



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2005

No. 131

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 17, 2005.

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

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Eternal Father, our Guardian and Stay, protect and guide America's military forces as they face the perils of combat. Strengthen their officers with wisdom and right judgment. May their families know that their country's citizens stand by them with pride and with our prayers.

As Congress addresses the issues of governance this week, be with all the Members of the House of Representatives. May every Democrat, every Republican, and every independent thinking Member come together under the banner of civility to seek only the best answers to the deepest problems facing this Nation.

May people across this Nation rejoice in the realization that this institution is truly government of the people, for the people, and by the people, today and every day. This we ask of You as our Sovereign Guide now and forever. 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.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, Speaker pro tempore TOM DAVIS signed the following enrolled bill on Friday, October 7, 2005:

S. 1858, to provide for community disaster loans.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to

meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

A CONSTITUTION FOR IRAQ

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, once again democracy has trumped anarchy, chaos, and terror. The Iraqis, 61 percent mind you, went out and voted for a new constitution. The Kurds, the Sunnis, and Shiites have formed a new democracy in Iraq. Those cynics, even those in this House who say the Iraqis are not competent to have a republic, have once again been proven to be the ignorant.

I was in Iraq this January and witnessed these proud people yearning to be free. The United States presence in Iraq is serving two purposes: we are fighting and winning the war on terror, and we have helped to establish a democracy, a free nation in that land far, far away.

Even though there are those who have the French mindset and want us to cut and run, we will not do so. We will not run from duty and democracy. When our noble cause is completed and the terrorists are on the run, and when the Iraqis can protect their own nation, our troops will return to these shores.

To those pacifists that cry, Peace, peace, at any price peace, there can be no peace as long as there is some American somewhere dying for the rest of us. That is just the way it is.

IRAQ CONSTITUTION VOTE

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

□ 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.

H8811

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, again, a significant milestone was reached this past weekend in the recovery of the sovereign nation of Iraq.

On my most recent trip to that country this past August, it was clear that the constitution was the key that gets them through the door to the next part of their ability to govern themselves.

There are things in this country that we take for granted, things like bank to check, things like transfer of title of real estate, things that are not possible in a country that does not have a constitution, things that are not possible in a country that does not know the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, in excess of 60 percent of the people of Iraq braved the terrorists, braved the threats of violence to go out and vote. We stand with the people of Iraq today, but mostly we stand with our troops who made this all possible, and I salute their efforts.

IRAQI ELECTION IS A SHINING EXAMPLE OF DEMOCRACY

(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, Saturday's election in Iraq was a shining example of democracy in action and continued proof that the Iraqi people are bravely determining the fate of their nation.

After Iraqi security forces and coalition troops worked together efficiently to provide security for the landmark event, the day was calm and the election was conducted professionally. On Sunday, the Chicago Tribune reported that Iraqis said they felt safer in this election than they did in January.

Most importantly, millions of Shites, Sunnis, Kurds, and Turkmen cast their ballots for a constitution that will protect their rights and serve as a blueprint for their nation's future. Their strong participation demonstrated that Iraqis respect the constitutional process and believe in the promise of democracy. Their success in building a civil society is a critical step of the global war on terrorism, protecting American families.

Today, I am honored to congratulate the Iraqi National Assembly, the Iraqi people, and Iraqi and coalition troops on this historic accomplishment.

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

MARINES PLAY IMPORTANT ROLE IN IRAQ

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have said, the people of Iraq have chosen ballots over bullets. I want to congratulate the United States forces, the coalition forces, and of course the Iraqi security forces which

did a phenomenal job over this past weekend.

I would like to share, Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues a letter that came from the family of Byron Norwood, who, you recall, was killed in the battle of Fallujah last November. His parents were in the gallery when President Bush delivered his State of the Union message. They wrote to the Marines who are getting ready to be redeployed:

"As you prepare to deploy once again, we as Gold Star parents of a sergeant from your own battalion want you to know the depth of gratitude and support felt by Americans everywhere. We live in a time of conflicting messages, as free speech rights are exercised by a vocal few.

"Since the battle of Fallujah last November, we have received countless letters expressing heartfelt thanks to not only Byron but also to you as his fellow Marines. Had we not lost our son, we would not have been aware of the overwhelming appreciation and respect for those of you who wear the uniform.

"Byron loved being a Marine and welcomed the duty and honor of protecting the United States. He also loved his brother Marines and said there was nowhere he would rather be than with them until the mission was complete. He believed strongly in the need to fight terrorism at its source in order to lessen the risk of having to face it in our own neighborhoods. We are grateful for all of you who are willing to fight for something greater than yourselves.

"We are grateful for the freedoms that we are afforded by living in America, and we are aware that those freedoms exist only because we have men and women in the military who, for generations, have fought to protect them. Thank you for taking your place in the ranks of great warriors who understand the value of honor, courage, and commitment."

RECOGNIZING KATHY LINEBERGER

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate an outstanding teacher from North Carolina's Fifth District, Ms. Kathy Lineberger.

Last Thursday, Ms. Lineberger, who teaches at Ward Elementary School in Winston-Salem, was named to USA Today's All-USA Teacher Team. This recognition means that she is one of the top 20 teachers in the United States.

As a reward, Ms. Lineberