangelistic meetings. He came to Nashville, Tennessee when it was not popular to do so.

In his audience of thousands and thousands over the weekend, we saw the faces of America, many colors, many different persons, many economic conditions. They came to hear the gospel said in an open and free society.

He pushes no agenda. He does not ask for the Ten Commandments to be placed in any place; but, he says, if you believe, then you should accept. That is what true religious freedom and liberty are all about.

That is why I am glad to be an American and believe in the first amendment. I salute the Reverend Billy Graham, a great American and a great patriot.

SHEDDING LIGHT ON THE SUPREME COURT

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, with the Supreme Court's decision regarding the Ten Commandments, they basically ruled as they had inferred, during oral arguments, as I witnessed them personally, in their chamber. They made fairly clear through their opinion that the only way the Ten Commandments are supposed to be displayed is if it is done in such a way as to render them completely meaningless.

Now, they just seem to have forgotten the fact that when the Founders and writers of the Constitution were alive, Old Testament scriptures, including the Ten Commandments, were frequently cited as a basis for laws being passed. Now, the majority has become wise in their own eyes to the detriment of the country, but it is only when the Ten Commandments are rendered completely meaningless that you can come out with a decision like we had the last 2 weeks where a city is allowed to take someone's property just because they think somebody may build a bigger, better, more expensive house; they can get more tax dollars.

We need to shed some light in the windowless ivory tower in which these decisions have been made.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). 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.

SAFER VEHICLES FOR SOLDIERS:
A TALE OF DELAYS AND
GLITCHES

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read a bit, which I do not usually do on the floor, from yesterday's New York Times front page, because I think it is so extraordinary and it goes so much to the incompetence and the indifference of Donald Rumsfeld and others in this administration regarding what is going on in Iraq and the lack of protection for our troops.

"When Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld visited Iraq last year to tour the Abu Ghraib Prison camp, military officials did not rely on a government-issued Humvee to transport him safely on the ground," not even an armored Humvee, that is my own little addition. "Instead, they turned to Halliburton, the oil services contractor, which lent the Pentagon a rolling fortress of steel called the Rhino Runner."

Now, no wonder Secretary Rumsfeld goes to Iraq and says everything is going great. He is rolling around in an armored fortress of steel provided by his former employer. Well, I am sorry, the former employer of Vice President CHENEY, Halliburton, riding around in something called a Rhino Runner, which is supposed to be able to withstand a thousand-pound bomb.

Now, our troops are out there, some of them in unarmored Humvees that cannot resist any bomb, bullets, or shrapnel; some of them are in armored Humvees which can resist between 4- and 8-pound bombs, but then there are other options out there.

Back to the New York Times: "State Department officials traveling in Iraq use armored vehicles that are built with V-shaped hulls to better deflect bullets and bombs. Members of Congress favor another model called the M1117, which can endure 12-pound explosives and 50-caliber, armor-piercing rounds.

"Unlike the Humvee, the Pentagon's vehicle of choice for American troops, the others were designed from scratch to withstand attacks in battlefields like Iraq with no safe zones. Last fall, for instance, a Rhino traveling the treacherous airport road in Baghdad endured a bomb that left a 6-foot-wide crater. The passengers walked away unscathed. 'I have no doubt should I have been in any other vehicle,' wrote an Army captain, 'the lone military passenger, 'the results would have been catastrophically different.'

"Yet more than 2 years into the war, efforts by United States military units to obtain large numbers of these stronger vehicles for soldiers have faltered, even as the Pentagon's program to armor Humvees continues to be plagued by delays, an examination by The New York Times has found."

And then, the end of last week, we had the revelation about the extraordinary shortages for the Marines.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I should not be surprised when we have a Secretary of Defense who predicted that our troops would be greeted with flowers and candies and sweets; and that the occupation would last, that we would be down to 30,000 troops within 2 months and would not be there longer than 5; that he has been two, four, six, or a hundred steps all the way along the way. But to still deny the reality, because he is riding around in an armored Rhino provided by Halliburton, of our troops, the bitter reality of them in unarmored Humvees, as many Marines still are, and we still hear from time to time of Army units that are out there in unarmored Humvees, although they claim they never go off base anymore; and then to hear that State Department people and Members of Congress get superior vehicles that are not available to the regular troops, this is extraordinary.

More than 2 years into this war, and now this insurgency, and the Pentagon is focused on Star Wars and other fantasies; and the troops still lack basics, things for which we need no technological development. The technology exists, the manufacturers exist, but the will to purchase those vehicles to protect our troops does not exist in Secretary Rumsfeld's higher echelons of the organization.

But, again, he is riding around, he cannot even hear or see the explosions in the Rhino Runner. They probably have the music turned up loud and the AC is blasting away, and he does not have the slightest idea where he is. But the troops sure know where they are; they sure do.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this embarrassment to end. He should have gone long ago, he should go now, and it is time to start providing the troops the basics they need to come home safe.

THE HIGH COST OF PRESCRIPTION
DRUGS IN THE UNITED STATES

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 to talk tonight about the unfairness of what Americans pay for prescription drugs compared to what consumers pay around the rest of the industrialized world.

I have with me again this chart. Let me just read some of the numbers, the difference between the prices for these drugs at the Metropolitan Pharmacy in

Frankfurt, Germany and at one of my pharmacies in Rochester, Minnesota: Nexium, for \$60.25 in Germany; \$145.33 in the United States.

□ 1930

Norvasc, \$19.31 in Germany, \$54.83 in the United States. Zyrtec, \$34.33 in Germany, \$73.02. Prevacid, \$35.22, \$146.47. Zocor, \$23.83 in Germany, \$85.39 here. The list goes on. These are 10 of the most commonly prescribed name-brand drugs. The total in Germany, \$455.57. The total here in the United States, more than double that, at \$1,040.40. Americans pay 128 percent more for exactly the same drugs made in the same plants under the same FDA approval.

But many Members ask me, well, how did you become so involved in this issue? What made you so passionate? I would like to share that story of how I got involved in this issue. A number of years ago I had a town hall meeting and there were some seniors who came to the meetings and they told me about going up to Canada to buy their prescription drugs. And to be honest, it was one of those events where I heard but I did not really listen. And then at a subsequent meeting one of the seniors asked me a very tough question. She said, why are we treated like common criminals for going to Canada to save some dollars on our prescription drugs? Well, I did not have a very good answer.

And then a few months later something happened that had nothing to do with prescription drugs. The price of live hogs in the United States collapsed. The price of pigs dropped from about \$37 per hundred weight down to about \$7. It was one of the worst catastrophes for American pork producers since the Great Depression. And they did what many constituents do. They called their Congressman and said, can you not do something about this? And I said, well, I do not know what I can do. And they said, well, can you not somehow at least stop all these Canadian pigs from coming into our market, making our supply-demand situation even worse? Is not there something you can do about that, Congressman?

So I called the Secretary of Agriculture, I called the Secretary of Commerce, and I got essentially the same answer. They both said, well, that is called NAFTA. That is called free trade. We have open markets. And finally, to the Secretary of Commerce I said, wait a second; you mean we have open borders when it comes to pork bellies but not when it comes to Prilosec? And he sort of laughed on the other end of the phone and said, well, I guess that is right. And I said, well, that does not sound right to me.

And so this little pilgrimage started there with the price of pigs. And there is something wrong with a system that protects the large pharmaceutical companies, but does nothing to protect our pork producers. And so I began to do research and realized how much more Americans pay.

Now, I do not want price controls. In fact, I do not want people buying their prescription drugs over the Internet. But I think it should be legal. What I really want is American pharmacists to have access to what pharmacists in Europe have. It is called parallel trade. Because that pharmacist in Frankfurt, Germany can go ahead and order his drugs from Sweden or Norway or France or Spain, wherever they can buy them cheapest.

You see, there was a President by the name of Ronald Reagan who said that markets are more powerful than armies. And it really is time that we use market pressures and market forces to help control the runaway prices of prescription drugs. I believe American consumers have a right to that. I believe American consumers have a right to world-class drugs at world-market prices. So I hope Members will join me in this great effort to make certain that we open markets, that we create a competitive market so that Americans can buy Zocor for \$30 rather than \$85. We are not asking for a free lunch. We are just asking for a fair price.

NICS/GUN SHOW LOOPHOLE/NO FLY, NO BUY

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, many here in this Chamber, each and every one of us came to Congress to try and make a difference, and each one of us are trying to make that difference.

I came to Congress to try and reduce gun violence in this Nation. And many people have heard me talk about this for close to 8½ years now. What I want to talk about tonight are three pieces of legislation that I have and why I feel they are so important, especially in the climate that we have.

We are post-9/11 now, and I think what we need to do is start looking at our gun laws that are here today and how we can make this country safer, certainly being part of our homeland security.

One of the bills that I think is probably extremely important is the NICS Improvement Act. Unfortunately, I had a tragedy back in my district going back 3 years ago, where a person came into one of our local churches and ended up shooting the priest and a parishioner. On further investigation, we found out that New York State actually had a record where he should not have been able to buy a gun. But being that they did not give that information to the NICS system, and we all know that a computer is only as good as the system that has the information in it.

Now, with that we did legislation, it actually passed here in the House by a voice vote, and I think it is important that we get that going again and get that improved.

And another reason why, many of us are experiencing high volumes of gangs

in our community. And it was only a few months ago that some gangs that were caught by our local police, who did a great job, traced the guns that these young people had, and they were bought legally in Alabama. And I say that, legally. But, again, if they had tried to buy them in New York, they would have been in the system. They were in the system and basically they would not have been able to buy the gun if the NICS system had the correct information in it.

Right now, 25 States have entered less than 60 percent of the convictions of why some people should not be able to buy guns. Thirteen States do not list domestic violence convictions and restraining orders. And unfortunately, that was one of the things with Mr. Troy, who did the shooting in the parish church. His mother actually had a restraining order on him.

Thirty-three States do not share mental health records. Now, I know there is an argument there that we are picking on people with mental health problems. That is not it. We are saying that people that come under adjudication under the system are denied the right to buy a gun. The privacy issue is kept in place. Mainly, if you are denied on a gun, all it does is come up rejected; it does not say for what area that you were rejected. And I think it is important that we get this bill up on the system. This way we will be able to certainly prevent people that should not be able to buy guns, by law under the 1968 Gun Control Act, which is only enforcing the law that is already on the books. We had terrific bipartisan support in the 107th Congress, and I think it is something that we should be doing to move around.

The gun show loophole. I know we had our battles here on the gun show loophole, but even information again for post, 9/11, the FBI has found that over 40 "terrorists" on the terrorist watch list have gone into gun shows and been able to buy AK-47s and other guns.

Now, it is common sense that those that go buy a gun, and 13 States have already passed legislation, it has not stopped anyone from buying a gun. It has not closed down any gun shows, because I know that many of our friends in the Midwest, this is a family weekend. They go out and spend a day there and that is fine. I do not have a problem with that. But I think the majority of people agree with me, if you are going to buy a gun, you need to go through a background check. I think that is the basic law that we could do.

The other thing that really perturbs me, and by the way this actually goes into my third bill, no fly, no buy list. Right now we have a list, a terrorist list, and they are not allowed to get onto a plane. And yet they can go into any gun store, they can go to any gun show and are able to buy a gun. I do not think that makes too much common sense. We should be stopping these people from being able to buy their guns.

Think about what happened here in D.C. a few years ago. One person, two people with a gun, certainly kept D.C. and the surrounding area petrified, and millions of dollars was lost.

Imagine these terrorists. You know, people, I think, are starting to become, feel too safe. We know that terrorists will strike when no one is paying attention. And as long as we pay attention to detail, we can stop these terrorists from doing bodily harm. No fly, no buy.

I understand that when you look at foreign countries, sometimes people are prosecuted. That would not be the same here in this country. We know that there are political reasons why they might be thrown in jail. We have a way of being able to adjudicate that.

And also, the list that I chose for this bill is on a list where people can actually go to it and get off the list. And I think that is important because we certainly do not want to deny anyone.

The three bills that I have introduced are not going to stop anyone from being able to buy a gun. Their second amendment rights are protected.

I made a promise when I came to Congress that I would reduce gun violence in this country. But I also am not here to try and take away the right of anyone to own a gun. That is a personal decision for many of us.

Some of us do not like guns. I used to do skeet shooting. It was not my sport. That is certainly up to me. Yet, I know there are many people around this Nation that like to go hunting. And we have always said, going back since 1994, they will be able to go hunting. We are not trying to take away the right to own the gun. But we must enforce the laws that are on the books and make this a safer country.

CLUB GITMO

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I spent part of the weekend down in the Tropics. I went to an island down in the Caribbean. And the place where I went had an ocean view, and the facility is relatively new. Some of the rooms are air-conditioned and some are not. Some of the rooms actually would meet ADA standards for the physically challenged.

The guests that were there, they were not working. They are standing around talking. There is a lot of talking and I noticed that there are soccer courts. There are volleyball courts. There is table tennis, and they are building a new basketball court.

I ate lunch, the same meals that the guests had. The lunch that I had was marinated chicken with orange sauce, rice pilaf, steamed vegetables, plenty of rolls and butter. Some of the guests that are there have even gained up to 5 to 10 pounds while being there.

New medical facilities are there, new dental facilities. The people that are

there average four medical visits a week or, rather, a month. That is more than most Americans do in a year.

The medical personnel there performed 128 surgeries, and no one that has been there, of the 700 guests that have been there, not one has died from any cause. In fact, the medical personnel saved the lives of numerous ones.

They come from all over the world, 24 different countries; 520 of them are there; 2,200 of them have gone back home.

The rooms are very clean. I notice that there are no Gideon Bibles in any of the rooms, but every room has a Koran. You know, American troops do not get U.S.-funded taxpayer Bibles overseas. But all these guests get taxpayer-funded Korans. And of course the staff that is there cannot touch these Korans.

Of course I am talking about Gitmo, the Guantanamo Bay terrorist detention center. These people are prisoners of war and the guards that are there are doing an outstanding job.

Speaking of the Koran, the guards are not permitted to touch the Koran except under rare circumstances. And if they do, they have to wear linen gloves before they can move this Koran to a different cell.

The people that are there are there for two purposes. They are suspected terrorists that are going to be tried for war crimes, like killing people all over the world, many of whom are Americans. The others that are there are being interrogated, those suspected terrorists.

Now I observed those interrogations, Mr. Speaker. There are no abuses. There are no dogs. There is no abuse. The interrogations that took place, neither the interrogator nor the prisoner knew that we were observing. And numerous Members of Congress went this past week and observed these facilities.

One hundred fifty of these individuals have attorneys. Any prisoner that is there that wants an attorney is entitled to have one.

Two hundred of them have been released; in fact, maybe releasing some we should not release, because 12 of the ones that have been released have been either recaptured or killed on the battlefield. One is of particular note. When he was first arrested and captured as a terrorist he had a leg that was infected, so part of it was amputated. And he was fitted with a new prosthesis by American medical personnel. Later released and he was captured, recaptured on the battlefield, and of course he was still wearing that American prosthesis that taxpayers paid for.

These people do not work. You know, even in Texas we work our inmates. Today they are out picking cotton. But they are just there to be observed and to be housed. You know, one of these facilities meets American Corrections Association standards.

And these people, Mr. Speaker, are not nice. They spit on our guards. They

throw urine and feces at our guards. And some of these people want to kill Americans.

The guards, Mr. Speaker, are first class. They are from all branches of the service. They have tremendous cooperation with each other, and they make us proud. The accusations of abuse in a dungeon-like facility do a disservice to these troops and the troops in combat.

I had lunch with two of these guards, George Telles and Enrique Lopez, Jr., both Navy sailors that guard cell blocks. And they do us a great honor and a service there.

These inmates are not protected by the Geneva Convention, although we treat them like they are. The Geneva Convention says that POWs, to be a real prisoner of war, they must be in a uniform, they must not have concealed weapons, they must not kill innocents, and they must have a chain of command. And these terrorists violate all four of these rules, but yet we treat them with greater respect than in the Geneva Convention.

The International Red Cross observes the entire facility and has access to all of the prisoners to talk to them on a one-on-one basis. There have been no deaths in Guantanamo. And you know, in prisoner-of-war camps in the past, Americans have died. Back in the war between the States, thousands of prisoners, Confederate and Union soldiers died. In Vietnam, about 9 percent of the Americans in custody there died. In Korea, about 30 percent. In World War II, we know that about 40 percent of Americans in custody in Japan died, all in prisoner-of-war camps, and not one person has died in these.

□ 1945

Amnesty International calls this place a "gulag." Well, these are words from the uninformed elite. They must want "Club GITMO" or "Disney World of the Caribbean."

Some said to close it down. That is just not appropriate, Mr. Speaker. We probably ought to make it bigger. It would be a crime to close this place down and let these criminals loose on the world. There is a war on terror going on and these people want to kill Americans. They are dangerous. The 20th hijacker of 9/11 is there, and these people need to be tried for war crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Iraq. I have seen what these people have done, these terrorists have done to civilians and to our military. Even one 8-year-old kid was killed while I was there. Mr. Speaker, I am more concerned about Americans being killed by terrorists by beheading and suicide bombers and the welfare of our troops than I am about some terrorist outlaw that is upset because his blueberry muffin gets cold.

SMART SECURITY AND VETERANS FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under a previous

order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sadness and in frustration over the news that the Nation finds itself \$1 billion short of the funding that is needed to cover health care for our Nation's veterans this year.

It is bad enough that next year's VA budget will almost surely be inadequate; now we are having trouble paying for this year's needs. Just as the architects of our Iraq policy did not have a plan for winning the peace, it appears that the budget experts in the executive branch did not plan for increased veteran costs associated with the deadly foreign war, a preemptive war that has killed over 1,700 troops and injured more than 13,000, a war that will certainly result in an increased burden on the Veterans Administration.

This shortfall comes on the heels of efforts by the Bush administration to increase veterans prescription drug copayments and to add an enrollment fee to enter the veterans health care system in the first place. There is even talk of classifying veterans in ways that entitle some veterans to benefits and leaves others on the outside looking in.

How is this possible, Mr. Speaker, all the talk of supporting the troops, is this just rhetoric? Is it just bumper sticker boiler plate, or are we really serious about honoring the sacrifices of war and showing our gratitude to those who have risked life and limb on our behalf?

What is even worse is that some people saw this budget problem coming and were ignored or rebuffed. Minority Members in the other Chamber, the Senate, proposed adding money to the VA budget in anticipation of this shortfall, but they were told by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs this spring that no emergency supplemental funds were needed.

Well, guess what? Emergency supplemental funds are needed. And now we either have to get an advance on next year's limited VA appropriations; borrow from other parts of the VA budget; or pass a supplemental bill to fill the gap. One of the key committee Chairs has said that it would be best to avoid a supplemental package. But were they saying that, Mr. Speaker, when we were debating an over-\$200 billion supplemental bill to fund the war effort in the first place? It does not make sense to me.

We have no problem approving billions upon billions of dollars and taking on massive debt to send our brave soldiers to Iraq in the first place. And while they are there, we are denying them of the protective body armor and vehicles that would prevent these severe wounds in the first place, and they are returning home more injured than ever. And when they come home, then we start pinching pennies, pinching pennies on their care. Are these the priorities of a great Nation?

Now, it is tempting to see this VA situation as simply an actuarial miscalculation, but it is indicative of something far more serious that we have been seeing over and over again from this administration, a rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul mentality; a tendency to ignore problems until they become crises; a habit of embracing war without accounting for its costs, human or financial.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one example of the way our Iraq policy has been bungled. Not only do we need to bring our troops out of Iraq as soon as realistically possible, a position that the majority of the American people agree with; we need an overhaul of our approach to national security in general.

I have proposed a new plan called SMART Security. SMART stands for Sensible Multi-lateral American Response to Terrorism For the 21st Century. The guiding principle behind SMART is that war should be the absolute last resort. Prevention of war, not preemptive war, which we know from the Downing Street memo was not the thinking on Iraq.

So SMART includes an ambitious international development agenda, democracy building, human rights education, business loans, agricultural assistance and more for the troubled, underdeveloped nations of the world.

SMART is tough, pragmatic, and patriotic. It protects America by relying on the very best of American values: our commitment to freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership.

HEALTH CARE FOR RURAL AMERICA

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, my arrival in Congress, it really was about what do I do to make certain that folks in Kansas, people across rural America have a quality of life, that they have the opportunity to put food on the family's table, that they have enough money to save for their retirement and for their kids' college education. But even perhaps more important than that, the goal for me as a policymaker has been what can we do to see that the communities that make up my State are around for a while longer.

Rural America faces many challenges; and among those challenges is an often declining economy, and an economy related to agriculture. But one of the things that became clear to me early on in my time in Congress is access to health care matters. If we care about the future of our communities, we need to make certain that our citizens, the people who live there, can access a physician, can have access to a hospital, that the hospital doors remain open, that there is home health care and nursing home care.

So for much of my time in Congress, I have worked on issues related to the availability of health care. I have been an active member and chaired the Rural Health Care Coalition. And I commend my colleagues who are actively engaged in a group of Republican and Democrat Members of this body who work time and time again to see that good things happen in the delivery of health care in rural America. The goal there has to be to make certain that we are reimbursed, that our providers, our hospitals and physicians and nurses and other health care providers, are reimbursed through Medicare in particular in a way that makes it possible for financially those health care providers to continue to provide the service and that we need to continue to make efforts to reduce the paperwork and bureaucratic burden that increase the cost of providing services, especially in communities where senior citizens comprise a significant component of the population.

Many of the hospitals in the First Congressional District of Kansas, 60, 70, 80, and sometimes even 90 percent of the patients admitted to a hospital seen by our physicians are over the age of 65; and, therefore, Medicare is responsible for payment at least in part of the hospital or physician bill.

During my time in Congress despite this continual focus on access to health care, one other thing has become clear to me. There is an overriding issue that should consume us all. I rise tonight to try to bring to my colleagues' attention the necessity of beginning to address the ever-rising cost of health care.

I am in the middle of 69 townhall meetings. I represent 69 counties in Kansas, and every year I conduct a townhall meeting in each of those counties. I remember the townhall meeting in Hoxie, Kansas. During that townhall meeting, the first question was from a teacher who said, Last year my premiums for my health insurance to the school district that I paid out of my pocket were \$450. This year it is \$700. What are you going to do about it?

The next question was from the farm implement dealer who said, We are trying to stay afloat here. It has been a difficult year. Drought on the high plains. You know how difficult the agriculture economy is. We are trying to keep our employees insured. We raised our co-payments. We raised our deductibles and our insurance premiums still went up 49 percent. And there was the question, What are you going to do about it?

The third question came from a lady who said, My brother has cancer. He has been in Texas in an experimental treatment program, and he has now returned home to Kansas and his treatment costs are \$40,000 a year. My mom and dad and other brothers and sisters, we are all trying to figure out how do we as a family come up with \$40,000 a year to take care, to perhaps save my

brother's life. Again, the implied question, What are you going to do about it?

So from that townhall meeting several years ago, it has been a growing desire on my part to move the House of Representatives, the Senate, the policymakers, the administration toward addressing the issue of health care costs. I think there are things we can do. It is more than just decrying the problem.

We clearly need more access to primary care physicians. Too much health care is delivered through the emergency room. I commend the Bush administration for their focus on community clinics. That is an important component of making certain that people who could not otherwise afford health care are not showing up at the emergency room, but could access a primary care physician or a nurse practitioner through our community clinics.

We need to focus more on wellness and prevention. I think perhaps the biggest bang for our buck in reducing health care costs is to encourage and to educate citizens of our country about nutrition, about life-style, about habits, about exercise.

Clearly our information technology system has to be overhauled. We have tremendous technology in the delivery of health care, but not in the way that we keep records and provide for their payment. IT needs to be overhauled for better and easier data retrieval. We clearly need to make certain that our reimbursements for our hospitals under Medicare and Medicaid are adequate to cover the costs, otherwise there is simply a cost-shifting onto those who have insurance.

I have been supportive of health savings accounts and opportunities for small businesses to pool their purchasing power to access health care for their patients.

I heard earlier about prescription drugs. We need to continue to work as a body, as a Congress and as policymakers in our Nation's capital to reduce the ever-escalating costs of health care.

RENEGOTIATE 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 earlier this month, President Bush called on Congress to pass CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Also earlier this month, the most powerful Republican in Congress, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), promised a vote by July 4. Actually, it is the third time the gentleman has promised a vote on CAFTA. The first time in 2004 he said there would be a vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement by the end of the year, December of 2004. Then earlier this year he promised a vote on CAFTA

by Memorial Day, and now he is promising a vote by July 4.

Where I come from, 3 strikes means you are out. As a result, Congress is waiting and waiting and waiting for the CAFTA vote count down to begin. While we wait, the many of us who have been speaking out against the Central American Free Trade Agreement have a message for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and for the President, and that is renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

President Bush signed CAFTA more than a year ago. Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration, Australia, Chile, Singapore, Morocco, every trade agreement negotiated by this administration was voted on by this Congress within 60 days of the President signing the agreement. CAFTA has languished in Congress for more than a year without a vote because this wrongheaded trade agreement offends Republicans and Democrats alike.

It offends small manufacturers. It offends labor unions. It offends environmentalists and ranchers and small farmers and food safety advocates. It offends religious leaders in Central America and many religious leaders in this country.

Most importantly, just look what has happened with trade policy in this country in the last 12 years. In 1992, the year I was elected to Congress, the United States had a \$38 billion trade deficit. That means we imported \$38 billion more than we exported. Today, a dozen years later, in 2004, last year, our trade deficit was \$618 billion. From \$38 billion to \$618 billion in only a dozen years. It is hard to argue that our trade policy is working.

□ 2000

Some people say, well, those are only just numbers, that is the trade deficit; who really cares? What that means is it means a significant loss in manufacturing jobs.

The States in red are States that have lost 20 percent of their manufacturing. The State of Ohio, 216,000 just in the last 5 years; Michigan, 210,000 manufacturing jobs lost; Illinois, 224,000; Pennsylvania, 200,000; Mississippi and Alabama combined, 130,000. In the gentleman from Georgia's (Mr. LEWIS) home State, they have lost between 15 and 20 percent.

These are the States in blue, 107,000. In the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from California's (Mr. BERMAN) State, 354,000 jobs lost.

In State after State after State we have seen hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs lost in the last 5 years, not entirely because of but in large part because of failed trade policies. Each one of these jobs translates into the loss of a bread winner, translates into less money for education in the community, less money for police and fire as the tax base shrinks with

more and more industrial concerns shutting down.

These are faces of real people, what these numbers represent, and it is hurting an awful lot of families in every one of these States and our country.

As we see, the Central American Free Trade Agreement was negotiated by a select few for a select few. It was negotiated by the U.S. pharmaceutical industry to help the U.S. pharmaceutical industry. It was negotiated by big energy companies in the United States to help big energy companies in the United States. It was negotiated by insurance and financial institutions to help insurance and financial institutions. But it is not helping workers. It is not helping the environment. It is not helping small manufacturers. It is not helping small farmers and small ranchers in our country.

It is the same old story, Mr. Speaker. Every time there is a trade agreement, the President makes three promises. He promises there will be more jobs in the U.S., more manufacturing products that are exported to other countries, and it means better wages and a higher standard of living for workers in the developing country. Yet, with every single trade agreement, their promises fall by the wayside.

Benjamin Franklin said, the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over and expecting a different result. The President makes the same promises about NAFTA, about PNTR with China, about CAFTA, about every trade agreement over and over and over, and the results are the same: more manufacturing job loss; more stagnation of wages in the developing world where their standard of living does not go up; more plant shutdowns in community after community in our country.

In the face of overwhelming bipartisan opposition, the administration and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the most powerful Republican in the House, have tried every trick in the book to pass this CAFTA. Mr. Speaker, CAFTA is a bad idea. Overwhelming opposition to this agreement says we should renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of debate on this House floor recently about the war in Iraq and not so much about Afghanistan, interestingly, but certainly about Iraq. Some in Congress are clamoring for us to pull out of Iraq immediately. Some want a timetable indicating a date certain when we will withdraw. Some say there is no plan concerning postwar Iraq, no exit strategy. I would like to address each of these points just briefly.

Number 1, we promised the Iraqi people that we would not pull out prematurely. Remember that back in the Gulf War in the early 1990s, we made a similar promise. We did pull out, and thousands of Iraqis died. We have had a very difficult time regaining their trust since. I think to this point we may have regained some of that status and some of that trust.

A date certain on which we will leave Iraq will encourage insurgents to hang on until that date and then intensify the attacks. I think the date certain of withdrawal will certainly be looked upon by many insurgents as a sign that they were winning, a sign of victory. I am sure they would claim victory at that point.

Also, I think it is important that a withdrawal without victory will dishonor the memories of those who have died and sacrificed, and I, for one, would very much hate to go back and face some of those parents and some of those husbands and wives who have lost soldiers in the war and try to tell them that basically their son, their daughter, their husband, or their wife died for no cause at all. That would be very, very difficult for them to swallow.

Then I think most of us who have been overseas, and a great many Members of Congress have, have been to Iraq and Afghanistan and Kuwait, and Landstuhl in Germany to the hospital, and up to Walter Reed, and one thing that we found almost universally is that our soldiers have tremendous morale. They have a very strong sense of mission, and they have a real sense of purpose. Almost to a person the military personnel that I have talked to would tell you that they absolutely do not want to leave this thing undone. They want to make sure there is a sense of accomplishment and a sense of purpose.

Finally, let us address the issue of no plan, that there is no strategy, no exit plan at all. We might refer to this chart here. One year ago, there was one Iraqi military battalion that was trained and equipped. Now there are more than 100 battalions trained and equipped, and those are reflected over here on this 75,791 total of Ministry of Defense forces. Also, in addition, there are 90,883 policemen and other patrol and security guards that have been trained. So it is a total of 170,000 Iraqis who are currently trained and equipped.

I have been to Iraq where I have seen some of this training occur. I have been to Amman, Jordan, where a lot of the police academies are held. So at the present time we are aiming for 270,000, and we are most of the way there. We still have 100,000 to go, and we are training about 10,000 a month. So that means in about 10 months we will be at roughly 270,000.

General Petraeus says there is no shortage of volunteers; we have more people applying for this position than we have slots to fill them at the present time.

So I think we are in reasonably good shape. The exit strategy is obviously to draw down our forces as the Iraqis are able to take control of the situation, and currently, in almost every military action, Iraqis are out in front. There are many areas of Iraq at the present time where there are no U.S. forces. Iraqi forces are totally in control, not a whole lot of those areas, but there are some. So the Iraqis are assuming more and more responsibility for their own protection. At the present time, there are 21,000 fewer Americans in Iraq than there were in January. So there has been some drawdown at the present time.

One of the wild card situations is the Sunnis. Recently, the Sunnis, it was reported, reached a resolution with the Shias and the Kurds as to their role in government. I think if that can be accomplished, then we are in reasonably good shape for a resolution.

A constitution will be written by August 15. It will be approved by October 15, and a new government will be elected on December 15.

So there is a strategy. Progress is being made. It is a very difficult situation. I really, truly believe all Members, both sides of the aisle, are very much in support of our troops. I think it is important that we support them with our votes, with money, with equipment, and also with our words, because our words that are spoken on this House floor and in the press certainly reverberate around the world and al Jazeera.

So I know our troops very much are hoping that we will show unqualified and tremendous resolution in resolving this issue.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION AND THE GROKSTER DECISION

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, today the United States Supreme Court, in a unanimous 9-0 decision, held that peer-to-peer file-swapping companies can be held liable if they promote the use of their sites to infringe copyright. The Grokster decision is a victory for all law-abiding Americans, especially the hardworking and talented individuals that make up our creative industries.

I am pleased that the Supreme Court struck the right balance between the protection of intellectual property and the desire to provide consumers with easy and lawful access to movies, music, and other content. Impressive advances in technology in recent years have produced a host of new and exciting avenues for consumers to access music and other content online. These new technologies, however, have also bred a culture of rampant pirating on the Internet.

Grokster and other peer-to-peer networks have become bastions of illegal

activity, providing safe havens for pirates to swap copied versions of copyrighted material without paying a cent. Every day, millions of copyrighted protected movies, songs, computer games, and other pieces of intellectual property are stolen over peer-to-peer networks.

The statistics speak for themselves. Over 90 percent of the file-sharing activity on Grokster is illegal copyright infringement. Of the music files available online, 99 percent are unauthorized, leading to a substantial drop in shipments of music to retailers.

In the last year alone, the number of feature films posted on file-sharing sites more than doubled to 44 million. Some estimates show that as many as 400,000 movies have been downloaded in one day alone.

Last month, it took just a few hours after the latest Star Wars movie opened in theaters for a copy to show up online on a file-sharing site. While so many Americans flocked to movie theaters across the country with their children and families to see the latest episode of this great Hollywood franchise, millions had access to an unauthorized copy of the film online, free for theft and the taking.

Our Nation's economy and creative industries that employ over 5 million Americans suffer a huge blow from the billions of dollars lost annually through illegal downloading. These networks that actively promote illegal activity continue to pose a serious threat to the livelihood of copyright creators and artists, many of whom live in my district.

One of our country's greatest exports, indeed the only area where we have a positive balance of trade with every Nation on earth, is in the area of creative content and our intellectual property, which is derived from the hard work of song writers, technicians, artists, programmers, musicians, independent filmmakers and scores of others who make their living from the lawful sale of these items.

The Supreme Court decision today strikes the right balance by protecting copyright holders from such illegal activity and promoting legal avenues for downloading movies, music, and other works by consumers.

Very simply, the Court decision today codifies an age-old principle: that one man should not profit from the fruit of another man's labor.

As the Court noted, their decision leaves breathing room for innovation, and a vigorous commerce and does nothing to compromise the legitimate commerce or discourage innovation having a lawful purpose.

Today's ruling upholds the principle that technology must and should advance, but not without respecting copyright law. Just moments after today's decision, a new legal peer-to-peer model was unveiled that will incorporate many user benefits common to the peer-to-peer file-sharing experience, and a number of sites have al-

ready been launched that offer Internet music downloads at affordable prices without infringing on copyright laws. These positive efforts provide a victory for both consumers and artists.

Today's decision will further encourage and spur even more technological innovation. As a result, consumers will be the ultimate winners as they will have more access to high-quality music, film, and other content on the Internet and elsewhere.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

BRINGING TROOPS HOME

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as the right honorable gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), a good friend, former coach, had indicated, there are Members of this body who believe the solution in Iraq is to set a date certain by which we will begin removing or have our troops removed from Iraq. When asked recently if such a strategy would not have been devastating if used in World War II and would not have left Hitler in power, one Congressman said, well, World War II is not really an appropriate comparison. He believed the more appropriate model was that of Vietnam, where we set a time and then we got out.

I do not question anyone's motive here, but for freedom's sake, what in the world kind of a mission is that? The retreat from Vietnam created a vacuum that was filled by dead and mutilated bodies of those we ran out and deserted, and it is one of our darkest and most heinous hours in American history. It is rivaled, however, for its humiliating nature by the very war in Vietnam itself in which we sent soldiers to fight but tied one arm behind their backs and did not give them the equipment and backing to actually win. They were not authorized to win. They were told to just hold what they had. No war can ever be won unless there is a commitment by the government to win.

If we did not learn anything from the wars of the 20th century, it would be obvious here, but in 1979, we had an attack on American soil. That is what it is when someone attacks an American

embassy, and they took hostages of our diplomats and we did nothing. We failed to defend our soil and our people and our diplomats and a terrible message went forward.

□ 2015

We failed to address the attacks properly of the first bombing of the World Trade Center and on the U.S.S. *Cole* and other attacks.

We have sent a terribly erroneous message in the past that America does not have the courage or the stomach to complete the defense of ourselves or to finish what we start. That is what Osama bin Laden has been saying for years. If we just keep attacking, keep up the insurgency, America does not have the stomach to win. We will wear them down.

And now I hear colleagues verifying they do not have the stomach to complete what we started. My colleagues, when I was in Iraq in March, one former general under Saddam looked me in the eyes, a Sunni, and said, If the U.S. will just stay behind us and back us until we get our constitution and have the next election, you will see most of the violence in Iraq stop. The terrorists know how critical it is that this battle go on. They know that if freedom and a free society take hold in Iraq, in a Muslim country in the Middle East, they lose.

Some of the people who now are calling for a date certain to withdraw are some of the same people in 1991 who screamed at former President Bush, stop, stop, do not attack, they are surrendering. Get out. Do not go to Baghdad. And shortly after that, after he did as they implored, they said well, he is just too weak. He did not have the stomach to finish what he started. He was a weak President. He should have done what he started and gone on to Baghdad. Now they are doing the same thing to this President. I thank God he has the backbone to stay in there.

Please, I would encourage my colleagues to not push for a date certain. It would not have worked in World War II or in any war. It tells the opponents, the enemy, that we do not have the stomach to stay in there. We have a plan. We are training policemen, we are training soldiers. They will be able to defend themselves. Let us ensure that Iraq will win the peace and that the terrorists lose.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON MGM V. GROKSTER

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ), and a colleague who wanted to be here as well

but could not be, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO), to react to a unanimous decision that came down today by the Supreme Court in the *MGM v. Grokster* case.

That ruling is a victory for American innovation. Artists will thrive, be encouraged to create the music and movies we love, and legitimate technology companies that distribute those same movies and music will no longer have to compete with piracy profiteers. Conversely, services that breed a culture of contempt for intellectual property will have to answer for their ill-gotten gains.

In addition to providing us with movies, sound recordings, computer games and software, books and other creative works, the core copyright industry accounts for over 6 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product. Businesses that rely on copyright employ more than 11 million U.S. workers. Unfortunately, the copyright piracy taking place over peer-to-peer networks has become a great threat to the livelihoods of all copyright creators. Therefore, robust protection for creativity is necessary to support everyone from the most famous artists to the completely unknown set designer, from shareholders and executives of studios and R&D record companies and software companies to the many thousands of hourly-wage earners who work for them.

Piracy robs creators and owners of sound recordings and movies of their right to be first in the market. But most harmful, peer-to-peer networks have created a culture where too many consumers, including our children, are accustomed to receiving their choice of entertainment anytime, anyplace, in any format for free, without providing the creator his or her rightful compensation.

In a 9-0 opinion, the Supreme Court has told businesses that facilitate copyright infringement that they will be held directly accountable for their actions. A business cannot model its success on the destruction of another's industry. To paraphrase Justice Kennedy's observation in the oral argument, unlawful expropriated property cannot be used by a business as part of its start-up capital.

This decision "does nothing to compromise legitimate commerce or discourage innovation having lawful promise." It has merely found a balance between the legitimate demand of copyright owners for effective protection and the rights of others to engage in substantially unrelated areas of commerce. Just because the transmission of these files happened in the ether, does not mean that the protection should only be symbolic. Just because we are in a digital age, the definition of stealing does not change. If I go to a store and take a CD without paying for it, I am stealing. If I go to a peer-to-peer network and download a song for free, I am also stealing.

The Supreme Court has instructed businesses: "You may not entice indi-

viduals to commit a moral and legal wrong." It is willing to hold businesses responsible for the part they play in promoting theft. It has issued a loud warning that companies will not be allowed to gain from illegal distribution. Those that specifically design their business models to target the demand for copyright infringement will be stuck wearing the bulls-eye.

Shed no tears: these illegitimate peer-to-peer networks are not innovators; they are free riders. Their services make it hard to teach our children about right and wrong. They send adware, spyware, viruses, and pornography on to our computers and into our homes. There are a great many reasons for parents, teachers, creators, and others to rejoice about the message the Supreme Court sent today.

Both the content and tech industry must continue developing innovative and legitimate ways to distribute content so that consumers can access entertainment on a variety of devices. This decision will improve opportunities for legitimate music and movie distribution, putting out of business the black marketeers.

This decision has provided greater protection for intellectual property rights and has provided the tools to effectively combat copyright theft. In turn, it will keep an engine of America's economic growth thriving by promoting innovation and creativity in entertainment and the arts. The decision is also a win for legitimate technology companies. Those who have structured their businesses to distribute content in innovative and legal ways that compensate the creator while providing consumers quality in choice should laud this decision.

The Founding Fathers dealt with pirates on the high seas and had the intuition to address the pirates over the air. They afforded protection in the Constitution for intellectual property rights that serve as the cornerstone of American innovation. The Supreme Court today has helped carry out the mission of article I section 8 of the Constitution by promoting the progress of science and the useful arts.

MGM V. GROKSTER

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would join with my colleagues about today's unanimous decision by the Supreme Court in *MGM v. Grokster*, for it represents a great triumph for American creativity and innovation. File-sharing companies that actively coax consumers into violating copyright laws can no longer escape legal consequences under the guise of fair use. They will no longer be able to rip off from the talent and the hard work of our Nation's creators. In ruling for our Nation's creative artists, the Supreme Court today struck a proper balance

between the protection of intellectual property rights and the need to expand our technologies.

As a representative of Hollywood, my district contains many movie and recording studios, which serve as the driving force behind our local economy and provide tens of thousands of jobs to many of my constituents. As Chair of the Congressional Entertainment Industries Caucus, one of my key concerns has been the continuing erosion of our Nation's copyright laws.

Let me share some shocking statistics. According to recent FBI data, U.S. producers of movies, music, computer games, and software lost \$23 billion in 2003 to illegal copying. In Operation Digital Gridlock, the first Federal law enforcement action against a peer-to-peer network, regulators seized the equivalent of 60,000 illegally distributed movies last August. It is clear to me that piracy of our creative products has reached an epidemic level, both domestically and internationally, creating a huge drain on our economy, job creation, and technological innovation. We are forced to resort to legal actions to help stem this tide of intellectual property theft.

That is why today's Supreme Court ruling was so important. In the unanimous opinion, the Justices held that "one who distributes a device with the object of promoting its use to infringe copyright is liable for the resulting acts of infringement by third parties using the device, regardless of the device's lawful uses." It is this unequivocal guidance from our Nation's highest court that I believe will help enhance the effective enforcement of our Nation's copyright laws and strengthen the public's respect for the value of intellectual property rights.

Of course, efforts to address privacy should not inhibit the continuing growth and development of our digital economy. New technologies should benefit not just the content distributors but the creative forces as well. But as the entertainment and technology sectors work together to utilize file-sharing networks to create new innovative and legal forms of content distribution, I hope today's decision will send a message to all pirates that winking and nodding at digital theft will not be tolerated any more than theft itself. I am confident that the lower courts will carefully apply this well-reasoned opinion in finding Grokster and other similar companies liable for activities that will induce their customers into illegal use of creative products.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject matter of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND THE GROKSTER DECISION

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

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the United States Supreme Court for their ruling today in the case of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Incorporated v. Grokster. By a unanimous ruling, 9-0 in favor of MGM, the Supreme Court sent a strong message today that our courts will protect the work of creative artists.

I represent the 39th Congressional District in California. My State, region, and district are home to the motion picture industry, the music industry, and software companies. Many of my constituents work in these creative industries, and I know from talking to them that piracy hits their companies hard and their pocketbooks harder.

Intellectual property is important to our economy as a whole, so copyright infringements also severely damage our national economy. In fact, according to the International Intellectual Property Alliance, in 2002, core copyright industries accounted for over 6 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product. That is over \$626 billion. When you look at all copyright industries, they accounted for approximately 12 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product, or \$1.25 trillion in 2002 alone.

Obviously, intellectual property is a vital part of our economy, and piracy robs our economy of billions of dollars from this important industry.

□ 2030

Conservative estimates say that counterfeiting of U.S. businesses' copyrighted goods cost our economy between \$200-\$400 billion each year. When our economy suffers like that, America's workers suffer, too.

The "core" copyright industries alone were estimated to have employed 4 percent of U.S. workers in 2002, a total of 5.48 million workers. But piracy causes 750,000 American workers to lose their jobs each year.

This is where intellectual property laws come in and why the Supreme Court decision today in the Grokster is so important. The Court drew a line in the sand in the Grokster case and said that peer-to-peer file-sharing networks that encourage illegal file-sharing should not be shielded by our laws. The ruling protects the creative community but also allows the public to retain access to the benefits of peer-to-peer file-sharing technology.

Mr. Speaker, I love movies and music as much as any consumer, and I use computer software every single day. I am also a fan of the Internet, and I want consumers to be able to use technology to get their favorite music and movies conveniently.

But stealing is stealing. Swapping copyrighted files online is illegal, and just because it is easy doesn't make it right. We can have peer-to-peer networks that give every American access to the files they want online, and also provide creators with copyright protections.

As long as companies like Grokster are allowed to facilitate illegal file swapping, we will continue to lose hundreds of dollars and hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs each year.

I am pleased that the Supreme Court took the first step today in Grokster towards ending illegal copyright infringement online, and protecting the industries that produce copyrighted works.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today's ruling is a victory for content creators and consumers. It is clear that those who encourage content theft are responsible for their conduct even if they themselves are not stealing. With this ruling, creators will be encouraged to take advantage of the digital marketplace and provide consumers with even more digital content.

For years, consumers have been clamoring for access to digital content. Because content protection technology and content owners had not caught up with the Internet, music lovers turned to illegal download sites like Napster and Kazaa for digital content.

We had heard that, if the content industry would just create a legal avenue for obtaining digital music, consumers would embrace it. The premonition was largely true. The record industry and high-tech worked together to develop digital content protection, to clear the rights needed to get music online, and to get music on the Internet. According to the Pew Internet and American Life Project, the response to legitimate digital content has been overwhelming: in 2004, only twenty-four percent of music downloaders had tried legitimate download sites; in 2005 to date, the number jumped to forty-three percent.

Internet sites like Apple iTunes, Napster, and Rhapsody offer consumers a variety of ways of obtaining music, from one-time downloads to monthly subscriptions. In just the past few years, over 300 million songs were sold on just a single website. No matter how you view it, the marketplace is working.

Today's Supreme Court decision makes it clear that encouraging others to steal is as nefarious as stealing directly. I have no doubt that, with this added assurance, content creators will roll out even more digital content to consumers.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my Democratic colleagues in support of protecting our Nation's intellectual property. For decades the theft of music and movies has been commonplace. But, with the explosion of the Internet, the theft of copyright material has become a crisis.

Just today, the Supreme Court, in an unanimous decision, stepped forward and protected Intellectual Property. In MGM v Grokster, the Supreme Court struck a fine balance that must exist to ensure consumers' rights and protect music and video content. The Court clearly stated that "the record is replete with evidence that from the moment Grokster and Streamcast began to distribute free software, each one clearly voiced the objective that recipients use it to download copyrighted works,

and each took active steps to encourage infringement." Neither of these programs offered themselves as legitimate devices such as a VCR. A great majority of users knew and intended to subvert copyright and deny not just the record and movie companies' compensation, but take money out of the pockets of songwriters, studio personnel, camera men and make-up artists.

We are also undertaking an effort to move to digital television. In the future, if the Congress does not act, copying and uploading a broadcast show will be all too easy. Many of us have worked on the "Broadcast Flag," which is a technology that will allow consumers to continue to record a show for later viewing, but prevent the mass redistribution. The Federal Communications Commission had instituted a rule to this end, but the federal courts found the FCC lacked such authority. Thus, it falls on us in Congress to continue to update our laws in the digital era to stop copyright infringement. I hope we can do so quickly or, I fear, the best entertainment will be moved to cable and satellite and be unaffordable to some Americans.

I thank Mr. HOYER and Mr. SCHIFF for arranging this effort and applaud all of my colleagues' commitment to the protection of one of our Nation's most valuable assets.

EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to be on the floor this evening speaking about this particular issue. As a matter of fact, I was hoping over the next few days I could concentrate all of my time on the Out of Iraq Congressional Caucus that we are working so hard on.

But this is National Homeowner Month, and I could not help but focus on the fact that in America owning your own home is one of the most ideal things that you can do. Americans aspire to own their own homes. We socialize in such a way that we teach our children to go to school, to get an education, to get a good job or have a good career, become an entrepreneur, and buy your home.

And so as I focus on National Homeowner Month, I am outraged that the Supreme Court of the United States of America last Thursday made a decision that local entities could take American's homes in eminent domain proceedings for something other than public use. I am amazed that the Supreme Court of the United States on a 5-to-4 decision, I believe it was, decided that the law, the Constitution as we know it, I think it is the fifth amendment, that says yes, you may use eminent domain for good public use, is something other than what was intended. This ruling says you can take anybody's home for private use. In this case Susette Kelo, the woman from New London, Connecticut, who brought the case, was trying to protect her home from the desire by a huge corporation to build some condominiums.

And so now with this Supreme Court decision, the State, the city, the public entity, can take your home for private use. They can take your home and they can give it to private developers to build shopping centers. They can take your home and give it to developers to build a condominium. They can take your home for any reason that they decide is in the public interest, and they are trying to hide behind the idea that there are some cities and some entities that need to get rid of slums and they need to redevelop in the best interest of the citizens of that community.

Yes, it may go to a private company or to a private corporation and yes, they may get rich from that development. But if the city fathers get together and believe that that somehow is in the best interest and it is already all right, that flies in the face of the Constitution of the United States.

I do not think Members have to be a strict constructionist or a liberal constructionist. All you need is good sense to know that the Constitution of the United States did not mean for your city government or any other entity to be able to ride over your rights and take your private property and give it to somebody else.

As a matter of fact, I think this is dangerous. I think it is dangerous because your city fathers could get together with developers and take land in ways it has never been done before. We know too many stories about the influence of developers on county council members and on city governments. We know too much about the flow of money. We know too much about campaign contributions to those who would just as soon institute eminent domain as do anything.

As a matter of fact, without this interpretation that we got last Thursday, we have city fathers who have tried it, even though they did not have this ruling. You have communities that have to fight against city council members and mayors getting together trying to take their property and at least trying to call it for public use.

But now the Supreme Court has made it clear that they can take it for private use. I do not like it. Members do not have to be a Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative. Members just need to be an American with good sense that says you will not stand for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to get together with some of my friends on the other side of the aisle and we are going to create a law that will undermine this decision of the Supreme Court and take back amendment 5 of the Constitution so we can redefine the meaning in the way it is supposed to be defined.

HONORING THOSE WHO MADE THE ULTIMATE SACRIFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Illi-

nois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last week my colleagues and I began a memorial tribute to read the names of over 1,900 men and women who gave their lives in service to our Nation in Afghanistan and Iraq. We read about 860 of those names. We recited the name and rank of each servicemember who fell in Iraq and Afghanistan theaters of war from 2001 through the beginning of 2004.

For the next hour we will continue this reading, honoring the fallen of 2004 and 2005. We will continue to do this reading on the floor of the House, the people's House, until we have recognized all who have given their life in service of this Nation. In this Chamber we often invoke their sacrifice in general, but we seldom take the time to recognize them individually.

By reading these names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is our hope that our Nation will never forget their sacrifice. God bless and keep each of the brave Americans whose memory we now honor:

1. Private First Class Marquis A. Whitaker
2. Specialist Jacob R. Herring
3. Staff Sergeant Kendall Thomas
4. Sergeant Adam W. Estep
5. Specialist Martin W. Kondor
6. Sergeant Landis W. Garrison
7. Staff Sergeant Esau G. Patterson Jr.
8. Staff Sergeant Jeffrey F. Dayton
9. Sergeant Ryan M. Campbell
10. Specialist James L. Beckstrand
11. Specialist Justin B. Schmidt
12. Private First Class Ryan E. Reed
13. Private First Class Norman Darling
14. Private First Class Jeremy Riccardo Ewing
15. Petty Officer Second Class Jason B. Dwelley
16. Petty Officer Third Class Christopher M. Dickerson
17. Corporal Scott M. Vincent
18. Corporal Joshua S. Wilfong
19. Specialist Trevor A. Wine
20. Specialist Ramon C. Ojeda
21. Sergeant Joshua S. Ladd
22. Specialist Ervin Caradine Jr.
23. Private Jeremy L. Drexler
24. Staff Sergeant Todd E. Nunes
25. Petty Officer Second Class Michael C. Anderson
26. Petty Officer Second Class Trace W. Dossett
27. Petty Officer Second Class Scott R. Mchugh
28. Petty Officer Second Class Robert B. Jenkins
29. Petty Officer Third Class Ronald A. Ginther
30. Captain John E. Tipton
31. Gunnery Sergeant Ronald E. Baum
32. Staff Sergeant Erickson H. Petty
33. First Lieutenant Christopher J. Kenny
34. Sergeant Marvin R. Sprayberry III

35. Sergeant Gregory L. Wahl
 36. Private First Class Lyndon A. Marcus Jr.
 37. Corporal Jeffrey G. Green
 38. Private First Class Jesse R. Buryj
 39. Specialist James E. Marshall
 40. Private First Class Bradley G. Kritzer
 41. Corporal Dustin H. Schrage
 42. Staff Sergeant Hesley Box Jr.
 Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).
 Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 43. Specialist Philip D. Brown
 44. Specialist Isela Rubalcava
 45. Specialist Chase R. Whitman
 46. Specialist James J. Holmes
 47. Sergeant Rodney A. Murray
 48. Private First Class Andrew L. Tuazon
 49. Specialist Kyle A. Brinlee
 50. Specialist Jeffrey R. Shaver
 51. Lance Corporal Jeremiah E. Savage
 52. Private First Class Brandon C. Sturdy
 53. Private First Class Brian K. Custer
 54. Specialist Philip I. Spakosky
 55. Sergeant Brud J. Cronkite
 56. Command Sergeant Major Edward C. Barnhill
 57. Private First Class Michael A. Mora
 58. Sergeant James William Harlan
 59. Staff Sergeant Rene Ledesma
 60. Senior Airman Pedro I. Espaillat Jr.
 61. Second Lieutenant Leonard M. Cowherd Jr.
 62. Specialist Carl F. Curran
 63. Specialist Mark Joseph Kasecky
 64. Lance Corporal Bob W. Roberts
 65. Staff Sergeant Joseph P. Garyantes
 66. Specialist Marcos O. Nolasco
 67. Staff Sergeant William D. Chaney
 68. Private First Class Michael M. Carey
 69. Specialist Michael C. Campbell
 70. Sergeant First Class Troy "Leon" Miranda
 71. Private First Class Leslie D. Jackson
 72. Corporal Rudy Salas
 73. Staff Sergeant Jeremy R. Horton
 74. Lance Corporal Andrew J. Zabierek
 75. Staff Sergeant Jorge A. Molina Bautista
 76. Specialist Jeremy L. Ridlen
 77. Specialist Beau R. Beaulieu
 78. Private First Class Owen D. Witt
 79. Private First Class James P. Lambert
 80. Private First Class Richard H. Rosas
 81. Sergeant Kevin F. Sheehan
 82. Specialist Alan N. Bean Jr.
 83. Private First Class Daniel Paul Unger
 84. Corporal Matthew C. Henderson
 85. Lance Corporal Kyle W. Codner
 86. Corporal Dominique J. Nicolas
 87. Lance Corporal Benjamin R. Gonzalez
 88. Specialist Michael J. Wiesemann
 89. Private First Class Cody S. Calavan
90. Lance Corporal Rafael Reynosasuarez
- 2045
91. Specialist Charles E. Odums II
 92. Private Bradli N. Coleman
 93. Sergeant Aaron C. Elandt
 94. Private First Class Nicholas E. Zimmer
 95. First Lieutenant Kenneth Michael Ballard
 96. Captain Robert C. Scheetz Jr.
 97. Lance Corporal Dustin L. Sides
 98. Private First Class Markus J. Johnson
 99. Corporal Bumrok Lee
 100. Lance Corporal Todd J. Bolding
 101. Specialist Christopher M. Duffy
 102. Sergeant Frank T. Carvill
 103. Specialist Justin W. Linden
 104. Sergeant Justin L. Eyerly
 105. First Lieutenant Erik S. McCrae
 106. Specialist Ryan E. Doltz
 107. Sergeant Humberto F. Timoteo
 108. Sergeant Melvin Y. Mora Lopez
 109. Private First Class Melissa J. Hobart
 110. Sergeant Jamie A. Gray
 111. Lance Corporal Jeremy L. Bohlman
 112. Captain Humayun S. M. Khan
 113. Private First Class Thomas D. Caughman
 114. Specialist Eric S. McKinley
 115. Private First Class Shawn M. Atkins
 116. Sergeant Arthur S. (Stacey) Mastrapa
 117. Specialist Jeremy M. Dimaranan
 118. Major Paul R. Syverson III
 119. Specialist Thai Vue
 120. Private First Class Jason N. Lynch
 121. Private First Class Sean Horn
 122. Staff Sergeant Marvin Best
 123. Staff Sergeant Gregory V. Pennington
 124. Lance Corporal Pedro Contreras
 125. Corporal Tommy L. Parker Jr.
 126. Lance Corporal Deshon E. Otey
 Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).
 Ms. DELAURO.
 127. Lance Corporal Juan Lopez
 128. First Lieutenant Andre D. Tyson
 129. Sergeant Patrick R. McCaffrey Sr.
 130. Staff Sergeant Charles A. Kiser
 131. Captain Christopher S. Cash
 132. Specialist Daniel A. Desens
 133. Lance Corporal Manuel A. Cenicerros
 134. Specialist Jeremy M. Heines
 135. First Sergeant Ernest E. Utt
 136. Lance Corporal Patrick R. Adle
 137. Sergeant Alan David Sherman
 138. Corporal John H. Todd III
 139. Specialist Robert L. DuSang
 140. Sergeant Kenneth Conde Jr.
 141. Lance Corporal Timothy R. Creager
 142. Sergeant Christopher A. Wagener
 143. Staff Sergeant Stephen G. Martin
 144. Lance Corporal James B. Huston Jr.
 145. Second Lieutenant Brian D. Smith
146. Corporal Dallas L. Kerns
 147. Lance Corporal Michael S. Torres
 148. Lance Corporal John J. Vangyzen
- IV
 149. Lance Corporal Scott Eugene Dougherty
 150. Private First Class Rodricka Antwan Youmans
 151. Corporal Jeffrey D. Lawrence
 152. Lance Corporal Justin T. Hunt
 153. Private First Class Samuel R. Bowen
 154. Sergeant Michael C. Barkey
 155. Specialist Jeremiah W. Schmunk
 156. Sergeant Robert E. Colvill Jr.
 157. Specialist Joseph M. Garmback Jr.
 158. Specialist William River Emanuel IV
 159. Specialist Sonny Gene Sampler
 160. Private First Class Collier Edwin Barcus
 161. Specialist Shawn M. Davies
 162. Corporal Terry Holmes
 163. Sergeant Krisna Nachampassak
 164. Private First Class Christopher J. Reed
 165. Staff Sergeant Trevor Spink
 166. Sergeant First Class Linda Ann Tarango-Griess
 167. Sergeant Jeremy J. Fischer
 168. Staff Sergeant Dustin W. Peters
 169. Sergeant James G. West
 170. Specialist Dana N. Wilson
 171. Private First Class Torry D. Harris
 172. Corporal Demetrius Lamont Rice
 173. Private First Class Jesse J. Martinez
 174. Staff Sergeant Paul C. Mardis Jr.
 175. Lance Corporal Bryan P. Kelly
 176. Specialist Craig S. Frank
 177. Sergeant First Class David A. Hartman
 178. Sergeant Dale Thomas Lloyd
 179. Private First Class Charles C. "C.C." Persing
 180. Staff Sergeant Michael J. Clark
 181. Corporal Todd J. Godwin
 182. Specialist Danny B. Daniels II
 183. Lance Corporal Mark E. Engel
 184. Private First Class Nicholas H. Blodgett
 185. Sergeant Tatjana Reed
 186. Private First Class Torey J. Dantzler
 187. Lance Corporal Vincent M. Sullivan
 188. Specialist Nicholas J. Zangara
 189. Sergeant DeForest L. "Dee" Talbert
 190. Private First Class Ken W. Leisten
 191. Gunnery Sergeant Shawn A. Lane
 192. Lieutenant Colonel David S. Greene
 193. Specialist Joseph F. Herndon II
 194. Specialist Anthony J. Dixon
 195. Specialist Armando Hernandez
 196. Sergeant Juan Calderon Jr.
 197. Specialist Justin B. Onwordi
 198. Corporal Dean P. Pratt
 199. Private First Class Harry N. Shondee Jr.
 200. Sergeant Tommy L. Gray
 201. Captain Gregory A. Ratzlaff
 202. Gunnery Sergeant Elia P. Fontecchio

203. Lance Corporal Joseph L. Nice
 204. Sergeant Yadir G. Reynoso
 205. Private First Class Raymond J. Faulstich, Jr.
 206. Specialist Donald R. McCune
 207. Sergeant Moses Daniel Rocha
 208. Specialist Joshua I. Bunch
 209. Lance Corporal Larry L. Wells
 210. Corporal Roberto Abad
 Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. BAIRD).
 Mr. BAIRD.
 211. Private First Class David L. Potter
 212. Lance Corporal Jonathan W. Collins
 213. Civilian Rick A. Ulbright
 214. Captain Andrew R. Houghton
 215. Staff Sergeant John R. Howard
 216. Lance Corporal Tavon L. Hubbard
 217. Captain Michael Yury Tarlavsky
 218. Lance Corporal Nicholas B. Morrison
 219. Lance Corporal Kane M. Funke
 220. First Lieutenant Neil Anthony Santoriello
 221. Sergeant Daniel Michael Shepherd
 222. Second Lieutenant James Michael Goins
 223. Private First Class Brandon R. Sapp
 224. Private First Class Geoffrey Perez
 225. Private First Class Fernando B. Hannon
 226. Specialist Mark Anthony Zapata
 227. Sergeant David M. Heath
 228. Lance Corporal Caleb J. Powers
 229. Specialist Brandon T. Titus
 230. Lance Corporal Dustin R. Fitzgerald
 231. Sergeant Harvey Emmett Parkerson III
 232. Specialist Jacob D. Martir
 233. Private First Class Henry C. Risner
 234. Sergeant Richard M. Lord
 235. Corporal Brad Preston McCormick
 236. First Lieutenant Charles L. Wilkins III
 237. Private First Class Ryan A. Martin
 238. Corporal Nicanor Alvarez
 239. Sergeant Jason Cook
 240. Lance Corporal Seth Huston
 241. Private First Class Nachez Washalanta
 242. Private First Class Kevin A. Cuming
 243. Gunnery Sergeant Edward T. Reeder
 244. Second Lieutenant Matthew R. Stovall
 245. Corporal Christopher Belchik
 246. Staff Sergeant Robert C. Thornton, Jr.
 247. Staff Sergeant Donald N. Davis
 248. Lance Corporal Jacob R. Lugo
 249. Lance Corporal Alexander S. Arredondo
 250. Specialist Charles L. Neeley
 251. Specialist Marco D. Ross
 252. Private First Class Nicholas M. Skinner
 253. Corporal Barton R. Humlhanz
 254. Specialist Omead H. Razani
 255. Lance Corporal Nickalous N. Alldrich
 256. Private First Class Luis A. Perez
 257. Sergeant Edgar E. Lopez
 258. Airman First Class Carl L. Anderson, Jr.
 259. Staff Sergeant Aaron N. Holleyman
 260. Specialist Joseph C. Thibodeaux III
 261. Lance Corporal Nicholas Wilt
 262. Lance Corporal Nicholas Perez
 263. Captain Alan Rowe
 264. First Lieutenant Ronald Winchester
 265. Petty Officer Third Class Eric L. Knott
 266. Sergeant Shawna M. Morrison
 267. Specialist Charles R. Lamb
 268. Private First Class Ryan Michael McCauley
 269. Staff Sergeant Gary A. Vaillant
 270. Staff Sergeant Elvis Bourdon
 271. Specialist Tomas Garces
 272. Specialist Brandon Michael Read
 273. Private First Class Devin J. Grella
 274. Captain John J. Boria
 275. Private First Class David Paul Burridge
 276. Lance Corporal Derek L. Gardner
 277. Lance Corporal Quinn A. Keith
 278. Lance Corporal Joseph C. McCarthy
 279. Corporal Mick R. Nygard-bekowsky
 280. Lance Corporal Lamont N. Wilson
 281. Specialist Clarence Adams III
 282. Specialist Yoe M. Aneiros
 283. First Lieutenant Timothy E. Price
 284. Specialist Chad H. Drake
 285. Lance Corporal Michael J. Allred
 286. Specialist Lauro G. DeLeon, Jr.
 287. Private First Class Jason L. Sparks
 288. Sergeant James Daniel Faulkner
 289. Specialist Michael A. Martinez
 290. Specialist Edgar P. Daclan, Jr.
 291. Petty Officer Third Class David A. Cedergren
 292. First Lieutenant Alexander E. Wetherbee
 293. Private First Class Jason T. Poindexter
 294. Specialist Benjamin W. Isenberg
 And I would like to conclude by acknowledging Regina Clark, who became the first Washington State woman to die in the war when a suicide bomber attacked her convoy in Fallujah. She was one my constituents, a single mother who leaves behind an 18-year-old son. Our thoughts and prayers are with Regina's son, the rest of her family, and with the families and loved ones of all our Nation's fallen heroes.
 Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).
 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 295. Staff Sergeant David J. Weisenburg
 296. Lance Corporal Cesar F. Machado-Olmos
 297. Lance Corporal Michael J. Halal
 298. Lance Corporal Dominic C. Brown
 299. Staff Sergeant Guy Stanley Hagy, Jr.
 300. Sergeant Carl Thomas
 301. Lance Corporal Mathew D. Puckett
 302. Corporal Adrian V. Soltau
 303. Corporal Jaygee Ngirmidol Meluat
 304. Sergeant Jacob H. Demand
 305. Major Kevin M. Shea
 306. First Lieutenant Tyler Hall Brown
 307. Lance Corporal Drew M. Uhles
 308. Lance Corporal Gregory C. Howman
 309. First Lieutenant Andrew K. Stern
 310. Corporal Steven A. Rintamaki
 311. Corporal Christopher S. Ebert
 312. Sergeant Thomas Chad Rosenbaum
 313. Private First Class James W. Price
 314. Sergeant Brandon E. Adams
 315. Specialist Joshua J. Henry
 316. Lance Corporal Steven C. T. Cates
 317. Sergeant Foster L. Harrington
 318. Private First Class Nathan E. Stahl
 319. Staff Sergeant Lance J. Koenig
 320. Private First Class Adam J. Harris
 321. Sergeant Skipper Soram
 322. Sergeant Benjamin K. Smith
 323. Lance Corporal Aaron Boyles
 324. Lance Corporal Ramon Mateo
 325. Sergeant Timothy Folmar
 326. Second Lieutenant Ryan Leduc
 327. Specialist David W. Johnson
 328. Specialist Clifford L. Moxley, Jr.
 329. Specialist Robert Oliver Unruh
 330. Captain Eric L. Allton
 331. Specialist Gregory A. Cox
 332. Sergeant First Class Joselito O. Villanueva
 333. Private First Class Kenneth L. Sickels
 334. Sergeant Tyler D. Prewitt
 335. Private First Class Joshua K. Titcomb
 336. Staff Sergeant Mike A. Dennie
 337. Specialist Rodney A. Jones
 338. Staff Sergeant Darren J. Cunningham
 □ 2100
 339. Specialist Allen Nolan
 340. Sergeant Michael A. Uvanni
 341. Sergeant Jack Taft Hennessy
 342. Sergeant Christopher S. Potts
 343. Sergeant Russell L. Collier
 344. Staff Sergeant James L. Pettaway, Jr.
 345. Staff Sergeant Richard L. Morgan, Jr.
 346. Specialist Jessica L. Cawvey
 347. Private Jeungjin Na "Nikky" Kim
 348. Specialist Morgen N. Jacobs
 349. Staff Sergeant Michael S. Voss
 350. Sergeant Andrew W. Brown
 351. Private First Class Andrew Halverson

352. Private Carson J. Ramsey
 353. Private First Class James E. Prevette
 354. Sergeant Pamela G. Osbourne
 355. Private First Class Anthony W. Monroe
 356. Staff Sergeant Michael Lee Burbank
 357. Private First Class Aaron J. Rusin
 358. Private First Class Oscar A. Martinez
 359. Corporal Ian T. Zook
 360. Specialist Christopher A. Merville
 361. Lance Corporal Daniel R. Wyatt
 362. Captain Dennis L. Pintor
 363. Specialist Michael S. Weger
 364. Specialist Jaime Moreno
 365. Specialist Jeremy F. Regnier
 366. Lieutenant Colonel Mark P. Phelan
 367. Major Charles R. Soltis, Jr.
 368. Second Lieutenant Paul M. Felsberg
 369. Lance Corporal Victor A. Gonzalez
 370. Specialist Ronald W. Baker
 371. Staff Sergeant Omer T. Hawkins II
 372. Specialist Bradley S. Beard
 373. Private First Class Mark A. Barbret
 374. Specialist Josiah H. Vandertulip
 375. Private David L. Waters
 376. Specialist Alan J. Burgess
 377. Corporal William I. Salazar
 378. Specialist Jonathan J. Santos
 Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).
 Mrs. MCCARTHY.
 379. Sergeant Michael G. Owen
 380. Lance Corporal Brian K. Schramm
 381. Captain Christopher B. Johnson
 382. Chief Warrant Officer William I. Brennan
 383. Specialist Andrew C. Ehrlich
 384. Sergeant Douglas E. Bascom
 385. Lance Corporal Jonathan E. Gadsden
 386. Sergeant Dennis J. Boles
 387. Lance Corporal Richard Patrick Slocum
 388. Corporal Brian Oliveira
 389. Staff Sergeant Jerome Lemon
 390. Private First Class Stephen P. Downing II
 391. Specialist Segun Frederick Akintade
 392. Sergeant First Class Michael Battles, Sr.
 393. Sergeant Maurice Keith Fortune
 394. Private First Class John Lukac
 395. Sergeant Kelley L. Courtney
 396. Private First Class Andrew G. Riedel
 397. Lance Corporal John T. Byrd II
 398. Corporal Christopher J. Lapka
 399. Lance Corporal Travis A. Fox
 400. Lance Corporal Michael P. Scarborough
 401. Lance Corporal Jeremy D. Bow
 402. First Lieutenant Matthew D. Lynch
 403. Sergeant Charles Joseph Webb
 404. Specialist Cody L. Wentz
 405. Corporal Jeremiah A. Baro
 406. Lance Corporal Jared P. Hubbard
 407. Sergeant Carlos M. Camacho-Rivera
 408. Private Justin R. Yoemans
 409. Specialist Brian K. Baker
 410. Lance Corporal Sean M. Langley
 411. Specialist Quoc Binh Tran
 412. Lance Corporal Thomas J. Zapp
 413. Corporal Robert P. Warns II
 414. Specialist Don Allen Clary
 415. Staff Sergeant Clinton Lee Wisdom
 416. Staff Sergeant David G. Ries
 417. Lance Corporal Branden P. Ramey
 418. Lance Corporal Shane K. O'Donnell
 419. Corporal Nathaniel T. Hammond
 420. Specialist Bryan L. Freeman
 421. Corporal Joshua D. Palmer
 422. Lance Corporal Jeffrey Lam
 423. Lance Corporal Abraham Simpson
 424. Sergeant David M. Caruso
 425. Sergeant John Byron Trotter
 426. Staff Sergeant Todd R. Cornell
 427. Staff Sergeant Russell L. Slay
 428. Lance Corporal Nathan R. Wood
 429. Lance Corporal Nicholas D. Larson
 430. Corporal William C. James
 431. Lance Corporal Juan E. Segura
 432. Sergeant Lonny D. Wells
 433. Command Sergeant Major Steven W. Faulkenburg
 434. Specialist Travis A. Babbitt
 435. Master Sergeant Steven E. Auchman
 436. Major Horst Gerhard "Gary" Moore
 437. Lance Corporal Wesley J. Canning
 438. Private First Class Dennis J. Miller, Jr.
 439. Staff Sergeant Michael C. Ottolini
 440. Corporal Romulo J. Jimenez II
 441. Lance Corporal Aaron C. Pickering
 442. Staff Sergeant Gene Ramirez
 443. Lance Corporal Erick J. Hodges
 444. First Lieutenant Dan T. Malcom, Jr.
 445. Petty Officer Third Class Julian Woods
 446. Lance Corporal Kyle W. Burns
 447. Second Lieutenant James P. "JP" Blecksmith
 448. Staff Sergeant Theodore S. "Sam" Holder II
 449. Corporal Theodore A. Bowling
 450. Specialist Thomas K. Doerflinger
 451. Staff Sergeant Sean P. Huey
 452. Corporal Peter J. Giannopoulos
 453. Lance Corporal Justin D. Reppuhn
 454. Lance Corporal Nicholas H. Anderson
 455. Sergeant James C. "J.C." Matteson
 456. Lance Corporal Brian A. Medina
 457. Lance Corporal David M. Branning
 458. Sergeant Jonathan B. Shields
 459. First Lieutenant Edward D. Iwan
 460. Corporal Brian P. Prening
 461. Corporal Nathan R. Anderson
 462. Sergeant Morgan W. Strader
 Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).
 Mr. PALLONE.
 463. Corporal Jarrod L. Maher
 464. Specialist Raymond L. White
 465. Sergeant Byron W. Norwood
 466. Lance Corporal Justin M. Ellsworth
 467. Corporal Kevin J. Dempsey
 468. Specialist Jose A. Velez
 469. Lance Corporal Benjamin S. Bryan
 470. Lance Corporal Justin D. McLeese
 471. Lance Corporal Victor R. Lu
 472. Captain Sean P. Sims
 473. Private First Class Cole W. Larsen
 474. Sergeant Catalin D. Dima
 475. Corporal Nicholas L. Ziolkowski
 476. Corporal Andres H. Perez
 477. Corporal Dale A. Burger, Jr.
 478. Lance Corporal George J. Payton
 479. Private First Class Isaiah R. Hunt
 480. Lance Corporal Travis R. Desiato
 481. Lance Corporal Bradley L. Parker
 482. Lance Corporal Shane E. Kielion
 483. Corporal Marc T. Ryan
 484. Lance Corporal Jeramy A. Ailes
 485. Sergeant Rafael Peralta
 486. Lance Corporal James E. Swain
 487. Captain Patrick Marc M. Rapicault
 488. Lance Corporal Antoine D. Smith
 489. Corporal Lance M. Thompson
 490. Lance Corporal William L. Miller
 491. Private First Class Jose Ricardo Flores-Mejia
 492. Specialist Daniel James McConnell
 493. Staff Sergeant Marshall H. Caddy
 494. First Lieutenant Luke C. Wullenwaber
 495. Sergeant Christopher T. Heflin
 496. Lance Corporal Louis W. Qualls
 497. Lance Corporal Michael Wayne Hanks
 498. Lance Corporal Luis A. Figueroa
 499. Sergeant Joseph M. Nolan
 500. Lance Corporal Michael A. Downey
 501. Lance Corporal Dimitrios Gavriel
 502. Lance Corporal Phillip G. West
 503. Corporal Bradley Thomas Arms
 504. Lance Corporal Demarkus D. Brown
 505. Specialist David L. Roustum
 506. Lance Corporal Joseph T. Welke
 507. Sergeant Jack Bryant, Jr.
 508. Corporal Joseph J. Heredia
 509. Specialist Blain M. Ebert
 510. Corporal Michael R. Cohen
 511. Sergeant Benjamin C. Edinger
 512. Sergeant Nicholas S. Nolte
 513. Specialist Sergio R. Diaz Varela
 514. Private First Class Ryan J. Cantafio
 515. Lance Corporal Jeffery Scott Holmes
 516. Corporal Gentian Marku
 517. Private Brian K. Grant
 518. Private First Class Harrison J. Meyer
 519. Lance Corporal Jordan D. Winkler

520. Lance Corporal Bradley M. Faircloth
 521. Lance Corporal David B. Houck
 522. Corporal Kirk J. Bosselmann
 523. Sergeant Michael A. Smith
 524. Specialist Jeremy E. Christensen
 525. Lance Corporal Joshua E. Lucero
 526. Lance Corporal Adam R. Brooks
 527. Lance Corporal Charles A. Hanson, Jr.
 528. Sergeant Trinidad R. Martinezluis
 529. Staff Sergeant Michael B. Shackelford
 530. Sergeant Carl W. Lee
 531. Private First Class Stephen C. Benish
 532. Sergeant Christian P. Engeldrum
 533. Private First Class Wilfredo F. Urbina
 534. Specialist Daryl A. Davis
 535. Specialist Erik W. Hayes
 536. Lance Corporal Blake A. Magaoay
 537. Sergeant Jose Guereca, Jr.
 538. Sergeant Pablo A. Calderon
 539. Specialist David M. Fisher
 540. Gunnery Sergeant Javier Obleas-Prado Pena
 541. Corporal Zachary A. Kolda
 542. Corporal Bryan S. Wilson
 543. Private First Class George Daniel Harrison
 544. Specialist David P. Mahlenbrock
 545. Staff Sergeant Henry E. Irizarry
 546. Corporal Binh N. Le
 Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.
 547. Corporal Matthew A. Wyatt
 548. Sergeant Michael L. Boatright
 549. Sergeant Cari Anne Gasiewicz
 550. Staff Sergeant Salamo J. Tuialuuluu
 551. Sergeant David A. Mitts
 552. Corporal Joseph O. Behnke
 553. Staff Sergeant Marvin Lee Trost III
 554. Staff Sergeant Kyle A. Eggers
 555. Specialist Edwin William Roodhouse
 556. Private First Class Andrew M. Ward
 557. Corporal In C. Kim
 558. Captain Mark N. Stubenhofer
 559. Sergeant First Class Todd Clayton Gibbs
 560. Sergeant Arthur C. Williams IV
 561. Private First Class Christopher S. Adlesperger
 562. First Lieutenant Andrew C. Shields
 563. Chief Warrant Officer Patrick D. Leach
 564. Corporal Kyle J. Renehan
 565. Lance Corporal Gregory P. Rund
 566. Specialist Robert W. Hoyt
 567. Lance Corporal Jeffery S. Blanton
 568. Staff Sergeant Melvin L. Blazer
 569. Lance Corporal Hilario F. Lopez
 570. Corporal Jason S. Clairday
 571. Corporal Ian W. Stewart
 572. Sergeant Jeffrey L. Kirk
 573. Lance Corporal Joshua W. Dickin-son
 574. Private First Class Joshua A. Ramsey
 575. Sergeant Tina Safaira Time
 576. Lance Corporal Richard D. Warner
 577. Private First Class Brent T. Vroman
 578. Specialist Victor A. Martinez
 579. Corporal Michael D. Anderson
 580. Lance Corporal Franklin A. Sweger
 581. Sergeant Barry K. Meza
 582. Staff Sergeant Donald B. Farmer
 583. Sergeant Lynn Robert Poulin, Sr.
 584. Specialist Thomas John Dostie
 585. Specialist Nicholas C. "Nick" Mason
 586. Sergeant David A. Ruhren
 587. Sergeant First Class Paul D. Karpowich
 588. Chief Petty Officer Joel Egan Baldwin
 589. Specialist Cory Michael Hewitt
 590. Private First Class Lionel Ayro
 591. Specialist Jonathan Castro
 592. Captain William W. Jacobsen, Jr.
 593. Staff Sergeant Robert S. Johnson
 594. Staff Sergeant Julian S. Melo
 595. Staff Sergeant Darren D. Van Komen
 596. Sergeant Major Robert D. O'Dell
 597. Lance Corporal Neil D. Petsche
 598. First Lieutenant Christopher W. Barnett
 599. Lance Corporal Eric Hillenburg
 600. Lance Corporal James R. Phillips
 601. Corporal Raleigh C. Smith
 602. Staff Sergeant Todd D. Olson
 □ 2115
 603. Specialist José A. Rivera-Serrano
 604. Seaman Pablito Peña Briones, Jr.
 605. Staff Sergeant Jason A. Lehto
 606. Staff Sergeant Nathaniel J. Nyren
 607. Private First Class Oscar Sanchez
 608. Specialist Craig L. Nelson
 609. Sergeant Damien T. Ficek
 610. Lance Corporal Jason E. Smith
 611. Lance Corporal Brian P. Parrello
 612. Specialist Jeff LeBrun
 613. Sergeant Thomas E. Houser
 614. Specialist Jimmy D. Buie
 615. Private Cory R. Depew
 616. Specialist Joshua S. Marcum
 617. Specialist Jeremy W. McHalfey
 618. Sergeant Bennie J. Washington
 619. Private First Class Curtis L. Wooten III
 620. Sergeant Christopher J. Babin
 621. Specialist Bradley J. Bergeron
 622. Lance Corporal Julio C. Cisneros-Alvarez
 623. Sergeant First Class Kurt J. Comeaux
 624. Sergeant Zachariah Scott Davis
 625. Specialist Huey P. L. Fassbender
 626. Specialist Armand L. Frickey
 627. Specialist Warren A. Murphy
 628. Private First Class Kenneth G. Vonronn
 629. Private First Class Daniel F. Guastafarro
 630. Corporal Joseph E. Fite
 631. Specialist Dwayne James McFarlane, Jr.
 632. Staff Sergeant William F. Manuel
 633. Sergeant Robert Wesley Sweeney III
 634. Specialist Michael J. Smith
 635. Private First Class Gunnar D. Becker
 636. Lance Corporal Matthew W. Holloway
 637. Sergeant First Class Brian A. Mack
 638. Lance Corporal Juan Rodrigo Rodriguez Velasco
 639. Corporal Paul C. Holter III
 640. Sergeant Jayton D. Patterson
 641. Sergeant Nathaniel T. Swindell
 642. Specialist Alain L. Kamolvathin
 643. Private First Class Jesus Fonseca
 644. Private First Class George R. Geer
 645. Private First Class Francis C. Obaji
 646. Staff Sergeant Thomas E. Vitagliano
 647. Captain Christopher J. Sullivan
 648. Sergeant Kyle William Childress
 649. Captain Joe Fenton Lusk II
 650. First Lieutenant Nainoa K. Hoe
 651. Staff Sergeant José C. Rangel
 652. Sergeant Leonard W. Adams
 653. Sergeant Michael C. Carlson
 654. Private First Class Jesus A. Leon-Perez
 655. Sergeant Javier Marin, Jr.
 656. Staff Sergeant Joseph W. Stevens
 657. Sergeant Brett D. Swank
 658. Captain Paul C. Alaniz
 659. Staff Sergeant Brian D. Bland
 660. Corporal Jonathan W. Bowling
 661. Specialist Taylor J. Burk
 662. Lance Corporal Jonathan Edward Etterling
 663. Sergeant Michael W. Finke, Jr.
 664. First Lieutenant Travis J. Fuller
 665. Corporal Timothy M. Gibson
 666. Corporal Richard A. Gilbert, Jr.
 667. Captain Lyle L. Gordon
 668. Corporal Kyle J. Grimes
 669. Lance Corporal Tony L. Hernandez
 670. Lance Corporal Brian C. Hopper
 671. Petty Officer Third Class John Daniel House
 672. Lance Corporal Saeed Jafarkhani-Torshizi, Jr.
 673. Corporal Stephen P. Johnson
 674. Corporal Sean P. Kelly
 675. Staff Sergeant Dexter S. Kimble
 676. Sergeant William S. Kinzer, Jr.
 677. Lance Corporal Allan Klein
 678. Corporal Timothy A. Knight
 679. Lance Corporal Karl R. Linn
 680. Lance Corporal Fred L. Maciel
 681. Corporal James Lee Moore
 682. Corporal Nathaniel K. Moore
 683. Lance Corporal Mourad Ragimov
 684. Lance Corporal Rhonald Dain Rairdan
 685. Lance Corporal Hector Ramos
 686. Lance Corporal Gael Saintvil
 687. Corporal Nathan A. Schubert
 688. Lance Corporal Darrell J. Schumann
 689. First Lieutenant Dustin M. Shumney
 690. Corporal Matthew R. Smith
 691. Lance Corporal Joseph B. Spence
 692. Lance Corporal Michael L. Starr, Jr.

693. Sergeant Jesse W. Strong
 694. Corporal Christopher L. Weaver
 695. Corporal Jonathan S. Beatty
 696. Private First Class Kevin M. Luna
 697. Captain Orlando A. Bonilla
 698. Private First Class Stephen A. Castellano
 699. Specialist Michael S. Evans II
 700. Sergeant Andrew K. Farrar, Jr.
 701. Chief Warrant Officer Charles S. Jones
 702. Specialist Christopher J. Ramsey
 703. Staff Sergeant Jonathan Ray Reed
 704. Staff Sergeant Joseph E. Rodriguez
 705. Specialist Lyle W. Rymer II
 706. Sergeant First Class Mickey E. Zaun
 707. Civilian Barbara Heald
 708. Lieutenant Commander Edward E. Jack
 709. Sergeant Lindsey T. James
 710. Lieutenant Commander Keith Edward Taylor
 711. Private First Class James H. Miller IV
 712. Lance Corporal Nazario Serrano
 713. Lance Corporal Jason C. Redifer
 714. Lance Corporal Harry R. Swain
 IV
 715. Sergeant First Class Mark C. Warren
 716. Corporal Christopher E. Zimny
 717. Specialist Robert T. Hendrickson
 718. Lance Corporal Sean P. Maher
 719. Captain Sean Lee Brock
 720. Lance Corporal Richard C. Clifton
 721. Sergeant First Class Sean Michael Cooley
 722. Sergeant Stephen R. Sherman
 723. Sergeant Daniel Torres
 724. Staff Sergeant Steven G. Bayow
 725. Lance Corporal Travis M. Wichlacz
 726. Specialist Jeremy O. Allmon
 727. Staff Sergeant Zachary Ryan Wobler
 728. Specialist Jeffrey S. Henthorn
 729. Sergeant Jessica M. Housby
 730. Staff Sergeant William T. Robbins
 731. Lance Corporal Richard A. Perez, Jr.
 732. Staff Sergeant Kristopher L. Shepherd
 733. Specialist Robert A. McNail
 734. Staff Sergeant Ray Rangel
 735. Sergeant Chad W. Lake
 736. Sergeant Rene Knox, Jr.
 737. Specialist Dakotah L. Gooding
 738. Private First Class David J. Brangman
 739. Sergeant First Class David J. Salie
 740. Private First Class Michael A. Arciola
 741. Specialist Justin B. Carter
 742. Specialist Katrina Lani Bell-Johnson
 743. Specialist Joseph A. Rahaim
 744. Sergeant Timothy R. Osbey
 745. Sergeant Adam J. Plumondore
 746. Staff Sergeant Jason R. Hendrix
 747. Sergeant Christopher M. Pusateri
 748. Sergeant Frank B. Hernandez
 749. Sergeant Carlos J. Gil
 750. Specialist Seth R. Trahan
 751. First Lieutenant Adam Malson
 752. Corporal Kevin Michael Clarke
 753. Specialist Clinton R. Gertson
 754. First Lieutenant Jason G. Timmerman
 755. Staff Sergeant David F. Day
 756. Sergeant Jesse M. Lhotka
 757. Corporal John T. Olson
 758. Lance Corporal Trevor D. Aston
 759. Staff Sergeant Eric M. Steffenev
 760. Sergeant Nicholas J. Olivier
 761. Specialist Jacob C. Palmatier
 762. Staff Sergeant Daniel G. Gresham
 763. Staff Sergeant Alexander B. Crackel
 764. Specialist Michael S. Deem
 765. Specialist Jason L. Moski
 766. Specialist Adam Noel Brewer
 767. Private First Class Colby M. Farnan
 768. Private First Class Chassan S. Henry
 769. Lance Corporal Andrew W. Nowacki
 770. Private First Class Min-Su Choi
 771. Private Landon S. Giles
 772. Private First Class Danny L. Anderson
 773. Second Lieutenant Richard Bryan Gienau
 774. Sergeant Julio E. Negron
 775. Specialist Lizbeth Robles
 777. Specialist Azhar Ali
 778. Sergeant First Class Michael D. Jones
 779. Sergeant Seth K. Garceau
 780. Corporal Stephen M. McGowan
 781. Specialist Wade Michael Twyman
 782. Sergeant First Class Donald W. Eacho
 783. Captain Sean Grimes
 784. Specialist Adriana N. Salem
 785. Staff Sergeant Juan M. Solorio
 786. Sergeant Andrew L. Bossert
 787. Private First Class Michael W. Franklin
 788. Specialist Matthew A. Koch
 789. Petty Officer First Class Alec Mazur
 790. Specialist Nicholas E. Wilson
 791. Staff Sergeant Donald D. Griffith Jr.
 792. Lance Corporal Joshua L. Torrence
 793. Specialist Paul M. Heltzel
 794. Staff Sergeant Ricky A. Kieffer
 795. Staff Sergeant Shane M. Koele
 796. Specialist Rocky D. Payne
 797. Private First Class Lee A. Lewis Jr.
 798. Specialist Jonathan A. Hughes
 799. Sergeant Paul W. Thomason III

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Members from both sides of the aisle who have participated over the last two days in reading the names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of those fellow citizens who have fallen both in Iraq and in Afghanistan. My colleagues and I will continue this tribute on other evenings as we finish up the over 1,900 fellow Americans who have given their lives, and intend to continue by

recognizing each of our fallen heroes by name on the floor of the people's House.

On behalf of my colleagues, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the brave men and women and their families who continue to serve our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our thoughts and prayers are with you and your families.

HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, tonight we will be engaging in a discussion about our Nation's homeland security. I will be joined by several of my colleagues here tonight who have some very interesting thoughts and perspectives they would like to share with the American people on this most important issue. Homeland security is a matter of concern to all Americans, irrespective of their political affiliation. This is especially true in the United States Congress. The Committee on Homeland Security, of which I am a member, reflects our national concern.

In the last 6 months, our committee has sent to the floor of the House some very important legislation designed to make America's borders, ports, and transportation facilities less vulnerable to terrorist attack or other catastrophe. One such bill is H.R. 1544, the Faster and Smarter Funding For First Responders Act of 2005.

Prior to this bill, grant funding for first responders tasked with responding to homeland emergencies was provided in equal percentage to all States with an allowance upward for population. Because these funds are distributed without regard to safeguarding against risk, there were many documented abuses within the system. Of the \$6.3 billion in grants appropriated by Congress and awarded by the Department of Homeland Security since fiscal year 2002, only 31 percent of those funds have been spent. Let me repeat: of the \$6.3 billion in grants appropriated by Congress and awarded by the Department of Homeland Security since fiscal year 2002, only 31 percent of those funds have been spent.

My own home State of Pennsylvania, that State has only spent 17 percent of these homeland security funds. Hundreds of millions of dollars earmarked for homeland projects are currently unaccounted for. Moreover, in some instances, local communities received these funds, but utilized them in ways that were not consistent with the promotion of our homeland security.

□ 2130

The chart I have here, and I will have those displayed in a moment, but these charts that I have here highlight some of the most egregious examples of misspent homeland security funds:

In Washington, DC, Dale Carnegie public speaking training for sanitation workers, \$100,000 was spent. These were homeland security dollars we are talking about.

Again in Washington, DC, a rap song to teach children emergency preparedness, \$100,000.

Santa Clara County, California, four Segway scooters to transport bomb squad personnel at a cost of \$18,000.

Mason County, Washington, biochemical decontamination units left sitting in a warehouse for more than a year, with no one trained to use it, \$63,000.

South Dakota, on-site paging system for the State agricultural fair at \$29,995.

Converse, Texas, a trailer to transport lawnmowers to lawnmower drag races, \$3,000.

Des Moines, Iowa, traffic cones, State of Missouri, 13,000 HazMat suits for every law enforcement official at \$7.2 million.

Tiptonville, Tennessee, purchases totaling \$183,000 including a Gator all-terrain vehicle at \$8,700 and two defibrillators, one for use at high school basketball games, \$5,200.

Washington, DC, computerized car towing service, \$300,000. Again, we are talking about homeland security funds here.

Montgomery County, Maryland, 8 large screen plasma television monitors for \$160,000.

Prince Georges County, Maryland, digital camera system used for mug shots at a half million dollars.

Newark, New Jersey, air-conditioned garbage trucks at a quarter million dollars.

H.R. 1544 seeks to rectify this deplorable situation by awarding grant funds based on risk. It requires that moneys be disbursed to those areas where threat vulnerability and consequence of attack is the greatest. It provides priority assistance to those first responders and first preventers that in fact are facing the highest risk. It streamlines the process by which local authorities can apply for and receive terrorism preparedness grants. It establishes specific flexible and measurable goals for the Department of Homeland Security and promotes the development of national standards for first responder equipment and training. It encourages regional cooperation to increase emergency preparedness. It follows the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission which had this to say about the prior funding formula: "Homeland Security assistance should be based strictly on an assessment of risks and vulnerabilities. Federal Homeland Security assistance should not remain a program for general revenue sharing. It should supplement State and local resources based on the risk or vulnerabilities that merit additional support. Congress should not use this money as pork barrel." That was the 9/11 Commission.

By directing grant funding to threatened areas without regard to politics,

H.R. 1544 has become a key part of the national security reforms necessitated by the September 11 attacks.

The second piece of legislation that reflects the Homeland Security Committee's bipartisan commitment to the preservation of homeland security is H.R. 1817, the Homeland Security Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006. This act promotes our national security in a number of different areas. To help secure our porous borders it authorizes funds to hire 2,000 new border patrol agents. In addition, it provides \$40 million so that local law enforcement agencies have access to the training required to apprehend illegal immigrants, some of whom may be involved in terrorist activities. To safeguard the cargo coming into our ports, it provides money to promote risk-based screening of containers in transit to the United States. The Container Security Initiative, or CSI, is a Department of Homeland Security initiative or program that places customs employees at 36 foreign ports to target and inspect these containers before they can gain entry to the United States. H.R. 1817 not only funds the existing program, but also makes provisions to expand inspections to approximately 50 ports.

Finally, with regard to deterring a nuclear or biological attack, the act promotes the improvement of the department's intelligence-gathering capabilities that is necessary to detect incoming threats and to develop the means to prevent these efforts.

H.R. 1817 provides the authorization to maintain the funds necessary to keep the country secure, while H.R. 2360, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006, appropriates the moneys required to do the job. Our committee has approved \$30.85 billion for operations and activities of the Department of Homeland Security. This represents an increase of \$1.37 billion over fiscal year 2005 and \$1.3 billion above the President's budget request. As with the authorization bill, border security is a high priority in this legislation. We have appropriated \$1.61 billion for border security and an additional \$3.2 billion for customs enforcement, which will allow the Bureau for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, to hire an additional 150 criminal investigators and 200 immigration enforcement agents. We have appropriated \$188 million to develop vehicle and cargo inspection technologies and we have given the Coast Guard \$2.6 billion to perform its homeland security missions.

H.R. 2360 also helps local first responders perform their vital homeland security mission. Among other expenditures we have earmarked \$200 million for a first responders training, \$400 million for State and local law enforcement terrorism prevention programs and \$600 million for firefighter grants. Since September 11, 2001, Congress has provided over \$32 billion to first responders. Again, since September 11, 2001, Congress has provided over \$32 bil-

lion to our first responders, including terrorism prevention and preparedness, general law enforcement, firefighter assistance, airport security, seaport security, and public health preparedness. And this year's share of that funding comes to approximately \$3.6 billion.

Finally, H.R. 2360 goes a long way toward helping us to maintain security at our transportation hubs and places deemed to be critical infrastructure. We have directed moneys for air cargo security, rail security and trucking security. We have earmarked \$1.3 billion toward research and development, including \$651 million to develop radiological, nuclear, chemical, biological and high explosives countermeasures designed to protect power plants, other industrial properties, and the people that work in or live near those particular facilities. These programs are expensive, but no mission is more important than safeguarding the country against the threat of attack by chemical, biological or nuclear agents, unthinkable attacks, and we are doing all we can to protect ourselves.

These three bills, taken together, the First Responders Act, the Homeland Security Authorization Act, and Homeland Security Appropriations Act reveal that the gentleman from California (Chairman COX), an extraordinary man who the President quite wisely nominated to become the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, he has done an outstanding job. Chairman COX and the rest of the Homeland Security Committee possess the highest possible commitment to keeping our Nation safe from terrorist attack and from other catastrophic events. While all these measures were thoroughly debated in the committee, they all passed to the floor with relative ease, a testament to the timeless adage that so aptly characterizes our political process. In America, debates over homeland security, like those regarding partisan politics, end at the water's edge.

And with that I would like now to turn to some of my colleagues who have joined me here tonight from the Homeland Security Committee, each of whom, many of whom, bring very interesting skills and background to this issue. And the first Member of the committee I would like to draw your attention to introduce is a good friend, my colleague from the 10th district of Texas. In addition to working on the International Relations and Science Committees, he also serves with me on, as I mentioned, the Homeland Security Committee where he is assigned to the Subcommittee on the Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack and the Subcommittee on Management, Integration and Oversight.

My colleague is a former Texas deputy attorney general and chief of terrorism and national security in the Department of Justice for the Western Judicial District of Texas. Further, because of his expertise in homeland security affairs, the Governor of Texas

appointed him to be the adviser to the Governor's office on homeland security. So with that, I would like to introduce to all of you my good friend from the 10th District of Texas (Mr. McCAUL).

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for managing this important debate on probably what is the most important issue facing this Nation today. As we heard the names of the men and women who served in Iraq and Afghanistan who paid the ultimate sacrifice just a few minutes ago in this Chamber, I say to the families, we remember. We thank you. We will never forget.

Every day I meet, it is part of our job, we meet with the families who have lost loved ones over there. And they all tell me the same thing, and that is, finish the job; I do not want my son to have died in vain. And finish the job we will. We thank you for your sacrifice fighting this war on terror abroad so that we do not have to face it here at home. And it has made this Nation more secure in our homeland.

Back home, this Congress has moved faster than ever in passing legislation, which, among other things, fulfills the 9/11 Commission's recommendations by bolstering the security along our borders and sending the badly needed funding to those areas of our Nation that terrorists still see as targets. Indeed, recently the Homeland Security Committee visited Ground Zero. The tragic events of 9/11 are still very much alive and well in that city. We met with the police commissioner. We met with the Liberty Street Firehouse, the fallen heroes, the families who survived that tragic day, who lost so many people. And I can tell you, you can feel it. It is as if it happened just yesterday.

And everything we do in this Congress is to provide the tools necessary to ensure that another 9/11 never happens again in this country. The need for this hard-hitting legislation comes from the United States grave and growing problem with undocumented aliens. An estimated 8 to 12 million undocumented aliens are here in the United States, and it is also estimated that two slip across the border for every one that is apprehended. That means that almost 3 million undocumented aliens enter our country every year; to put it in perspective, roughly the size of the city of Dallas. And in the post-9/11 world, these figures no longer represent just an immigration problem, but rather one of national security.

This Nation is being compromised by our inability to identify those who are coming into our country. And I am convinced that the first step we need to take to solve this problem is to secure our borders and to better enforce the laws currently on the books. Congress knows that immigration plays a major part in our national security. Accordingly, we have provided more than \$1.5 billion in spending for border protec-

tion, immigration enforcement, and related activities in the 109th Congress.

When combining the homeland security authorization and appropriations bill that the House has passed, Congress has supplied funding for all 2,000 new border patrol agents that were recommended by the 9/11 Commission and fully authorized by last year's intelligence reform bill. These agents will have greater authority to detain and incarcerate illegal immigrants, instead of sending them back into our communities with a notice to appear in court, something very few abide by.

Indeed, we do not have to look too far back in history to see an example of this when Ramsey Yusef entered our country in 1992 and was apprehended. He too was given a notice to appear. He too failed to show up to the hearing, and instead he joined his fellow colleagues from the bin Laden academy to join the first al Qaeda cell in the United States. He then conspired to blow up the World Trade Center. Fortunately, he was not successful. But that day would come later and his dream would be realized with Osama bin Laden's dream to bring down the towers that fateful day.

□ 2145

But I say to you, the days of this catch-and-release policy are numbered. Congress has also worked hard to ensure that when border patrol agents catch undocumented aliens, we now have somewhere to hold them before they are extradited. Congress has funded over 4,000 new detention beds to help our Federal law enforcement uphold our Nation's immigration laws.

Our Federal law enforcement officers are being stretched too thin and being asked to do too much. According to current law, immigration laws can only be enforced by Federal law enforcement officials. Couple that with existing sanctuary policies in most of our big cities and one can easily see why our Federal officers have such a difficult time enforcing the laws on our borders.

This is why I offered an amendment to the Homeland Security Authorization Bill that would fund local law enforcement training at Federal facilities in order to create a force multiplier so that our Federal law enforcement gets the assistance it needs.

These additions will crack down on illegal immigration in between our borders and ultimately lessen the threat of terrorism.

Congress has also passed legislation to make America's first responders more expeditious and more effective by improving the process by which they receive their resources. The Faster and Smarter Funding For First Responders Act guarantees that the States with the biggest risk and the greatest threats receive the necessary funding to protect their communities. My home State of Texas, for example, currently ranks last in the amount of homeland security dollars received per person.

And that in a State which claims an international border, the Western White House, and a prominent State capital.

Texas and other States like New York should be receiving more money than those other States with fewer targets. And by closing these gaps in the defense of our homeland, we have learned what our weaknesses are and how to better prepare for, defend against, and preempt a terrorist plot.

Those like al Qaeda who wish to do harm to America have a track record of being patient and conspiring until they succeed in their terrorist agenda.

In my former job, I was chief of counterterrorism in the Justice Department, I had the Mexican border, the State capital, I had the President's ranch. I can tell you the threat is very much still alive in this country, and we need to give law enforcement every tool necessary to protect us and to fight this war on terror not just abroad but at home.

And with that in mind, this body has moved to address that threat. The House passage of the 2006 Homeland Security Authorization and Appropriations Act and Faster and Smarter Funding For First Responder Act send a clear message to our enemies that we will not stand idly by while they plot to do harm to our Nation.

As the President stated, we will not waiver, we will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail. Peace and freedom will prevail.

Mr. DENT. The next speaker tonight who will be joining us in this discuss on homeland security is another good friend who brings to us a great deal of experience. I would like to introduce to you now my colleague from the third district of California. In addition to working on the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the Budget, he also serves with me on the Committee on Homeland Security where he is assigned to the Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment.

My colleague is a former attorney general for the State of California, that State's top law enforcement officer; and he is strongly committed to enhancing the quality and depth of congressional oversight of our government's intelligence gathering and analysis in the provision of homeland security. I would like to introduce the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and commend him for having this Special Order.

When we talk about homeland security, we have to talk about those investigative techniques that are necessary for us to be able to forestall terrorism, terrorist attacks on our homeland; and one of the points I would like to make is prompted by comments that aids to the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Judiciary of the United

States Senate said that he would introduce legislation aimed at limiting the government's ability to detain material witnesses indefinitely.

The reason I mention this is that this is just a part of an overall criticism of this technique of the investigative community. As a matter of fact, the New York Times recently described it this way: that we, that is the Federal Government, are "thrust into a Kafkaesque world of indefinite detention without charges, secret evidence, and baseless accusations." Dozens of people, some were held for weeks and even months and the majority were never even charged with a crime. The Times seethes, did "the Bush administration twist the American system of due process."

An interesting article appeared today in the National Review by Andrew McCarthy, who is a former Federal prosecutor who has actually prosecuted some of the major terrorist cases in this country, that aptly responds to these criticisms of this effort by the Federal law enforcement community.

He says, In point of fact, material witness detentions have been with us for decades pursuant to duly enacted law, that is, section 3144 of title 18 of the U.S. Code. They were used countless times prior to 9/11. Hysteria aside, it should come as no surprise that these are detentions without charges since by definition the person being detained is being detained as a witness, not being charged with a crime.

What would require baseless accusations would be to hold such a person as a defendant, which is precisely what the government refrains from doing in detaining on material witness law. The proceedings, moreover, involve secret evidence only in the sense that all proceedings before the grand jury, whether they involve terrorism, unlawful gambling or anything in between, are secret Under Federal law. The left of course well knows that when investigative information about its champions seeps into the public domain, it routinely complains about the reprehensible violation of grand jury secrecy rules, a useful diversion from dealing with the substance of any suspicions.

Mr. McCarthy goes on, There were many, many people who were identified in that investigation of having had some connection or another with the 19 suicide attackers and their al Qaeda support network. Some of those connections seem intimate, some attenuated; but all of them had to be run down. Just imagine what the 9/11 Commission would have said if they had not been.

So here is the problem, says Andrew McCarthy. You identify a large number of people who at a minimum have information that might be vital to protecting against terrorist attacks and who might in fact be terrorists or at least facilitators. It is very early in the investigation, so you do not have sufficient evidence to charge them with a crime or to say conclusively either

that they are not dangerous or they are willing to tell you what they know rather than flee.

What do you do? It would be irresponsible to do nothing, but you cannot watch these people 24-7. There are not anywhere close enough agents for that. Well, the law does not require you to do nothing. The law which existed before 9/11 but used here permits the government to detain people for a brief time in order to compel their information either in the grand jury or some other court proceedings.

Contrary to what you might think from the latest spate of coverage and from the comments to aides of the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee on the Senate side, the government may not sweep innocent people up and hold them in secret.

While grand jury proceedings are supposed to be kept from the New York Times, for instance, they are not kept secret from the court. A prosecutor has to go to court and get a material witness arrest warrant. This means the arrest does not happen unless the government satisfies a Federal judge that there is a reasonable basis to believe, A, the person at issue has information that would be important to an ongoing investigation and, B, the person might flee without providing that information to the grand jury or the court unless the person is detained until his testimony can be secured.

And that is not all. Mr. McCarthy goes on to tell us the arrested witness, even though he is not being charged with a crime, is given the same kinds of protections that are afforded to actual defendants. The witness must promptly be presented upon arrest to a judge so that a neutral official can advise him of why he is being held. More significantly, counsel is immediately appointed for him at public expense if he cannot afford an attorney. Indeed, if he is a foreign national, the United States is obligated by law to advise him that he is right to have his consulate advised of his arrest. And frequently the consulate will not only obtain counsel on behalf of its citizen but will also closely monitor the case, including by demands for information from the U.S. State Department.

The lawyer is given information about why the witness is being detained. Counsel is permitted to be present at any interview of the witness by the government. And although counsel is not permitted to accompany the witness inside the Federal grand jury, no witness, material or otherwise, has that right, the government is not permitted to interview the witness outside the grand jury unless counsel allows it.

In addition, at any time during the course of the detention, counsel is permitted to make a bail application to the court; and if the judge is satisfied that the bail offered vitiates the risk of flight, the witness is freed on the promise to appear for his testimony.

Furthermore, if at any point the length of detention or the condition of

the witness's confinement actually offend the witness's fundamental rights, counsel may submit a habeas corpus petition seeking the witness's immediate release.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, how is that Kafkaesque? How is that somehow putting people outside the bounds of law? How is that having this administration twisting the Constitution in some way?

It is, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, this kind of hyperbole, this kind of misstatement which makes it more difficult for us to do our duty with respect to homeland security. We need to have those investigative tools that have been used against organized crime, that have been used against organized drug dealers and organizations. We need to be able to use those same investigative techniques, those same prosecutorial tools against those who would destroy us as a Nation, against those who have allied with those who have said it is their duty to kill any American, man, woman or child, anywhere in the world, combatant or non-combatant.

We are in a new world, a world of terror, in which we have to respond in ways that, yes, are consistent with the Constitution, but ways that allow us to protect ourselves in a proper and forceful way. And these kinds of criticisms that come from the outside, whether it is with respect to Guantanamo or whether it is with respect to the use of laws which allow our application of the law against material witnesses, these kinds of attacks weaken our ability to do the job.

And with respect to my second point, let me talk briefly about what we have done here in the House of Representatives to respond to the demand for us to respond to this unique challenge that is the challenge of terrorism.

One cannot criticize a Congress for responding as best it could in the direct aftermath of 9/11. One cannot criticize Congress for doing as Congress always does in attempting to respond to some problems, throwing money at it. But one can criticize Congress at a time it has to take a pause and look at what it has done and seen what it can perhaps do better. And that is what we have done with the various bills that we have passed out of the House that were mentioned by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

One of the things that we did in that was respond to the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission report when they said homeland security assistance should be based strictly on an objective, non-political assessment of risks and vulnerabilities. These assessments should consider the threat of an attack, localities vulnerability to an attack, and the possible consequences of an attack.

Secondly, they told us, Congress should not use this money as a pork barrel. Third, they said, Federal homeland security assistance should not remain a program for general revenue

sharing. Fourth, they told us, the Federal Government should develop specific benchmarks for evaluating community needs and require that spending decisions be made in accordance with those benchmarks. Fifth, they told us, each State receiving funds should provide an analysis of how funds are allocated and spent within the State.

Finally, they said, each city and State should have a minimum infrastructure for emergency response.

□ 2200

This is precisely what we have done with the two bills that have been mentioned before. We have said that rational risk assessment should drive our strategy, should drive our tactics and should drive our funding.

The House Committee on Homeland Security, with the leadership of the gentleman from California (Chairman COX), reported out the Faster and Smarter Funding for First Responders Act. This bill will reduce the across-the-board formula for providing homeland security funds to State and local responders from .75 to .25 percent. Therefore, under this bill, a greater amount of funds will be disbursed solely based on risk assessment.

In April of this year new-Secretary Michael Chertoff testified before our committee regarding the need within DHS to promote risk-based prioritization and management. He said one of the goals before him is to "build a culture in which the disparate pieces of information are being transmitted to our analysts so that they, who have the benefit of the fuller picture, can properly analyze all of our information and inform our decision-making." We do need to make informed decisions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for having this Special Order this evening for us to have an opportunity to recount some of the things that are necessary for us to do to provide for the defense of our homeland and understand that this threat remains.

The biggest challenge we have here today is that the longer we are successful in forestalling terrorist attacks, the more difficult it is to explain to people why we need to continue to keep our defenses up, the harder it is to explain that these things do not happen by happenstance. Rather, it is because of strong work done by brave men and women involved in the protection of our homeland that allow us to be safer than we would be otherwise.

The worst thing we could possibly do is to not maintain our persistence and our dedication, our true dedication to doing those things that are necessary to protect it, despite the criticism of those who easily look at law enforcement, look at homeland security, the community, and saying they are going too far too fast.

Contrary to that, we know we have not done enough, and while we in the

Congress are required to provide the oversight to ensure that there are not abuses in the system and to ensure that no prosecutor, no law enforcement agent takes advantage of those tools we have given them, we also must make sure that they are not cowed by criticism from doing the job that they need to do.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN). I think we have heard quite clearly from these individuals who have tremendous and deep experience in law enforcement in their States. They bring a perspective here that is very valuable to the Committee on Homeland Security and, frankly, to the security of our Nation.

The next person I would like to introduce tonight also has a great deal of experience in law enforcement. Actually, he has 33 years of experience as a first responder. He was the sheriff of King County, Washington. That is the Seattle area, for those of you not from the State of Washington, but the gentleman from Washington's (Mr. REICHERT) Eighth District, again, is just loaded with experience as a first responder or a first preventer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), my colleague, former sheriff and extraordinary member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania and commend him for sponsoring this hour tonight.

We have heard about the Faster Smarter First Responder Act. We have talked about risk assessment. We have talked about the PATRIOT Act. We have talked about better cooperation and those things that we have done as members of the Committee on Homeland Security to support first responders.

As a freshman Member and law enforcement officer of 33 years, as my friend has indicated, I am honored to be a member of the Committee on Homeland Security to represent the thoughts, ideas, needs and concerns of first responders across the Nation. The role of the first responder has changed since September 11, and it is important that we recognize that and equip them accordingly. In the first months of this session, we have given them priority risk-based funding and brought them into important homeland security decisions.

What I want to do tonight is to really focus on where the rubber meets the road and to just take a moment to look back and then take a look forward.

Where were first responders in 1972 when I started out as a cop, as a 21-year-old, naive police officer? The things that we did back in 1972 through the 1970s and into the 1980s was to respond to crime, to operate from our police cars and answer burglary calls and

respond to other crime needs in our community and work with local police departments and local school districts.

Then in the 1980s, we moved ahead and we actually ended up with some additional tools. We look back to 1972, and we think about what did we have for tools? We had a police car, a gun and a badge essentially, and a pair of handcuffs. As we moved forward into the 1980s and into the 1990s, we ended up with tools like DNA, an automated fingerprint identification system, and I know it sounds funny, but computers started to come onto the scene. So we added those tools to our arsenal of crime-fighting weapons.

Then we find ourselves in the 1990s, also in the middle of community policing and our efforts to work with the community to solve not only crime in the communities but to improve the quality of life, to interact with leaders of the community, to sit down and listen to their needs and concerns and come to some solutions for their neighborhoods, even as far as painting over graffiti and towing away old cars. That was what police officers did in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s.

Then came along September 11 and our role changed forever, and as my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) just said, we now live in a different world.

After September 11, the role of the first responder has changed. It still includes those things that I just talked about, the stuff that cops do every day, helping people, arresting crooks, criminals on the streets of our cities across this country, but the added responsibility now of also being a part of the team and protecting our homeland, and they truly are on the front line of that effort.

In our local community in Seattle we have a Joint Analytical Center where police officers from local police departments are assigned to the Federal intelligence task force. We have a regional intelligence task force gathering information within our specific region in the Northwest and sharing with the FBI Joint Analytical Center. That information is analyzed, prioritized, and then assigned to the joint terrorism task force where, again, local police detectives are a part of and member of and participate in investigating and following up those leads that are prioritized by the analytical center. Every day, cops on the streets today are following up leads to find terrorists, people who are in this country to do us harm, and we in the Committee on Homeland Security are here to support that effort.

We would have never thought years ago that police officers on the street would have to respond to calls or train in HazMat uniforms. We would have never thought 5, 10, 15 years ago that we would have had to worry about our police officers and first responders responding to a dirty bomb, a bioterror, or some other weapon of mass destruction, but these are the things today

that our local police officers are trying to deal with, and it is a tough, tough job.

So let us not forget them. Let us support them and we will continue to do our work on the Committee on Homeland Security, and I am proud to be a member of that committee.

I thank the gentleman so much for the time to speak tonight on the role of first responders.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) for sharing his thoughts and perspectives with us, again a 33-year first responder and police officer from the Seattle year.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), another fine individual, member of the committee, from the Third District of Alabama. In addition to working on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Agriculture, he also serves with me on the Committee on Homeland Security where he is assigned to the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology and chairs the Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight. As chairman of this subcommittee, my colleague is very concerned about making sure that the Department of Homeland Security operates in the most efficient and effective and transparent way possible.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for organizing this discussion tonight. It is vital we take the time to talk about these important issues, and I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to highlight some of our accomplishments this evening.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has done many good things to help secure our homeland, some of which we are discussing tonight, but in other areas, we still have a ways to go.

Take, for example, the issue of border surveillance. About 2 weeks ago, the subcommittee I chair held a hearing to discuss the camera system that monitors our Nation's northern and southern borders. Known as the Integrated Surveillance Intelligence System, or ISIS, these cameras are a critical link for helping secure our border.

Unfortunately, this system is not working as planned. What began as a program to monitor the border crossing of illegal immigrants, drug trafficker, and even terrorists has morphed into what one of our witnesses called "a major project gone awry."

According to a 2004 GSA audit, the problems go even further. For example, the initial \$2 million contract was awarded without full competition. Just 1 year later that same contract ballooned to over \$200 million, again without full competition, and the problems do not end there.

The GSA audit also reported significant issues relating to the surveillance system itself: 60-foot poles that were

paid for but never installed; sensitive equipment that failed to meet electrical codes; an operations center where contractors and government employees did little or no work for over a year; and not surprisingly, numerous cost overruns. To top it off, in September 2004, the GSA abruptly ended the maintenance contract. This left approximately 70 border sites without monitoring equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. What we have here, plain and simple, is a case of gross mismanagement of a multimillion-dollar contract. This agreement has violated Federal contracting rules, and it has wasted taxpayers' dollars. Worst of all, it has seriously weakened our Nation's border security.

Before DHS spends another \$2.5 billion on a replacement system known as the America's Shield Initiative, we need to first fix the system we have got. With Federal dollars scarce and budgets tight, it is vital that the American people know what they are getting.

Thanks to the work of this Congress and many of my colleagues here tonight, we are improving the safety of America's homeland, but we still have a ways to go. As we move forward, I hope we can continue to address these issues at DHS.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for his comments as well and appreciate his leadership on the Committee on Homeland Security.

I would now like to further this conversation tonight, this Special Order and this discussion with the American people, and I would like to say a few words about the interrelationship between immigration and homeland security.

While so many immigrants who come to this country do so legally and with the sole intention of seeking a better life, there are those who have links to terrorist organizations or who come here to do us harm. To be fully effective, then, the homeland security programs need to contain measures to curb illegal immigration and to prevent those who would seek to propagate acts of violence from crossing international borders.

Legislation recently passed in the House contains these kinds of measures. The Real ID Act is one such provision. It serves to protect the homeland in four distinct ways.

First, it establishes rigorous proof of identity for all driver's license applicants and strong security requirements for all licenses and State-issued identity cards. It further requires that Federal agencies only accept State-issued licenses and ID cards from those States that have confirmed by substantial evidence that the applicant is lawfully present within the jurisdiction. These measures are important because they make it more difficult for would-be ter-

rorists to utilize phony or temporary licenses or secure cover for their nefarious activities here in the U.S. As the 9/11 Commission states: "It is elemental to border security to know who is coming into the country. Today more than 9 million people are in the United States outside the legal immigration system. All but one of the 9/11 hijackers acquired some form of U.S. identification document, some by fraud.

□ 2215

"Acquisition of these forms of identification would have assisted them in boarding commercial flights, renting cars, and other necessary activities." That is from the 9/11 Commission.

The REAL ID Act also makes it easier to deny asylum to and deport would-be terrorists. Prior to REAL ID, individuals who allegedly committed certain terrorist acts could be denied admission to the U.S., but an anomaly within U.S. immigration law provided that once here, individuals who had committed these same acts could not be deported. The REAL ID Act rectifies this situation.

In addition, terrorist organizations have been using front organizations and alleged charities to support and provide cover for their terrorist activities. As President Bush has stated, "International terrorist networks make frequent use of charitable or humanitarian organizations to obtain clandestine, financial and other support for their activities." Money given to terrorist organizations is fungible. Unfortunately, prior to the act, an alien could provide funding or other material support to many terrorist organizations and then escape deportation merely by claiming he did not know the funds would be spent on weapons or explosives.

The REAL ID Act, by contrast, directs that an alien who provides funds or other material support to a terrorist is inadmissible and deportable if he knew or reasonably should have known that he was giving to a terrorist organization.

Finally, the REAL ID Act provides an important component to the physical security of the United States. In 1996, Congress mandated the building of a 14-mile border fence inland from the Mexican border in the San Diego area. The goal was to curb illegal entries into the most heavily trafficked corner of the United States and to guarantee security at the U.S. naval base in San Diego. More than 8 years later, that fence is still not completed, in large part because the construction is tied up in litigation. In order to facilitate the construction of this important security perimeter, the act waives all Federal laws necessary to ensure the expeditious completion of this structure.

Immigration as a security issue was also the subject of portions of the Homeland Security Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006. The act fully funded the hiring and training of some 2,000

border patrol agents. It also clarifies the existing authorities of State and local law enforcement personnel to apprehend, detain, remove, and transport illegal aliens in the routine course of their duty.

Further, it buttresses up that policy determination that local police have the right to help enforce U.S. immigration laws by appropriating \$40 million in training funds for these same municipal authorities. These funds are available to reimburse those communities that choose to send officers to the Department of Homeland Security programs run by ICE, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, designed to train and certify these officers in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws. Having officers trained in this way can only work to the detriment of a would-be terrorist detained as a result of his committing a crime unrelated to national security.

As I have described, the Homeland Security Act has a strong border security component, but so does the homeland appropriation bill. The appropriation bill provides \$19.4 billion for border protection, immigration enforcement, and related activities, an increase of \$1.9 billion over fiscal year 2005 enacted levels and \$285 million over the President's budget request. These funds support a robust revitalization of immigration enforcement efforts, both along our borders and within the interior of the Nation.

Specific funding includes, but is not limited to, \$3.2 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, providing an additional 150 criminal investigators and 200 immigration enforcement agents; \$61 million for border security technology, including surveillance and unmanned aerial vehicles; \$20 million for replacement border patrol aircraft; \$690 million to fund 3,870 beds to house illegal immigrants detained in U.S. facilities; \$119 million to fund fugitive operations teams; and \$211 million for transportation and removal of undocumented aliens.

All these measures I have previously described are designed to enforce immigration laws, but we must also remember that in doing so we are contributing to the preservation of our homeland security as well. By preventing access to this country by undocumented aliens, by removing those who are here illegally, and by training local police officers to help enforce immigration laws, we will increase the odds that a would-be terrorist seeking to enter our country will be stopped before he can wreak any acts of violence against our citizenry.

Another comment I would like to make with respect to this whole issue of homeland security is this. We have heard from a number of speakers tonight about what the United States Congress is doing to make our homeland more safe and more secure. We have heard about the PATRIOT Act, the Homeland Security Authorization Act, the First Responder Bill, and the

appropriations act. But, really, the bottom line is, why are we going through this? The events of 9/11 should have woken up everyone. I believe they did. Many of us lost friends. I had a relative in the first tower on the 91st floor who escaped, luckily. The plane entered that tower in the 93rd floor, and he lived to talk about it.

So we have all been touched by this in one way or another, and certainly as a freshman Member of Congress I spend a great deal of time going to orientation sessions and being fed a lot of information. I have felt sometimes that being a Member of Congress is sometimes like drinking water out of a fire hose. A lot of information is thrown at you very quickly, and you do your best to absorb it all.

When I was up at Harvard University to be engaged in the orientation program, I met an interesting individual up there, a man name Grahm Allison, who wrote a book called "Nuclear Terrorism," and I highly recommend that people read it because it helps bring focus and clarity to the issue of homeland security and why this government, and not just in the Department of Homeland Security but throughout our Federal Government, State government, our local officials are working so diligently to protect us from unspeakable criminal acts that our enemies would like to commit against us.

I will go to this book, again entitled "Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe," written by Grahm Allison, but he quotes an individual named Suleiman Abu Gheith, who was Osama bin Laden's official press spokesman. Nine months after the 9/11 attacks, Suleiman Abu Gheith made this announcement, and it was put out on al Qaeda Web sites. He says: "We have the right to kill 4 million Americans, 2 million of them children, and to exile twice as many and wound and cripple hundreds of thousands."

What a frightening and extraordinary statement. He says he wants to kill, that al Qaeda wants to kill 4 million Americans. He did not say 1.5 million Americans, he did not say 8 million Americans. He said 4 million, 2 million children. How did he get to that number? He goes on to explain. He itemizes the number. He goes on and he says that for 50 years in Palestine he blames the Jews, and with the blessing and support of the Americans he says the Jews exiled nearly 5 million Palestinians and killed nearly 260,000. They wounded nearly 180,000 and crippled nearly 160,000. And he talks about the American bombings and the siege of Iraq, as he says more than 1.2 million Muslims were killed in the past decade.

So he blames Israel and the United States. He says in the war against the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan, America killed 12,000 Afghan civilians and 350 Arab jihad fighters. In Somalia, America killed 13,000 Somalies. So as he itemizes this number, he somehow gets to 4 million. This is what our enemies are saying about us.

So, then, he asks the rhetorical question as to how should a good Muslim, in his case what he considers a good Muslim, which is not what most of us or most Muslims would consider to be a good Muslim, I am sure, but he said, "Citing the Koran and other Islamic religious texts and traditions," he answers his question by saying, "anyone who peruses these sources reaches a single conclusion: the sages have agreed that the reciprocal punishment to which the verses referred to is not limited to a specific instance. It is a valid rule for punishments for infidels, for licentious Muslims, and for the oppressors."

He concludes: "According to the numbers in the previous section of the lives lost among Muslims because of Americans, directly or indirectly, we are still at the beginning of the way. The Americans have still not tasted from our hands what we have tasted from theirs. We have not reached parity with them." He says, "Parity will require killing 4 million Americans."

This is very frightening. And I would suggest to everyone here today that 4 million Americans is a very big number. On September 11 we lost nearly 3,000 of our own. It would require 1,400 attacks of 3,000 people to get to 4 million.

Al Qaeda is quite clear in their intentions, and it is my belief that they intend to pursue whatever weapons are available to them to maximize the amount of damage they can upon the American people. And that is why our committee is so dedicated, is so committed to making sure that our folks at Homeland Security have what they need to do the job to protect us.

Finally, I want to turn to another man who is a great leader and a friend from my home State of Pennsylvania. I would like to introduce my colleague from the Seventh District of Pennsylvania. In addition to being a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Science, he also serves with me on the House Homeland Security Committee, where he is vice chairman.

He is also active on the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science and Technology, as well as the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Risk Assessment. He is a former first responder himself, an active student of international relations, and an expert on ballistic missile proliferation.

He, too, is an author of a highly acclaimed book, "Countdown to Terror." I have been talking about books, so I might as well mention this one too. It has been talked about quite a bit in the press, and it highlights his concerns about terrorist failures and the spread of ballistic missile technology in Iran. So without any further discussion from me, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and

of ballistic missile technology in Iran. So without any further discussion from me, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague for yielding to me and thank him for this outstanding Special Order. I hope that our colleagues tonight have been listening, because they have seen an outstanding assemblage of excellent young Members of Congress who are picking up the mantle and taking the lead on homeland security issues in our committee.

This is the first year for the full operation of the authorization committee for homeland security funding and oversight, and it is extremely important that we get off to a good start. I just want to say, as a Member who was very aggressively behind this committee, I am overwhelmingly pleased and positive with the type of membership we have on this committee. My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), is an example of an outstanding leader who is committed; and he has brought together an assemblage of Members tonight who have articulated the various parameters of the concerns we face, from first responders, to our borders, to protecting our ports and our airports, and for all of the significant work that has been accomplished under Secretary Ridge, now being accomplished under our current new Secretary and under the able leadership of the chairman of our House Homeland Security Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), and our appropriations subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

□ 2230

Mr. Speaker, later on this evening I will be offering another Special Order that will reveal some absolutely amazing information for the American people. I will divulge tonight the information that prior to 9/11, not only did we know about the Mohammed Atta cell, but that the Special Forces Command in our military actually wanted to take action against that cell, and we did not take that action.

I will be discussing our intelligence in detail, and by following through on a special project that was initiated under the leadership of General Shelton focusing on al Qaeda. But at this point in time, I wanted to stop by and thank our distinguished Members, thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for his leadership, and say to those who participated in this Special Order, if we are going to win the battle and protect the homeland, all Members must play the critical role that you have played tonight and pick a specialty area that you have a focus on so we as a team can make sure that our country is properly protected.

THIRTY-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for half the time until midnight, 44 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor to address the House, and the 30-Something Working Group would like to send our appreciation to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for allowing us to have the time to come to the floor once again to talk about issues that are facing everyday Americans.

The 30-Something Working Group was created in the 108th Congress, some 3 years ago, to start talking about issues that focus on young people, children and grandchildren, about their future and the direction this country is going in. Every 30-Something Working Group hour, we talk about issues that we feel that young Americans and Americans in general should know about, but we also talk about what Democrats are doing that is different than the majority side.

I celebrate the fact that in this democracy we have an opportunity to give our views and opinions as it relates to what is happening and what is not happening. I think both are very, very important. For us to continue to move in the direction that we moved in since we became the United States of America, it is important that we have not only factual information to share with the Members and the American people, but to make sure that we are consistent.

Tonight I am joined by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN). We will talk about issues that are at the forefront of the debate here in Washington, D.C. One is Social Security. Two, we want to continue not necessarily in this order to talk about the issues that are facing veterans. We have men and women that are in the forward area in Iraq and Afghanistan, and many other parts of the world where they are fighting terrorism, but at the same time we have to understand the responsibility of making sure that we keep our end of the deal as it relates to their veterans affairs once they get back.

We have individuals that have served in past conflicts on behalf of this country, that allow us to celebrate the very freedom that we live under today. We cannot leave them behind. We cannot forget them, or turn our back on them. In many places we will point out where there are those in Congress fighting on behalf of veterans, and those in Congress who say they are fighting on behalf of veterans, but it is not coming out on the other end.

I want to talk about the Social Security proposal that has been put forward by not only the President and some Republican leaders, not only in the House but in the other body. I think it is important that the American people understand that in Washington, D.C., all

you may see and hear may not be true. It is also important that we point out those inequities because anything that goes toward private accounts, I think that the American people need to continue to be very wary of. You can dress a private account up and put a fake mustache on it and a wig, but it is still privatization of Social Security.

The bottom line is across the board with both of these proposals, Americans will lose benefits if we go into private accounts. Will private accounts deal with the Social Security solvency issue? I must add that is 47 years away; 100 percent of benefits will still be provided to 48 million Americans, those 33 million in retirement, the rest who are receiving disability and survivor benefits. It will be here. What we are asking for on this side as it relates to the Democratic leadership, not only the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) but also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), our chairman, and our vice chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), we have not only an ongoing, but are working toward a bipartisan approach.

Mr. Speaker, I must also add there is a discussion going on now, there was a press conference last week talking about we have a bill and private accounts. It is not as bad as the President's bill, but it is starting us off on private accounts. In this same press conference it was admitted by the sponsors of the bill this will not deal with the solvency of Social Security. I do not know why we are trying to fool the American people. I do not know why we are going through this dance that we call here in Washington the Potomac two-step, trying to fake out the American people.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and I are going to attempt to share not only with the Members that we know exactly what they are doing, and we are here, elected by the people from our districts, and also representing the people of the United States of America, to make sure that they know exactly what is going on.

Tonight is not about the 30-Something Working Group and what we want to talk about. It is factual. It is not the Tim Ryan report or the Kendrick Meek report, it is what is happening right now, third-party validators. And we will continue to come to the floor to point out factual inequities in what the majority side is talking about. We want to make sure that the American people understand the difference, the difference between the leadership of veterans, or not; and the difference between leadership on behalf of Social Security and making sure that we do not leave the present generation and future generations behind.

We talked last week about the issue of the ever-growing deficit. Guess what, we are going to have to pay it off, and I do mean all of us, some

\$26,000-plus that American people with children, and those unborn, that are going to have to pay because of the ever-growing infatuation with spending.

I think it is important that we point this out.

I want to take a couple of excerpts of what has been said and what has not been done.

For about 6 months the Republicans have talked about, and I would say the Republican leadership because I do not like to generalize. There are some Republicans who are very uncomfortable with both of these proposals. I think it is important that we continue to hold onto those individuals who are showing leadership.

I would also add there are some individuals in the Republican leadership that are trying very quietly to share that private accounts are not the way to go. We are asking them to go see the wizard, not only to get some courage, but to make sure that they stand up to these forces that are trying to push private accounts on the American people.

I have to digress so we can make sure that we all understand, we want to break it down. The bottom line is on the Republican side, by the rules that are set here in the House of Representatives, the majority runs the agenda here in the House. The majority runs the agenda here in the House. I am not only talking to Democrats, Republicans, and the one Independent we have in this House, that we have a responsibility to make sure that we stand up not on behalf of the leader of the Republican Conference or Republicans here in the House, but on behalf of the individuals who woke up early one Tuesday morning to go vote for some leadership. It is time for us to stand up and make that happen.

We hope in the 30-Something Working Group by the pressure applied that two things happen. One, right here and right now, people in the leadership positions make the right decision, to make sure that we make Social Security solvent and do away with the whole idea of trying to go into private accounts.

Private accounts would only benefit those individuals who are involved in the New York Stock Exchange, that care about the \$944 billion that they would be able to prosper from in the next 20 years on the backs of everyday working Americans.

I think it is important that before that happens, in whatever form, and I am in no way supporting or encouraging any of the Members of this House to try to move in that direction, that we need to make sure that Democratic Members who are solid on this issue, and the few Republicans who are solid on this issue, that we stick together on behalf of the American people. Or we may very well have the American people say, fine; I am a Republican or Democrat or Independent, I believe in my Social Security and I want it here.

If you are not a recipient of Social Security, you have a family member that is a recipient of Social Security. If you do not have a family member that is a recipient of Social Security, you will have a family member that will be a recipient of Social Security. That is the good thing about America, is that we care about one another. These individuals work every day and may hurt themselves on the job, and they count on Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, it is once again an honor to have the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) to share this hour, and also to let the Members of this House, to let them know exactly what the truth is.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important as we start tonight and get things rolling here we talk a little bit about what the new proposal is. The 30-Something Working Group has taken a step in another direction as far as our billboards. We are going to go with hand-drawn charts. It is like we are in the locker room during half-time of the football game.

I think it is important to know where we end up after the second proposal that is circulating around Congress. Democrats have not seen one plan yet, but the important thing for the American people to understand is the second proposal that is now circulating around Congress ends up at the same exact place that the first proposal put us.

So here we have on our little chart here everything broken down. The original Bush proposal is on the right, and the new proposal that is circulating in Congress is on the left.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) may remember that the first proposal was out of the 12-plus percent, 12.4 percent you pay into Social Security, half by the employer and half by the employee, the Bush proposal was saying that the employee could take up to 4 percent of that and put it in this side private account. Right out of your paycheck, you could give 4 percent and put it into a private account. The rest of yours, the 2.2 left from yours and I think the 2.2 left from the employer, would go into the Social Security trust fund. The employer was actually getting a break. They would not have to match. So the Wal-Marts of the world would not have to match their employees' 4 percent that they put in the private account. So the diversion into the side account is what led to the whole shortfall.

In the second proposal that is now being circulated around Congress, it is just a shell game. All they do, instead of allowing someone to divert the money right away from their paycheck, you send the whole thing to Social Security and then Social Security takes a portion of it and puts it into a private account with your name on it. So it is just a typical Potomac two-step.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what they are doing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is a typical shell game in Washington. All of a sud-

den we have a new proposal. It is all different. The end result is the same thing. There is money not going into a trust fund that is being diverted into a private account. Here is the kicker. There is going to be a tremendous increase in administrative costs for people to have to handle this money, and there is going to be a reduction in the benefits that people get. That is why we are here every week talking about the same issue over and over because we are not going to allow any privatization scheme to come through this body that is going to reduce the benefits.

In the first proposal from the paycheck to the private account, the rest goes in Social Security. The second proposal, here is the paycheck, and everything goes to Social Security and then Social Security will then divert it to a private account with your name on it. It is just a shell game to try to sell the new proposal. You can put lipstick on a pig, but it is still a pig.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Members need to truly understand this. We know where we are as Democrats. We are solid on the side of the issue of dealing with the solvency of Social Security beyond the 48 years it will be solvent, and beyond 80 percent benefits that individuals will receive after that.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and I have been working on this issue. We have had town hall meetings on it. Democrats have had some 900 town hall meetings throughout the country and will continue to have more to make sure that we fight against this issue of privatization and make sure that we make sure that Social Security is there for future generations.

□ 2245

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

It is wonderful to be here with the both of them, my two esteemed colleagues from the next generation in the United States Congress, and I have been able to listen to a little of what they have been saying on my way over here.

A few weeks ago when we were talking about this before the latest version of the privatization scheme was put on the table, we were talking about how interesting it is that no matter how many times they are told no, they still keep coming back with the same concept, just a different version. And I know I analogized it is like when I speak to my children and they keep asking me and asking me if they can do something that I do not think they should do for one reason or another, whether it is not responsible or they are not old enough, and they try a lot of different versions of the same thing, and the answer is still no because I have carefully reviewed what they want to do, as their parent, and decided it is not the best timing right now or

for whatever reason I have concluded it is not a good idea.

It would be as if one's teenager came to them and said Mom, Dad, I really want to go to this party, and I want to stay out until 2 o'clock in the morning, and the parent said, no, that is not a good idea, and so they come back to them. This new proposal is like if one's teenager came back to them and said I still want to go to the party, but I promise I will be home by midnight. The whole idea was that they did not want them to go to the party in the first place.

And after 60 days initially on the road trying to sell his privatization scheme to the American people and essentially they have rejected it and an additional 60-day effort where the more the President talks about this, the less people like it, it is mindboggling to me. And I am the sort of baby of the group of the three of us, I am a freshman, I was just elected. It is mindboggling to me that they do not want to come to the table now, as we have been asking them to do, and come up with a bipartisan solution.

Privatization balloons the deficit. It cuts benefits; and yet every version of their proposal, the premise of it is to privatize Social Security, and that pulls the safety net out from future retirees and, quite honestly, from people who are about to retire.

I actually had an electronic town hall meeting today at 4:30, which was amazing. We got tremendous feedback. But can I tell my colleagues that not one person who participated, and I had over 100 people participate live and 120 people signed on in advance of our beginning, and no one said, "You really need to consider private accounts. We really want you to do this." I mean, it is time to sit down and put privatization aside, and like in 1983 when Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan and others who were part of that group sat down and in a bipartisan way came up with a solution. It is time.

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman just said in a State like Florida that the President won in the last election is not getting the kind of support. Here is an interesting statistic, group of statistics, asking rural voters: "Are Bush's proposed changes to Social Security mainly consistent with the values of the people in your community or out of step?" And here is the pie chart. All rural voters, consistent with rural voters' values, 27 percent; out of step with our values, 61 percent. And Bush cleaned Senator KERRY's clock in rural areas, and 61 percent of rural America believe that the President's proposed changes to Social Security are out of step with their values. And when we look at white fundamentalists, 55 percent; conservatives, 47 percent; white women, 65 per-

cent; Bush voters, 44 percent; and Southerners, 58 percent.

Why are we having this debate? Why are we having this argument when we have all these other issues that need to be addressed in Congress and the President keeps running against the wall, hitting his head, bouncing back, and thinking if he keeps running and keeps hitting his head that somehow it is going to change. And when this President in particular, who has done so well in rural areas, is losing support on this issue, it is mindboggling to me.

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

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, the two of us are from a State and from a region of a State where it would be expected that there would be deep, deep concern about the potential privatization of Social Security. Obviously, we have a disproportionately high percentage of senior citizens in my district and the gentleman from Florida's district. But like the gentleman from Ohio said, across all demographic groups, all regions of the country, there is no group that has wide or deep support for this concept, and that is because people are uncomfortable at every level with the explosion of the deficit and this proposal's potential to expand it even more.

When I asked at my live town hall meetings whether people were confident enough in their own investment ability to be assured that their own investment decisions would carry them all the way through their entire retirement years, no one except for two people in three town hall meetings with more than 600 people in attendance, no one raised their hand, because look at the ebb and flow of the stock market; and this proposal is not backed by the full faith and credit of the United States. If people hit a bump in the road where one year the stock market is not going so well, it is whatever is left when they retire in that account with a proportionate cut in their Social Security benefits.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right. And if the gentleman from Florida will continue to yield, the new system, the new plan that they have where they give the money to Social Security and they put it in side accounts, they are going to invest it in T bills just like Social Security is. So there is no real advantage.

The argument in the first proposal was that we are going to put it in a private account and they are going to be able to gain all this extra interest. Now the new proposal is saying they are going to take it and put it in a private account and they are only going to be able to invest it in T bills just like Social Security is now. So it is just getting more and more ridiculous. It is like a comedy of errors. Every single new proposal is worse than the last proposal. And I think they need to just work with us, work with our side, let us get a solution, make it more sol-

vent, move forward, and start addressing poverty and health care and all the other issues here.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Florida will continue to yield, if he does not mind my adding one more thing, like I said, I am a freshman. I was elected. I have been in Congress for 6 months. I really expected there to be a lot more collegiality in this body. The gentlemen are veterans, now, of this process. I have talked to my Republican freshmen colleagues on the other side. We all expected there to be more of an opportunity to work together, less rancor. It is sort of astonishing, and it is astonishing, I think, to the average American that we are still bickering about this and that we are all sharpening our elbows and digging in and going to our respective corners instead of acknowledging, like we are willing to do, that there is a problem with Social Security.

It is not a crisis like the President has been portraying; but there is a problem, a long-term problem with Social Security, and we need to come together and make some changes. But, unfortunately, the leadership in this Congress, the Republican leadership, just wants to be right, or somehow if they say it enough times, perhaps they think that they will be right when the American people are clearly telling them they are not.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Or that they just want to win, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman will continue to yield, this sometimes is not even about policy. It is about winning the argument, and they are losing; so they are trying to find a new way to win it, and it is just not working out.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why we are here. It is not about winning or losing under the Capitol dome. It is about the American people being able to win and keep confidence within this body. And I will tell my colleagues now, looking at the recent poll numbers, they do not feel good about what is happening here in Congress.

There was an article on Friday, and it was in The Washington Post: "GOP Sounded the Alarm but didn't Respond to" the issue of Social Security. And I would recommend Members take a look at this. It was written by Michael Allen, and I just want to take an excerpt out of this.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) mentioned something about winning, wanting to win. We are here to win on behalf of the American people; and one Republican Member of the other body, not this House but the other body, and I know that Members understand that we have the legislative branch, judicial branch, and executive branch but the legislative branch consists of the House and the Senate. But in the other body I must add that if the Republicans take this to a vote and the Democrats try to stop us, we will end up as the winners. That comes from a Member of the

other body that is from South Carolina.

Let me just share this with my colleagues. This is not school yard kickball here. This is Social Security, and this is serious business; and this is not about because we can, we will. This is about doing the right thing. And it really is stomach-turning when we see individuals taking an end zone dance and talking about what we can do because we can do it.

If I can, I would like to talk a little bit, because we have limited time here tonight, and we can talk about Social Security, but I have to address this issue of not only the Veterans Affairs but what is happening right now in Iraq and Afghanistan. Earlier tonight during the first Democratic hour, members of the Democratic Caucus read the names of those individuals who have fallen in the line of duty, and we honor and we respect them, and on behalf of a grateful country, we appreciate their family members' sacrifice. They paid the ultimate sacrifice, and so did their loved ones.

A lot of mothers and fathers are no longer with us because we asked them, this Congress asked them, to go into battle and they lost their lives. And, Mr. Speaker, this is the reason why we run not only for Congress. And I hate to hear the gentlewoman from Florida say 6 months. I mean, she spent double-digit years in the State legislature. She has dealt with many of these issues in the Florida house and the Florida senate, and many of those issues are the same here. Unfortunately, the inaction on behalf of the Republican leadership is very disturbing, and I say some of them because I know some are people of good will and want to make sure we do the right thing.

I want to point the attention of the Members, Mr. Speaker, to the June 27, today, article that was on page A13 of *The Washington Post*: "VA Gets the Picture, No Shortfall Here." I just want to take some excerpts out of this article because we have limited time, but we have to make sure that we call a spade a spade, and that is the reason why I like the 30-something Working Group because we put it on the table and let it be known. If anybody wants to make an argument, it is democracy. Bring it on and defend the situations that they are making. But, unfortunately, this is not school yard kickball. This is the United States Congress.

"Turns out that \$1 billion shortfall for health care funding for our Nation disclosed last week by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs hearing is only one of many important and vexing dilemmas facing top officials at the Department of Veterans Affairs."

I am going to go a little further down in the article. It talks about a conversation, I believe a conference call, by the Deputy Under Secretary Laura Miller, who said on the May 27 call, "Many of our facilities, medical centers, community-based outpatient clinics,

there are about 850 of them in the country, many in rural areas," Mr. Speaker, "and some open only 1 or 2 days a month." Not 1 or 2 days a week; 1 or 2 days a month in rural areas. "And other offices have a picture of Secretary Jim Nicholson prominently displayed. Unfortunately, however," Ms. Miller continued, "there are many facilities that currently do not have the picture displayed. I am aware that the mailings of the pictures occurred on April 22, 2005. So that's more than 5 full weeks." It goes on to say that "We are asking that you give this your highest priority."

□ 2300

This is from Washington, DC. The highest priority, we will continue to ask daily on updates of the status until we are sure that all facilities have a current displayed picture.

In the defense of local VA officials, it turns out that Miller was wrong. Not all the photos went out on the 22nd. We are hearing that some officials disagree that the photos should be the highest priority, and they are asking that it should not be. Also they are saying what they are focused on right now at these local VA facilities is they are trying to sell furniture to buy prescription drugs on behalf of veterans out there now.

Then it goes on, and, unfortunately, it gets worse. The Secretary, Mr. Nicholson, when he testified in a hearing last week, Nicholson was the author of an April 5 letter to Senators saying "I can assure you that the VA does not need additional funds to continue to provide timely and adequate service."

Let me just share something with you. The bottom line here, Mr. Speaker, when we have a Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs that is more concerned about his picture being displayed in VA hospitals and community-based facilities, some that I must add are only open 1 or 2 days a month, these are individuals that get all teary-eyed here on the floor talking about what we need to do for the troops and for the veterans, but meanwhile, back at the ranch, we have a \$1 billion shortfall. And Democrats have tried to do something about it.

All I have to say to the Secretary is, he wants his picture displayed, I am going to put his picture in my office. His picture will no longer be the priority on behalf of veterans. We will to the Hill and fight on behalf of veterans and make sure that they do not have to wait 6 months to be able to see the ophthalmologist.

Mr. Speaker, I know I am bending on the time here, but I wanted to share this with my colleagues, because I think it is important that everyone understands we are about the business of not just saying pounding our chest and saying "we are going to go to Iraq and make sure that we have democracy there." We are making sure we keep our promise, not only to those individuals that have served in past conflicts, but are in present conflicts.

So the individuals walking around here talking about what we are going to do, and how long we are going to stay, and there is no plan to make the coalition bigger or no plan really to start talking about how we are going to bring our troop levels down in Iraq, meanwhile Democrats are here adding amendments to the Committee on the Budget. And I must add again, we all know, and it is important our constituents know, that the majority runs this House of Representatives. The bottom line is, they bring bills to the floor, they bring issues to the floor. Some issues we can work with them on. But when it comes down to veterans, to health care, when it comes down to Social Security and folks want to talk about something that is going to take us back versus move us forward, we have a problem with it.

There was an amendment, an alternative to the budget that was passed on March 5 of this year, the Democratic budget. It included a \$20.9 billion increase for the next 5 years for veterans health care in order to meet the needs of the returning soldiers and veterans who rely on VA hospital care. Without that, there will be an estimated fee, can I say "tax" on veterans, to pay more for their health care.

Now, they have been lied to. I will not be an unindicted co-conspirator in that lie. I think it is important that we make sure that the veterans know. I see veterans, and I am not concerned about their party affiliation. The bottom line is what they get and are not getting. What they are not getting, in my opinion, is appropriate representation that they need here in Congress to make sure that they get what they need.

Am I emotional about this? You are dog-gone right I am, because I would not be here under this flag if it was not for individuals that have served this country, day in and day out. Many of them have to put on a prosthetic limb to walk around in the morning. Many of those individuals cannot perform the kind of functions that they carried out prior to going into a conflict. So, I have no time and no tolerance for the Potomac Two-Step.

Once again, Democrats, people want to know the difference. I am sharing it with them right now. Once again, an amendment in the committee by one of our great Members, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), increased health care funding above President Bush's proposed budget by \$1.9 billion, an estimate that the Republican budget plan for \$798 million in veterans cuts over 5 years. Once again, a Democratic Member from Texas supported by Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means, a 15 to 20 vote.

The bottom line is, one of two things needs to happen: Either some individuals on the Republican side have to step up and represent the people that sent them here, or the American people are going to have to make a difference.

I will tell Members in closing that I am really, truly not concerned about

individuals' feelings being hurt about what I am sharing with them as it relates to facts and what we are sharing with them as it relates to facts. If we were here talking fiction, I would not be able to sleep well at night.

I will tell you right now, this is factual. Individuals can go into the record. As a matter of fact, they can go to nationaljournal.com/members/markups/2005/03/200506812.htm and find it. It is what it is. And if individuals do not want to man up and woman up and lead, then the American people need to make other decisions.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the former chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, was removed; not by Democrats, not by the people in his district, but by the Republican Conference. Why? Why? This is Fox News, okay? This is what I am reading right now, Fox News, right off their website. "Smith passed an increase in investment on the Veterans Affairs Administration budget that put him on a different page from party leaders." He is no longer the chairman because he decided to represent the veterans that are out there in America.

So, the gentlewoman knows, being from Florida, we have a number of veterans. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) from Ohio has a number of proud veterans and reserve units in harm's way. It is important to stand up for them.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there are three things I want to add to augment the gentleman from Florida's comments. One of them is 30-something oriented.

I noted when I went and spoke at Memorial Day services this year and Veterans' Day services on November 11 of last year, that every previous Veterans' Day and Memorial Day that I was able to participate in as an elected official prior to my time in the legislature, I was able to thank them. And generally the crowds that come to those events are older folks, senior citizens especially in Florida, veterans of many wars. I was able to say "thank you" from our generation, because prior to now, our generation is the first since before World War II that has never been called to war, that had never had the casualties that the generations before us had. And I was able to thank them for allowing us to stand on their shoulders and their sacrifice.

But I cannot say that any more. I cannot say that any more, because, as was read tonight, the more than 1,500 names that we are in the process of reading, we could have a whole hour just on the Iraq war and our deep concerns over that.

But to continue in the gentleman's thought process about health care for veterans, I visited Walter Reed Army Medical Center a few weeks ago and had an opportunity to visit with soldiers who had come back from Iraq and Afghanistan without their legs, hearing their stories, watching the pain

etched in their face, and the dedication that they have. To the person, they wanted to go back, and their regret was they were not able to, they had to leave their comrades behind.

These people are struggling to get the health care they need when they are still enlisted. At home in South Florida and across the country, our veterans, as the gentleman said, 6 months is not an exaggeration for how long our veterans have to wait to get their health care needs taken care of. Is that the thanks that we give them, the proud veterans that have served this country?

We sound so soap-boxish, but your actions have to back up your words. It is really nice to stand on the floor and give a good speech and get all choked up, but what matters is how you cast that vote and what your light up on that board when they put it up there says, and you are either with them or against them. The Members that voted against those amendments that were offered in committee and on this floor and who opposed them, in spite of valiant speeches that were made on behalf of those veterans, should be ashamed of themselves.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, 70 percent of those currently in Iraq and Afghanistan are under 30, so they are going to need to access this system because they are going to have a lot of years in it.

□ 2310

Mr. Speaker, we are wrapping up here; I think we just have a few minutes left. If you have any e-mails you want to send to us, the address is as follows:

30something.dems@mail.house.gov.
Again, the address is
30something.dems@mail.house.gov.

I received a letter today from a local veteran in Ohio. Korean War veteran Bob Brothers wrote and sent me a copy of a letter to the editor that he was sending. He wrote this after the flag burning amendment that we voted on last week. He calls it, "Conundrum: Congress of the United States is voting on a flag desecration amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America. The riddle is, this allows Congressmen to stand under the American flag and declare, I am patriotic. The pun is these same Congressmen vote against mandatory funding for the Veterans Affairs Department. This demonstrates to me the true hypocrisy of Congressmen and women who vote against mandatory funding for the Veterans Affairs Department. Why are these two items not attached so that courage, honor, and valor become necessary when they enter the Chamber to vote?"

"A veteran is a veteran is a veteran. When as a young kid I hit the beach in Korea, I did not see any Congressmen or Congresswomen, and I was not asked my income before going ashore. I will not vote for anyone who tries to show

they are patriotic by voting for the flag desecration amendment and voting against mandatory funding for the Veteran Affairs Department. Iraqi Freedom veterans take note: as soon as you are discharged, you will begin a life-long battle with your government. A vote for the flag desecration amendment coupled with a vote against mandatory funding for the Veterans Affairs Department brings shame on the very symbol of liberty and freedom that my comrades gave life and limb and more since it all began over 200 years ago. Not giving the care veterans earned and deserved is burning the flag."

That was from Bob Brothers, a Korean War veteran from my district who is at every Memorial Day, at every Veterans' Day event that there is. They are committed to the community. So I just wanted to share that.

We have a long way to go here, and I think the point tonight is, the argument nationally is about Social Security and how we are going to fix a problem that does not exist for 40 years, or are we going to address the veterans issues that we face today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have demonstrated here tonight, as we will in the future, that there are so many issues facing our generation, and we need to make sure that we take this country back in the right direction so that when our generation inherits the results of the decisions that we are making here, that we are not struggling to make sure that we can clean up the mess that was left for us.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, we had another good 30-something Working Group Special Order. We look forward to coming back after we celebrate our independence on the Fourth of July. As my colleagues know, here on the Washington Mall we have quite a celebration and throughout America in many small towns and cities. We will be coming back to the floor to talk about Social Security, factual information, and to talk about how Democrats are part of the solution.

I must say, once again, we are not here to generalize. We have some Republicans on the other end that are totally against the privatization of Social Security and totally for the full funding, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) was, as it relates to veterans affairs, doing better by our veterans. Seventy percent of the individuals who are fighting in Iraq are young people who are doing what they have to do.

Mr. Speaker, with that, we would like to not only thank the Democratic leader but the Democratic leadership for allowing us to come again.

U.S. INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 44 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to discuss for the next 45 minutes the most important topic that will allow us to protect the homeland, provide for the security of the American people and our allies and our troops around the world: our intelligence.

Last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting with the very able and distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). We discussed many things, one of which was a source that I had hoped that we could get some information to assist us in understanding the threats in Iraq and the Middle East, and especially in regard to Iran.

I said to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), I am going to make a prediction to you. Based on my source, I said, common wisdom tells us that the winner of the election in Iran that will take place on Friday and Saturday our time will probably be Rafsanjani. He is the name that most pundits have said would be the likely winner in a two-person runoff against the more conservative and not well-known mayor of Tehran. But I said to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), based on information we had, the election was not going to be close; it will be a landslide. But the conservative mayor of Tehran, a relative unknown, had been anointed by Ayatollah Homeni in Iran and he would in fact win the Iranian election.

We all saw the results, Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night and Sunday morning as, in fact, the mayor of Tehran won the election with a margin of 62 to 38 percent, an overwhelming landslide. I raise this issue, Mr. Speaker, because good intelligence and good information is the most critical tool that we can have over the next several years and decades to protect our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because information has come to my attention over the past several months that is very disturbing. I have learned that, in fact, one of our Federal agencies had, in fact, identified the major New York cell of Mohamed Atta prior to 9/11; and I have learned, Mr. Speaker, that in September of 2000, that Federal agency actually was prepared to bring the FBI in and prepared to work with the FBI to take down the cell that Mohamed Atta was involved in in New York City, along with two of the other terrorists.

I have also learned, Mr. Speaker, that when that recommendation was discussed within that Federal agency, the lawyers in the administration at that time said, you cannot pursue contact with the FBI against that cell. Mohamed Atta is in the U.S. on a green card, and we are fearful of the fallout from the Waco incident. So we did not allow that Federal agency to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, what this now means is that prior to September 11, we had employees of the Federal Government in one of our agencies who actually identified the Mohamed Atta cell and made

a specific recommendation to act on that cell, but were denied the ability to go forward. Obviously, if we had taken out that cell, 9/11 would not have occurred and, certainly, taking out those three principal players in that cell would have severely crippled, if not totally stopped, the operation that killed 3,000 people in America.

Tonight, I am going to provide some background to my colleagues, because I think this represents a major problem with our intelligence that needs to be focused on by the committees of the House and the Senate, by the leadership of the House and the Senate, by John Negroponte, the new person assigned by President Bush, and a very able man, to integrate the 33 classified systems overseen by the 15 Federal agencies.

I want to also start off by praising Porter Goss, the director of the CIA. Porter served us extremely well in this body as the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and he went over to the CIA with an aggressive agenda to change that agency, and he has begun that process. We, in this body, need to rally the American people to support the efforts brought forward by Porter Goss and to allow John Negroponte to undertake perhaps the most difficult task in protecting the security of America, a task that will not be easy, given the history of our Federal agency system.

Let me take my colleagues back, Mr. Speaker, to 1999. It was, in fact, the spring of 1999 when I was first involved in taking a delegation of 10 Members of Congress to Vienna with the support of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and with the support of the Clinton State Department.

□ 2320

The 11-member delegation of five Democrats, five Republicans and myself, along with the State Department employee, traveled to Vienna to meet with five senior leaders of the Russian political parties. Our purpose was to try to reach a framework that could allow for a peaceful resolution of the war in Kosovo on the terms that the U.S. had desired after Ramboulet.

After securing a military plane, my Russian friends told me they were bringing a Serb along with them, a Serb who would be able to understand what we were talking about and help us decide and determine whether or not Milosevic back in Belgrade would accept any recommendations that we would develop. I did not know anything about the Serb. I knew the Russians. But I figure I had better ask the CIA what they knew about this Serb so I could be better prepared, and to make sure that the Serb was not a part of the Milosevic regime, because that would cause myself and my colleagues to be in violation of the Hobbs Act because we were at war with Serbia at that time.

So I called George Tenet. I said, Director Tenet, can you give me some in-

formation about this Serb? His family is evidently well known. I need to know whether or not he is a part of the Milosevic regime. I need to know any other information you can provide to me because we are going to meet with him when we travel to Vienna to meet with the Russian leaders to help provide a beginning of a solution to end the war in Kosovo.

He called me back the next day and he gave me a couple of sentences and said not to worry, he was not a part of the Milosevic regime. And he had strong ties to the Communist Party inside of Moscow and had ties to other leaders in the Russian Government. It was not much to go on.

But at the time, Mr. Speaker, I was chairman of the Defense Research Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. My job was to oversee the funding, approximately \$40 billion of defense research money on new systems and new technologies. And one of the most striking technologies was the work being done by the Army's Information Dominance Center at Fort Belvoir, formerly known as the LIWA, the Land Information Warfare Assessment Center. I had visited the LIWA several times and was tremendously impressed with not just the ability to provide security for our Army classified systems, but I saw a unique approach to doing well beyond that, data mining, data collaboration, using cutting-edge software tools like Starlight and Spirex, able to do profiling. Having plussed-up funding for this facility after talking to George Tenet, I called my friends at the Army's Information Dominance Center and said, can you do something for me as a favor, off the record? And they said sure, Congressman, whatever you like. Would you run me a profile of this Serb, for the same reason I had asked the Director of the CIA. They said, no problem, Congressman; we will get back to you in a few hours. And they did. They gave me 10 pages of information, Mr. Speaker, about the Serb and his ties. Now, the information was not vetted but it was from a number of sources that the Information Dominance Center was able to pull together very quickly. I used that information as we traveled to Vienna to understand who we were meeting with. We had those meetings for 2 days and my colleagues, my five Republican and five Democrat colleagues, worked aggressively to establish a framework that would begin the end of the Kosovo war. In fact, it was historic.

When we returned to Washington several weeks later I was contacted by the FBI and they said, Congressman, we would like to debrief you. We would like you to tell us what you know about that Serb that you all met in Vienna. I said, no problem, I will be happy to do it Monday afternoon in my office. The Friday before the Monday, my D.C. office paged me with a 911 page. When I called them they said, you have got to call CIA Congressional Affairs immediately, which I did. CIA

Congressional Affairs said, Congressman WELDON, we are going to fly two agents to Philadelphia this evening. They will meet you at the airport, at a hotel, at your home, wherever you want to meet them. And I said, I am sorry, I cannot do it. It is a weekend. It is a Friday night. I have got events already planned. What is the urgency of this meeting? And the CIA Congressional Affairs person said well, Congressman, we have been tasked by the State Department to brief our Ambassador, who is negotiating the final terms to end the war in Kosovo, and he needs to know something about this Serb that you met in Vienna. I said, well, the FBI has already called me for that. Can we not do it together? And finally, after pushing back for 10, 15 minutes, the CIA agreed. And so on Monday afternoon in my office I hosted four agents, two FBI and two CIA. These agents asked me four pages of questions about the Serb that I had met with along with our colleagues in the House.

When I finished answering all their questions and giving them all of the information I had, I said to them, now you know where I got my data from, right? And they said, well, you got it from the Russians. I said, no. Well, you got it from the Serb. I said, no. I said, before I left Washington, before I left my office, I called the Army's Information Dominance Center and asked them to do me a favor. They ran a profile and gave me 10 pages. The CIA rep and the FBI rep said, what is the Army's Information Dominance Center, congressman?

It was then, Mr. Speaker, that I knew we had a problem; that our intelligence systems were not linked together, that the stovepipes were so great that we would never be able to deal with emerging transnational terrorist threats. So beginning in the spring of 1999, I began a process working with the Army, and their subgroup working with them, Special Forces Command down in Florida, which had a similar capability to develop a national prototype, a prototype that could be providing support for the President, the National Security Adviser, and all of our policymakers. In fact, working together over a multiweek period, we came up with a plan, a document. And Mr. Speaker, I would like to place this document in the RECORD at this point in time.

NATIONAL OPERATIONS AND ANALYSIS HUB:
NOAH

Policy makers' tool for acting against emerging transnational threats and dangers to U.S. national security.

Policy makers need better decision support tools.

Policy makers continue to work in a vacuum. Briefings and testimonies are the primary vehicles for transmitting information to leadership.

The volume of information germane to national issues is expanding so rapidly that policy makers are overwhelmed with data.

Policy makers need robust situational awareness over growing asymmetric threats to national security.

Policy makers need an overarching information and intelligence architecture that will quickly assimilate, analyze and display assessments and recommended course of action from many national agencies simultaneously.

Policy makers need tools to aid them in developing courses of action against threats to U.S. policy, interests, or security.

Policy makers need virtual communications with one another.

White House, Congress, Pentagon and at the agency levels should each have centers they can go to and receive, send, share, discuss, and collaborate on assessments before they act.

National Level Collaboration Solution: NOAH, National Operations and Analysis Hub.

Tasks supported by NOAH's overarching collaborative environment:

Provide Multi Issue, Multi-agency Hybrid Picture to White House Situation Room, JCS;

HUMINT Support;
Peacekeeping Missions;
Humanitarian Aid;
Battle Damage Assessment;
Develop and Leverage new Technologies of important to national security;
Support Congressional Committees/Hearings;

Apply Analysis of Foreign Threat to Policy;

Provide Hybrid Situational Awareness Picture of the Threat;

Incorporate Industrial Efforts of Interests to the Policy Maker;

Link academia directly to policy maker; and

National Emergencies.
NOAH can leverage existing networks to address diverse issues:

NOAH's Hub Center if linked to other agency centers electronically;

Each key agency must possess a Pod Site and be connected to the NOAH network;

The Pod can consist of a large screen and appropriate connect for collaboration. Operations Centers can simply be converted into NOAH;

National Policy makers cannot control agency Pods, agencies must post replicated data on the NOAH system so that sister groups can access data;

Support multi-level security requirements and can sanitize and "push" data to many types of users to many levels;

NOAH can address National, law enforcement and military needs. The situation will determine the mission;

Ties policy maker, military and law enforcement together;

Goals of the NOAH Hub Center is to apply agency operations, strategies analysis, tactical assessments to a course of action for the policy maker; and

Optimizes group of expertise within each organization—experts always on hand regardless of issue.

NOAH and Pod Site Network:
Part of national policy creation and execution system;

Will existing sites and connectivities where available;

Will share tools available at LIWA IDC so every agency has same tools;

All agencies will post data on NRO highway in a replicated format sensitive to classification;

NOAH's Global Network will use NRO System as backbone;

All centers connect to other centers electronically; and

Mechanism for gathering, analyzing, displaying, tailoring, and disseminating all kinds of information quickly at the national level.

Overview—National Operations and Analysis Hub:

Center dedicated to National Policy Makers at White House, Congress and National Agencies;

Provides system of system advanced technological communications environment to harvest, analyze, display data as needed;

Coordinate and synchronize information among IC, S&T centers, military services;

Provide near real time situational awareness at the national level;

Link virtually via a pod site to every participating member agency; and

Pod sites designed to pull together agency resources on single system of systems.

NOAH's is staffed by members from participating agencies. The staff has a 24 x 7, high bandwidth, virtual connectivity to experts at agency Pod Sites. This provides decision makers with real-time situational awareness of adversary picture and courses.

Steps to Achieve NOAH Capability:

Establish baseline capability by building initial Hub Center and congressional virtual hearing room. Equip White House Situation Room to Collaborate with these sites;

Staff the Hub Center with two reps from each of the 28 key participating agencies;

Link up NOAH internal and external collaborative environment;

Hook in Back up Site for redundancy and begin training on collaborative tools;

Build the 28 Key Agency Pod Sites along model of the Information Dominance Center at Fort Belvoir, VA;

Link all Pod Sites to NOAH hub center establish Protocols for Inter-agency data sharing;

Exercise live ability to retrieve, collate, analyze, display disparate data and provide policy makers course of action analysis at the NOAH Hub Center; and

Refine procedures and Protocols.

Agencies Represented in the National Collaborative Center:

Central Intelligence Agency; Defense Intelligence Agency; National Imagery and Mapping Agency; National Security Agency; National Reconnaissance Office; Defense Threat Reduction Agency; Joint Chiefs of Staff; Army/LIWA; Air Force; Navy; Marine Corps; Joint Counter-Intelligence Assessment Group; ONDCP; and FBI.

Drug Enforcement Agency; U.S. Customs; National Criminal Investigative Service; National Infrastructure Protection Center; Defense Information Systems Agency; State Department; Five CINCs; Department of Energy; Department of Commerce; Department of the Treasury; Justice Department; Office of the Secretary of Defense; National Military Command Center; and National Joint Military Intelligence Command.

Elements to be connected to the national collaborative center would include the White House Situation Room, a Congressional Virtual Hearing Room and a possible redundant, or back-up site.

This document, as you can see, Mr. Speaker, is entitled the NOAH, National Operations and Analysis Hub, Policy Makers' Tool for Acting Against Emerging Transnational Threats and Dangers to U.S. National Security. This 9-page briefing, Mr. Speaker, was put together in the spring of 1999.

I asked the Deputy Secretary of Defense, John Hamre, to take a look at this capability. He went down to the LIWA and he came back and he said, Congressman, you are right. I agree with you. This capability is amazing. It offers unlimited potential. How about sending me a letter describing your interest, Congressman?

So on July 30, 1999, I sent this 3-page letter to Deputy Secretary John Hamre, Deputy Secretary of Defense, at his request, talking about creating an integrated collaborative center for all of our intelligence. I would like to place this letter in the RECORD at this point in time, Mr. Speaker

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 30, 1999.

Hon. JOHN HAMRE,
Deputy Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. HAMRE: I believe the time has come to create a central national level entity that can acquire, fuse and analyze disparate data from many agencies in order to support the policy maker in taking action against threats from terrorism, proliferation, illegal technology diversions, espionage, narcotics, information warfare and cyberterrorism. These challenges are beginning to overlap, thereby blurring their distinction while posing increasing threats to our Nation.

Before we take action to counter these emerging threats, we must first understand their relationship to one another, their patterns, the people and countries involved, and the level of danger posed to our Nation. The Department of Defense has a unique opportunity to create a centralized national center that can do this for the country. It would be patterned after the Army's Land Information Warfare Activity (LIWA) at Fort Belvoir, but would operate on a much broader scale. This entity would allow for near-time information and analysis to flow to a central fusion center, which I would designate the National Operations Analysis Hub (NOAH). I think this title is fitting, as NOAH will provide a central hub built to protect our nation from the flood of threats.

NOAH would be comprised of a system of agency-specified mini-centers, or "pods" of participating agencies and services associated with growing national security concerns (attachment 1). NOAH would link the policymaker with action recommendations derived from fused information provided by the individual pods. NOAH would provide the automation and connectivity to allow the pods to talk together, share data and perspectives on a given situation in a near real-time, computer-based environment.

The NOAH center in the Office of the Secretary of Defense would be comprised of representatives from an initial cluster of pod sites to include: CIA, DIA, National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA), NSA, NRO, Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTSA), JCS, Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, ONDCP, FBI, DEA, Customs, National Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS), National Infrastructure Protection Center, Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA), State, the five CINCS, DOE, INS, Commerce, Treasury.

Elements which would be connected into NOAH would include the White House Situation Room, a Congressional Virtual Hearing Room and a possible redundant (back up) site.

The benefits of creating a NOAH include:

For national policy makers, a national collaborative, environment offers situations updates across a variety of issues and offers suggested courses of action, based on analysis, to help government officials make more informed decisions.

For the Intelligence Community, a national collaborative environment will help end stovepiping and create more robust strategic analyses as well as near real-time support to field operations.

For military commanders and planners, a national collaborative environment offers

full battlefield visualization, threat profiling, robust situational awareness, as well as near real-time support to special missions such as peacekeeping, humanitarian aid, national emergencies or special operations.

For law enforcement, a national collaborative environment provides investigative and threat profiling support, and field station situational awareness.

Along with its system of connected agency pod sites, NOAH would permit the display of collaborative threat profiling and analytical assessments on a large screen. It would be a national level operations and control center with a mission to intergrate various imagery, data and analytical viewpoints for decision-makers in support of national actions. I see NOAH as going beyond the capability of the National Military Command Center (NMCC) and the National Joint Military Intelligence Command (NJMIC), providing recommended courses of action that allow us to effectively meet those emerging challenges from asymmetrical threats in near real-time. Given its mission, I believe that NOAH should reside in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Attachment 2).

I am aware of the initiative to link counterintelligence groups throughout the community. I am also aware of the counterterrorism center at the CIA, the new National Infrastructure Protection Center at the FBI, and a new HUMINT special operations center. I have heard of an attempt to connect the Office of Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) and OSD assets with federal, state and local law enforcement agencies. I also have seen what the Army has done at LIWA, which has created a foundation for creating a higher-level architecture collaborating all of these efforts. Each of these independent efforts needs to be coordinated at the national level. I believe LIWA has created a model that should be used as a basis for creating the participating agency pod sites.

I do not expect that establishment of NOAH should exceed \$10 million. Each agency involved could set up its own pod to connect with the central NOAH site or to exchange data with any of its participants. Each agency could dedicate monies to establish their own pod site, while the \$50 million available in DARPA for related work could be used to establish the NOAH structure immediately.

The NOAH concept of a national collaborative environment supporting policy and decision-makers mirrors the ideas you have expressed to me in recent discussions, and it is a tangible way to confront the growing asymmetrical threats to our nation. I have a number of ideas regarding staffing options and industry collaboration, and would appreciate the opportunity to discuss them with you. Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

CURT WELDON,
Member of Congress.

Secretary Hamre was interested and he told me, Congressman, I will even pay the bill. The Defense Department will provide the funding for this. And I do not care where they put it, Congressman. It could be at the White House, it could be at the NSC, wherever it is most appropriate, but I will pay the bill. But, Congressman, the problem is not with me or the money. You have got to convince the CIA and the FBI that this is something they want to pursue.

In fact, he wrote me a letter, Mr. Speaker, dated October 21, 1999: "Dear

Congressman Weldon, I wholeheartedly agree that combating asymmetrical threats challenging national security requires a collaborative interagency approach as suggested in your concept of the National Operations Analysis Hub. We are actively engaged in assessing how the department should leverage ongoing activities and develop a long-term strategy along these lines. I will keep you apprised of our progress. I would be happy to meet with you on the subject."

And then he puts a personal comment on the note that I will read. "Sir, this is a mealy-mouth response because no one wants to commit to a LIWA-based solution. You know I am very impressed by LIWA and see them involved in a range of activities. I would like to get together with you to review some of our thinking when you have time. John."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place this in the RECORD.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, October 21, 1999.

Hon. CURT WELDON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WELDON: I wholeheartedly agree that combatting the asymmetrical threats challenging National Security requires a collaborative, inter-agency approach, as suggested in your concept of the National Operations Analysis Hub. We are actively engaged in assessing how the Department should leverage ongoing activities and develop a long-term strategy along these lines.

I will keep you apprised of our progress, and I would be happy to meet with you on this subject.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. HARME.

□ 2330

Mr. Speaker, that was in October of 1999 at John Hamre's suggestion on November 4 of 1999, almost 2 years before 9/11. I had John Hamre and the representatives of the CIA and the FBI in my office. And at John Hamre's suggestion, we went through the 9-page briefing to create an overarching national collaborative center. When I finished the briefing which had been prepared for me with our intelligence officials off the record, the CIA said, Congressman WELDON, that is all well and good, but we really do not need that capability. It is not necessary. We are doing something called CI-21; and, therefore, we do not need to pursue that multi-system approach that you have outlined where we bring in all of these other classified systems.

I was very unhappy with that response because I knew full well the Army and our special forces commands were using that capability at that very moment in a special project against al Qaeda.

So, Mr. Speaker, in 1999 and in 2000 and in 2001, I put language in each of our defense bills calling for the creation of a national collaborative center to bring together our disparate intelligence capabilities and systems for 3 consecutive years. And, in fact, one of

those bills required a response by the CIA as to why this system had not been put into place.

But in the meantime, on November 12, 1999, the Defense Information and Electronics Report published an article about the need for a massive intelligence network for shared threat information. On April of 2000, Signal Magazine did another story on a fusion center concept taking root as we kept pushing this process.

Mr. Speaker, the following are both of these articles:

[Nov. 12, 1997]

DEFENSE INFORMATION AND ELECTRONICS
REPORT

WELDON: DOD NEEDS MASSIVE INTELLIGENCE
NETWORK FOR SHARED THREAT INFORMATION

Senior Pentagon officials are mulling over an idea proposed by Rep. Curt Weldon (R-PA) that would link classified and unclassified documents in a massive intelligence clearinghouse that could be accessed by 33 federal agencies—a concept similar in some ways to one floated by DOD intelligence officials but with significantly fewer players involved.

“Our problem with intelligence is that we’re stove-piped,” said Weldon, chairman of the House Armed Services military research and development subcommittee, during a Nov. 8 interview. “Each agency has its own way of collecting data and analyzing it, but they don’t share that information with other agencies. The need is to have a better system of analyzing and fusing data sets across agencies and services—certainly within the Pentagon and the military, but my opinion is that we have to go further than that.”

Weldon first proposed the concept of a “National Operations Analysis Hub” to Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre last July, although the congressman said he kept his initiative quiet until a stronger plan could be developed.

The Pentagon-funded network of agencies would be operated by DOD. According to Weldon, it would pull together large amounts of information to produce intelligence profiles of people, regions and national security threats, such as information warfare and cyber-terrorism.

“The NOAH concept of a national collaborative environment supporting policy and decision-makers mirrors the ideas you have expressed to me in recent discussions, and it is a tangible way to confront the growing asymmetrical threats to our nation,” Weldon wrote in his July 30 letter to Hamre.

The NOAH concept, however, was not wholeheartedly embraced by Hamre, who met with Weldon last summer and told the congressman his suggested use of the Army’s Land Information Warfare Activity at Ft. Belvoir, VA, as a model for NOAH, would never stick.

Because LIWA is already short of resources, the Army is apprehensive about taking on any new tasks, Hamre told Weldon.

Weldon, in a July 21 letter to Hamre, also urged the Pentagon to support additional future funding for LIWA, citing critical budget shortfalls that he said have kept the agency from fulfilling a barrage of requests for intelligence files from Army commanders (Defense Information and Electronics Report, July 30, p1).

“There’s massive amounts of data out there, and you have to be able to analyze it and create ways to focus on that data so its relevant to whatever you’re interested in,” he said this week about his support for LIWA. “Well the Army has already done that.”

While Weldon continues to push for NOAH to be patterned after LIWA, he sees it operating on a much larger scale. Impressed by its ability to pull together huge amounts of both unclassified and classified data, Weldon noted LIWA’s Information Dominance Center can create in-depth profiles that could be useful to the CIA, FBI and the White House. Yet most federal agencies don’t even know LIWA exists, he added.

“Right now the military is limited to [its] own sources of information,” Weldon said. “And in the 21st century, a terrorist group is more than likely going to be involved with terrorist nations. So the boundaries are crossed all the time. We don’t have any way to share that and get beyond the stove-piping.”

Meanwhile, officials within the Defense Department’s intelligence community have been considering another way to amass intelligence information through a concept called the Joint Counter-intelligence Assessment Group. A DOD spokeswoman said proponents of the idea, for now, are unwilling to disclose details about it. She was also unable to say whether a formal proposal to Hamre had been made yet.

In Weldon’s July 30 letter to Hamre, however, Weldon alludes to an ongoing “initiative to link counterintelligence groups throughout the community.”

“I have heard of an attempt to connect the Office of Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) and [Office of the Secretary of Defense] assets with federal, state and local law enforcement agencies,” Weldon wrote. However, Weldon said in the interview he believes JCAG is simply more “stove-piping.”

“I also have seen what the Army has done at LIWA, which has created a foundation for creating a higher-level architecture collaborating all of these efforts,” his July letter states.

NOAH would link together almost every federal agency with intelligence capabilities, including the National Security Agency, the Nation Imagery and Mapping Agency, the Energy Department, the CIA and the FBI. Both Congress and the White House would be offered a “node” for briefing capabilities, meaning intelligence agencies could detail situations on terrorist attacks or wartime scenarios.

“It’s mainly for policymakers, the White House decision makers, the State Department, military, and military leaders,” he said.

Although information sharing among the intelligence community has yet to be formalized through NOAH or JCAG or a similar system, military officials have said they need some kind of linked access capability.

Intelligence systems need to be included within the Global Information Grid—the military’s vision of a future global network that could be accessed from anywhere in the world, said Brig. Gen. Manlyn Quagliotti, vice director of the Joint Staff’s command and control, communications and computers directorate, during a Nov. 5 speech on information assurance at a conference in Arlington, VA.

“We need a more integrated strategy, including help from [the Joint Staff’s intelligence directorate] with Intelligence reports or warnings of an attack,” he said.

Quagliotti said the toughest challenge for achieving “information superiority” is the need to unite networks and network managers under one command structure with stronger situational awareness capabilities.

Part of [the challenge] is the overwhelming amount of information, the ability to access that information, and the ability to reach back and get that information, which means that networks become more crucial to the warfight” she said.

FUSION CENTER CONCEPT TAKES ROOT AS
CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST WAXES

[From Signal, Apr. 2000]

Creation of a national operations and analysis hub is finding grudging acceptance among senior officials in the U.S. national security community. This fresh intelligence mechanism would link federal agencies to provide instant collaborative threat profiling and analytical assessments for use against asymmetrical threats. National policy makers, military commanders and law enforcement agencies would be beneficiaries of the hub’s information.

Prodded by a resolute seven-term Pennsylvania congressman and reminded by recent terrorist and cyberthreat activities, the U.S. Defense Department is rethinking its earlier aversion to the idea, and resistance is beginning to crumble. Funding to establish the national operations and analysis hub (NOAH), which would link 28 federal agencies, is anticipated as a congressional add-on in the Defense Department’s new budget. An initial \$10 million in funding is likely in fiscal year 2001 from identified research and development accounts.

Spearheading the formation of NOAH is Rep. Curt Weldon (R-PA), chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives National Security Committee’s military research and development subcommittee. He emphasizes that challenges facing U.S. leaders are beginning to overlap, blurring distinction and jurisdiction. “The increasing danger is both domestic and international.”

Conceptually, NOAH would become a national-level operations and control center with a mission to integrate various imagery, data and analytical viewpoints. The intelligence products would support U.S. actions. “I see NOAH as going beyond the capability of the National Military Command Center and the National Joint Military Intelligence Command. NOAH would provide recommended courses of action that allow the U.S. to effectively meet emerging challenges in near real time,” the congressman illustrates.

“This central national-level hub would be composed of a system of agency-specified mini centers, or ‘pods,’ of participating agencies and services associated with growing national security concerns,” Weldon reports. “NOAH would link the policy with action recommendations derived from fused information provided by the individual pod.” Automation and connectivity would allow the to talk to each other in a computer-based environment to share data and perspectives on a given situation.

The congressman believes that NOAH should reside within the Defense Department and is modeling the hub’s concept on a U.S. Army organization he closely follows. He says the idea for NOAH comes from officials in several federal agencies. However, it is also based on his own experiences with the U.S. Army’s Intelligence and Security Command’s (INSCOM’s) Land Warfare Information Activity (LIWA) and Information Dominance Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

Patterned after LIWA (SIGNAL, March, page 31), NOAH would display collaborative threat profiling and analysis with the aid of a variety of electronic tools, the hub would support national actions, Weldon discloses.

The congressman is conscious of other initiatives such as linking counterintelligence groups throughout the community. He also is aware of the Central Intelligence Agency’s, (CIA’s) counterterrorism center, the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI’s) National Infrastructure Protection Center and a new human intelligence (HUMINT) special operations center, “We don’t need another

analytical center. Instead, we need a national-level fusion center that can take already analyzed data and offer courses of action for decision making," he insists.

Weldon's wide experience in dealing with officials from the FBI, CIA and the National Security Agency (NSA) convince him that policy makers are continuing to work in a vacuum. "Briefings and testimonies are the primary vehicles for transmitting information to leaders. The volume of information germane to national security issues is expanding so rapidly that policy makers are overwhelmed with data," he claims.

Robust situational awareness of asymmetric threats to national security is a key in assisting leaders, Weldon observes. "Policy makers need an overarching information and intelligence architecture that will quickly assimilate, analyze and display assessments and recommend courses of action for many simultaneous national emergencies," he declares. The concept of NOAH also calls for virtual communications among policy makers.

Weldon's plan is for White House, Congress, Pentagon and agency-level leaders each to have a center where they receive, send, share and collaborate on assessments before they act. He calls NOAH the policy maker's tool. In the collaborative environment, the hub would provide a multiissue, multiagency hybrid picture to the White House situation room and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

NOAH's concept also includes support for HUMINT and peacekeeping missions along with battle damage assessment. The same system could later help brace congressional committees and hearings. The new capability would allow application of foreign threat analyses to policy, while providing a hybrid situational awareness picture of the threat, Weldon relates. Industrial efforts of interest to the policy maker could be incorporated, and academia also could be directly linked.

In meetings with high-level FBI, CIA and defense officials, Weldon stressed the need to "acquire, fuse and analyze disparate data from many agencies in order to support the policy maker's actions against threats from terrorism, [ballistic missile] proliferation, illegal technology diversions, espionage, narcotics [trafficking], information warfare and cyberterrorism." He is convinced that current collection and analysis capabilities in various intelligence agencies are stovepiped. "To some extent, this involves turf protection, but it clearly hinders policy making."

Weldon, who was a Russian studies major, offers some of his own recent experiences as examples of why there is a strong need for NOAH. He maintains close contact with a number of Russians and understands their programs and technologies. The congressman is quick to recall vignettes about Russian officials and trips to facilities in the region.

During the recent U.S. combat action involvement in Kosovo, Weldon was contacted by senior Russian officials.* * *

Weldon learned from the agents that they were seeking information on Karic that they felt the State Department. When he explained that the information came from the Army and LIWA, the CIA and FBI agents had no knowledge of that organization, he confirms. Before his departure for Vienna, the congressman received a six-page LIWA profile of Karic and his family's links to Milosevic.

"This is an example of why an organization like NOAH is so critically necessary," Weldon contends. "LIWA's Information Dominance Center provides the best capability we have today in the federal government to assess massive amounts of data and develop profiles. LIWA uses its contacts with other agencies to obtain database informa-

tion from those systems," he explains. "Some is unclassified and some classified."

Weldon cites an "extraordinary capability by a former CIA and Defense Intelligence Agency official, who is a LIWA profiler, as one of the keys in LIWA's success. She does the profiling and knows where to look and which systems to pull information from in a data mining and extrapolation process," he proclaims. "She makes the system work."

Weldon intends to use LIWA's profiling capability as a model for building NOAH. "My goal is to go beyond service intelligence agencies and integrate all intelligence collection. This must be beyond military intelligence, which is too narrow in scope, to provide a governmentwide capability. Each agency with a pod linked to NOAH would provide two staff members assigned at the hub, which would operate continuously. Data brought together in "this cluster would be used for fusion and profiling, which any agency could then request," he maintains.

NOAH would not belong to the Army, which would continue with its own intelligence capabilities as would the other services. There would only be one fusion center, which would handle input from all federal agencies and from open sources, Weldon explains. "NOAH would handle threats like information operations and examine stability in various regions of the world. We need this ability to respond immediately." The congressman adds that he recently was briefed by LIWA on very sensitive, very limited and scary profile information, which he describes as "potentially explosive." In turn, Weldon arranged briefings for the chairman of the House National Security Committee, the Speaker of the House and other key congressional leaders.

"But this kind of profiling capability is very limited now. The goal is to have it on a regular basis. The profiling could be used for sensitive technology transfer issues and information about security breaches," the congressman allows. LIWA has what he terms the fusion and profiling state-of-the-art capability in the military, "even beyond the military." Weldon is pressing the case for NOAH among leaders in both houses of Congress. "It is essential that we create a governmentwide capability under very strict controls."

Weldon adds that establishing NOAH is not a funding issue; it is a jurisdictional issue. "Some agencies don't want to tear down their stovepipes. Yet, information on a drug lord, as an example, could be vitally important to help combat terrorism." He makes a point that too often, federal agencies overlap each other in their efforts to collect intelligence against these threats, or they fail to pool their resources and share vital information. "This redundancy of effort and confusion of jurisdiction only inhibits our nation's capabilities," he offers.

NOAH would provide high-bandwidth, virtual connectivity to experts at agency pod sites. Protocols for interagency data sharing would be established and refined in links to all pod sites. The ability to retrieve, collate, analyze and display data would be exercised to provide possible courses of action. A backup site would be established for redundancy, and training would begin on collaborative tools as soon as it is activated.

The hub system would become part of the national policy creation and execution system. The tools available at LIWA would be shared so that every agency would have the same tools. Weldon explains that all agencies would post data on the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) highway in a replicated format sensitive to classification. NOAH's global network would use the NRO system as a backbone.

NOAH optimizes groups of expertise within each organization—experts who are always

on hand regardless of the issue. This approach ties strategic analysis and tactical assessment to a course of action. "Before the U.S. can take action against emerging threats, we must first understand their relationship to one another, their patterns, the people and countries involved and the level of danger posed to our nation," Weldon says. "That is where NOAH begins."—CAR

So we have pushed the process, Mr. Speaker. We pushed it in legislation passed by this Congress 3 years in a row. I pushed it publicly in magazine articles, in newspapers, in speeches before intelligence symposiums and agency briefings; but the CIA continued to balk.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have one of the report languages from H.R. 5408, the conference report printed October 6, 2000, the section entitled "Joint Report on Establishment of a National Collaborative Information Analysis Capability."

That section is as follows:

Joint report on establishment of national collaborative information analysis capability (sec. 933)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 905) that would: (1) require the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence to prepare a joint report assessing alternatives for the establishment of a national collaborative information analysis capability; (2) require the Secretary of Defense to complete the data mining, profiling, and analysis capability of the Army's Land Information Warfare Activity; and (3) restrict funds to establish, support, or implement a data mining and analysis capability until such a capability is specifically authorized by law.

The Senate amendment contained no similar provision.

The Senate recedes with an amendment that would: (1) require the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence to prepare a joint report assessing alternatives for the establishment of a national collaborative information analysis capability; and (2) require the Secretary of Defense to complete the data mining, profiling, and analysis capability of the Army's Land Information Warfare Activity. The amendment would not restrict funds, but would require the Secretary to make appropriate use of such capability to provide support to appropriate national defense components.

Mr. Speaker, to push this process, a report came back from the CIA dated May 1, 2001, just a few short months before 9/11. And I will read one sentence in this report in the summary: "A single overarching collaborative solution addressing the totality of mission requirements is not practical."

In other words, the CIA said, We cannot create what the Department of Defense already has. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense and the Army and our special forces commands already had this capability, and they were using it in 1999 and 2000. I knew they were using it, but was not quite sure of the extent of the use until 2 weeks after 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, exactly 2 weeks after 9/11 where I lost some very good friends, Ray Downey, the chief of all rescue for the New York City Fire Department and one of my best friends, was the chief of all rescue at Ground

Zero when the first tower came down. It was Ray Downey who had taken me through the Trade Center in 1993 when bin Laden hit us the first time. It was Ray Downey who convinced me in the late 1990s to introduce legislation, eventually becoming law, to create a commission to make recommendations to prepare for the next terrorist threat.

My legislation was passed, became law, and created what is now known as the Gilmore Commission, chaired by Virginia Governor Jim Gilmore. Ray Downey was one of those commissioners. The Gilmore Commission and Ray Downey gave us three reports before 9/11 of recommendations of things we should be doing to prepare for the next terrorist attack. And they gave us those three reports before 9/11 occurred. In fact, almost 40 percent of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission were actual recommendations of the Gilmore Commission. But because the attack had not occurred, it did not get as much visibility.

On September 11, Ray Downey was killed. I brought his wife and five kids to my district 1 month after 9/11, and 40,000 of my constituents came out to honor Ray as an American hero at a parade ending at our county park.

We also lost one of my neighbors, Mr. Speaker, a fellow graduate of Westchester University, Michael Horrocks who served our Nation in the Navy, was a pilot on one of the planes that was commandeered on September 11. Michael left behind a young wife, a teacher in my district, and two young children in the Rose Tree Media School District. In fact, we built a playground in Michael's honor at the school of the two children.

Mr. Speaker, September 11 touched all of us; 3,700 of us were wiped out. Two weeks after 9/11, my friends from the Army's Information Dominance Center in cooperation with special ops brought me a chart. This chart, Mr. Speaker, this chart. Two weeks after 9/11, I took the basic information in this chart down to the White House. I had asked for a meeting with Steve Hadley, who at that time was Deputy National Security Advisor. The chart was smaller. It was 2 feet by 3 feet, but the same information was in the center.

Steve Hadley looked at the chart and said, Congressman, where did you get that chart from? I said, I got it from the military. I said, This is the process; this is the result of the process that I was pitching since 1999 to our government to implement, but the CIA kept saying we do not need it.

Steve Hadley said, Congressman, I am going to take this chart, and I am going to show it to the man. The man that he meant, Mr. Speaker, was the President of the United States. I said, Mr. Hadley, you mean you have not seen something like this before from the CIA, this chart of al Qaeda worldwide and in the U.S.? And he said, No, Congressman. So I gave him the chart.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is interesting in this chart of al Qaeda, and

you cannot see this from a distance, but right here in the center is the name of the leader of the New York cell. And that name is very familiar to the people of America. That name is Mohammed Atta, the leader of the 9/11 attack against us. So prior to 9/11, this military system that the CIA said we did not need and could not do actually gave us the information that identified Mohammed Atta's cell in New York. And with Mohammed Atta they identified two of the other terrorists with them.

But I learned something new, Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks and months. I have talked to some of the military intelligence officers who produced this document, who worked on this effort. And I found something out very startling, Mr. Speaker. Not only did our military identify the Mohammed Atta cell; our military made a recommendation in September of 2000 to bring the FBI in to take out that cell, the cell of Mohammed Atta. So now, Mr. Speaker, for the first time I can tell our colleagues that one of our agencies not only identified the New York cell of Mohammed Atta and two of the terrorists, but actually made a recommendation to bring the FBI in to take out that cell. And they made that recommendation because Madeleine Albright had declared that al Qaeda, an international terrorist organization, and the military units involved here felt they had jurisdiction to go to the FBI.

Why, then, did they not proceed? That is a question that needs to be answered, Mr. Speaker. I have to ask, Mr. Speaker, with all the good work that the 9/11 Commission did, why is there nothing in their report about able danger? Why is there no mention of the work that able danger did against al Qaeda? Why is there no mention, Mr. Speaker, of a recommendation in September of 2000 to take out Mohammed Atta's cell which would have detained three of the terrorists who struck us?

□ 1140

Those are questions, Mr. Speaker, that need to be answered.

Last week, I asked the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, my good friend, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, my good friend, who I have the highest respect for both of these individuals, to allow us to proceed with an investigation that has not yet been brought forward to the American people and our colleagues in this body.

We need to know, Mr. Speaker, why those recommendations, if they, in fact, occurred, as my intelligence military friends told me that they occurred, why were they stopped. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been told informally that they were stopped because the lawyers at that time in 2000 told them that Mohamed Atta had a green

card and they could not go after someone with a green card.

I have also been told, Mr. Speaker, that it was because of the fear of the lawyers of the fallout that had occurred on the Waco attack in Texas just a short time earlier. Mr. Speaker, if that is, in fact, the case, that is an outrage and a scandal. If our reason for not going after the Mohamed Atta cell was because of the fear of the fallout from Waco, then someone needs to answer some questions.

The bottom line process in all of this, Mr. Speaker, is that this capability, which the CIA said we did not need, which the CIA said was not necessary, which was, in fact, being used by the military, both the Army and Special Forces command did something the CIA did not do. It identified the key cell of Mohamed Atta prior to 9/11, and it actually gave us a suggestion to deal with that cell. Mr. Speaker, this story needs to be investigated. This information needs to be pursued.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the CIA's refusal to implement a national collaborative center, thank goodness our President did respond, and in January of 2003, standing in this very chamber, in the State of the Union speech, he announced the TTIC, the Terrorism Threat Integration Center. Mr. Speaker, the TTIC is identical to the NOAH, no different, same concept, same design, linkage together in one location of all 33 classified systems.

But, Mr. Speaker, we proposed that in 1999, 2 years prior to 9/11. The administration put it into place in January of 2003. That is the same capability that the CIA said we do not need that, Congressman; we cannot do that, Congressman; we have better ways to assess emerging threats. TTIC has now been reformed. It is now known as the NCTC, the National Counterterrorism Center, but Mr. Speaker, I still have concerns, and I rise this evening to express those concerns.

This capability was produced in 1999 and 2000 by the IDC, the Information Dominant Center. I asked them to update me on al Qaeda, to show me what they can do today at the IDC. This, Mr. Speaker, is al Qaeda today. It is obviously impossible for anyone watching our television monitor to see what is on this chart. I have had this chart magnified by a large factor and have large copies in my office.

Each of these little individual people are cells of al Qaeda, are groups of al Qaeda, clusters of al Qaeda around the world. In fact, Mohamed Atta's cell is identified in this chart. This chart, Mr. Speaker, was prepared through the national collaborative efforts of our IDC, using, Mr. Speaker, open source data. That chart was produced with open source data.

What troubles me, Mr. Speaker, is in talking to my friends in the defense community who work with the NCTC, I have learned that quite possibly the NCTC cannot duplicate this capability. That is a question I plan to get answered this week because we have a

very new and very capable leader of the NCTC that hopefully will tell me I am wrong, that they can produce this kind of capability to understand a threat group like al Qaeda.

I rise tonight, Mr. Speaker, to raise the importance of intelligence collaboration. We can never allow ourselves to return back to the days prior to 9/11, to the days where individual agencies or individual agencies that think that they have all of the answers in providing security for our country and intelligence for our agencies and our policy-makers. Mr. Speaker, we can never return to the days of 1999 and 2000, and I hope this is not the case today, but back in those days where the agency bureaucrats were fighting with each other over who would take credit for the best information. Let me read a couple of excerpts, Mr. Speaker.

Back in 1999, when I was pushing the CIA to establish this collaborative capability and our military was actually using that capability, focusing on emerging threats like al Qaeda, this conversation went back and forth, Mr. Speaker, September 1999. This is, by the way, written from military intelligence officers, a summary of notes to me.

At the military's inception, the CIA drags its feet and limits its support to the effort. In an off-the-record conversation between the DCI and the CIA representative to this military unit, a man that I will call Dave and our military intelligence officer explains that even though he understands the military's effort is against the global infrastructure of al Qaeda, he tells me that the CIA will, and I quote, never provide the best information on al Qaeda, end quote. Why would they not do that? Because of the effort that they were taking as part of a finding they had on bin Laden himself and if the military's project was successful it would, quote, steal their thunder. Steal the CIA's thunder.

Dave went on to say that short of the CINC, General so and so, calling the Director, George Tenet, directly, the CIA would never provide the best information to the military on al Qaeda. To my knowledge, that information was never provided.

Mr. Speaker, never again can America allow intelligence bureaucrats to argue back and forth over who is going to steal whose thunder, that you heaven forbid would want to embarrass the CIA because a military intelligence unit got information that is supposed to be under their authority and jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read all these pages, but this classified information that I have to back up what I have given in unclassified format, will be provided and has been provided for the chairman of our intelligence oversight committee and our armed services oversight committee.

Again, I have to ask the question, why did the 9/11 Commission not investigate this entire situation? Why did

the 9/11 Commission not ask the question about the military's recommendation against the Mohamed Atta cell? Why did the 9/11 Commission not document the internal battles and disputes between agency personnel going after the same terrorist organization al Qaeda?

If we are truly going to have an understanding of the need to reform our intelligence system, then we have to be honest with the American people about the past.

□ 2350

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight because I am very troubled by what I have seen and by what I have heard. I have interviewed and talked to some very brave military intelligence officers who, back in 1999 and 2000, were involved in protecting America. They knew what we needed, and they were trying to do it. As I have read to you, there were some in other agencies, especially the CIA and some in DIA, who were saying you cannot do that, that is not your area. That is our area. You cannot steal our thunder. That is our job, not your job.

Never again, Mr. Speaker, can we allow agency bureaucrats to argue over who is going to get the credit for solving the next attack or planned attack against us. I do not rise tonight, Mr. Speaker, to embarrass anyone. I rise tonight because of my own frustration. We knew 6 years ago what direction we had to go. The agency said we do not need that, Congressman, we know better than the Congress. Trust us.

Thank goodness President Bush put that system in place when he took office. If we had had that system in 1999 and 2000, which the military had already developed as a prototype, and if we had followed the lead of the military entity that identified the al Qaeda cell of Mohamed Atta, then perhaps, Mr. Speaker, 9/11 would never have occurred. Certainly taking out the Mohamed Atta cell and two of the terrorists that were with him, would have had a profound positive impact in shutting down the major plan against us that moved forward on September 11, 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I have placed these documents in the RECORD because I want our colleagues to have a chance to read them. I want our colleagues to see the facts and the information, and I want to support our very capable chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) as they move forward with an investigation.

We have to ask the question, why have these issues not been brought forth before this day? I had my Chief of Staff call the 9/11 Commission staff and ask the question: Why did you not mention Able Danger in your report? The Deputy Chief of Staff said, well, we looked at it, but we did not want to go down that direction.

So the question, Mr. Speaker, is why did they not want to go down that direction? Where will that lead us? Why

do we not want to see the answers to the questions I have raised tonight? Who made the decision to tell our military not to pursue Mohamed Atta? Who made the decision that said that we are fearful of the fallout from Waco politically?

Were those decisions made by lawyers? Were they made by policy-makers? Who within the administration in 2000 was responsible for those actions? This body and the American people need to know.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2005, AT PAGE H5116

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Chairman, I believe, under the traditions of the House, the Chair is the Speaker of the Whole House, and the Chair has an obligation to call the vote in the manner in which the vote was arrived at under the voice vote. It is not a question of whether the ayes or the noes will prevail on a recorded vote. The question is what happened on the floor at that particular time. In this instance, the yeas prevailed, and the Chair said the noes prevailed.

A number of years ago, we had very heated debates on this floor from the Republican side, from Mr. Walker, because they felt that they were insulted, especially when cameras came into this Chamber, that the Chair would call votes against their interests when they clearly prevailed on the voice. The Chair was admonished by the Speaker of the House, and we went back to what was the traditionally fair point of view.

So I would ask the Chair in the future, and future Chairs, to recognize that the Chair is calling the event that takes place in front of the Chair on the floor, not what the Chair perceives to be, and may be correctly so, the outcome of the vote later on in the day when the recorded vote is taken.

Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote on the Chair's ruling.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2005, AT PAGE H5163

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 337, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minimum time for electronic voting on any motion to recommit may be 5 minutes, notwithstanding that it would be the first vote in a series.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we cannot hear.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection, and I support the gentleman's motion.

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

There was no objection.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. BISHOP of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. BOYD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 22 and the balance of that week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. CARDIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. ISRAEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of health reasons.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of BRAC hearings.

Mr. HIGGINS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. MICHAUD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and June 28 on account of official business.

Mr. RAHALL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. ROSS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. ISTOOK (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of official business in New York City.

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and June 28 on account of official business in his district.

Mr. MCKEON (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of travel logistics.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of family 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. SCHIFF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, June 29.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, June 29 and 30.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 28, 29, and 30.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, June 28.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 28, 2005, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2466. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of an Accountability Review Board to examine the facts and the circumstances of the loss of life at a U.S. mission abroad and to report and make recommendations at a U.S. mission abroad, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4831 et. seq.; to the Committee on International Relations.

2467. A letter from the Director, U.S. Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for Reporting the Kimberley Process Certificate Number for Exports and Reexports of Rough Diamonds (RIN: 0607-AA44) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2468. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment to the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 022-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

2469. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services from the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 018-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 341. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-155). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 342. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3058) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-156). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 426. A bill to encourage the development and integrated use by the public and private sectors of remote sensing and other geospatial information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 1022. A bill to provide for a Near-Earth Object Survey program to detect, track, catalogue, and characterize certain near-earth asteroids and comets (Rept. 109-158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 3070. A bill to reauthorize the human space flight, aeronautics, and science programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. NEY (for himself and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 3071. A bill to permit the individuals currently serving as Executive Director, Deputy Executive Directors, and General Counsel of the Office of Compliance to serve one additional term; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3072. A bill to revive the system of parole for Federal prisoners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 3073. A bill to allow Congress to reverse the judgments of the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 3074. A bill to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by exempting health care professionals from the Federal antitrust laws in their negotiations with health plans and health insurance issuers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 3075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make health care coverage more accessible and affordable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 3076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for the cost of insurance against negative outcomes from surgery, including against malpractice of a physician; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 3077. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for medical expenses for dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 3078. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the employee portion of Social Security taxes imposed on individuals who have been diagnosed as having cancer or a terminal disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. OTTER):

H.R. 3079. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on the sale of animals which are raised and sold as part of an educational program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GINGREY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 3080. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase tax benefits for parents with children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National HIV Testing Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ISSA, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 343. A resolution commending the State of Kuwait for granting women certain important political rights; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 282: Mr. HULSHOF and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 427: Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 752: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 838: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BARROW, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 867: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 887: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 934: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 939: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 1039: Mr. POMEROY.
 H.R. 1337: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1338: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1339: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 1505: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1651: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROSS, and Mrs. DRAKE.
 H.R. 1678: Mr. PAUL and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 1687: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 1707: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1708: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1742: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 1767: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1791: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 1849: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1898: Mr. SWEENEY.
 H.R. 1902: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1951: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 1993: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2017: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 2206: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2231: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. BARROW, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2248: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2340: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2355: Mr. TOWNS and Mrs. BONO.
 H.R. 2356: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. INSLER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. R. 2526: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H. R. 2588: Mr. GERLACH.

H. R. 2620: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. R. 2646: Mr. CANNON, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. CARDIN.

H. R. 2648: Mr. HERGER.
 H. R. 2671: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. R. 2680: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. R. 2735: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H. R. 2792: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. R. 2794: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. AL GREEN of TEXAS.

H. R. 2803: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania and Mr. CALVERT.

H. R. 2807: Mr. BARROW.
 H. R. 2869: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. R. 2870: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
 H. R. 2874: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. R. 2877: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. R. 2925: Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H. R. 2930: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H. R. 2943: Mr. FORD.
 H. R. 2957: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. HONDA.

H. R. 2981: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. MICHAUD.

H. R. 3000: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. R. 3046: Mr. STARK, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. R. 3064: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H. J. Res. 3: Mr. WAMP.

H. J. Res. 53: Mr. NORWOOD.
 H. Con. Res. 123: Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 175: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FALCONEVAEGA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr.

THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SCHALKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 181: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 187: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. WATSON.

H. Res. 146: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H. Res. 317: Mr. WOLF, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 325: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H. Res. 332: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FARR, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 338: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. HERSETH.

H. Res. 340: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. SESSIONS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: Mr. SIMPSON

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS BY THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK TO SUPPORT EXPORTS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to guarantee, insure, extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by—

(1) the People's Republic of China or any agency or national thereof; or

(2) any other foreign country, or agency or national thereof, if the product to be purchased or leased by such other country, agency, or national is, to the knowledge of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, principally for use in, or sale or lease to, the People's Republic of China.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: Mr. BONILLA

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 4, line 9, before the period insert the following:

“: Provided further, That, of the amounts provided under this heading, \$7,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until the head of the Office of Inspector General in the Export-Import Bank of the United States is appointed and confirmed pursuant to section 3 of the Inspector General Act of 1978”.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: Mr. KUCINICH

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE FOR GUATEMALA

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading “INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING” may be used to provide assistance for Guatemala.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: Mr. ROYCE

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$7,000,000) (reduced by \$7,000,000)”.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

AMENDMENT No. 5: Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS RELATING TO ATTENDANCE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AT CONFERENCES OCCURRING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 Federal employees at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. MCGOVERN

AMENDMENT No. 6: Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. GINGREY

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 948. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance under the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) for any private economic development project (including assistance for any project under paragraph (17) of section 105(a) of such Act) involving the obtaining of property by the exercise of the power of eminent domain.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. GINGREY

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 948. None of the funds made available in this Act for the community development

block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) may be used to provide assistance under paragraph (17) of section 105(a) of such Act for any economic development project involving the obtaining of property by the exercise of the power of eminent domain.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 91, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$7,700,000)".

Page 91, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$3,900,000)".

Page 92, line 23, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$7,700,000)".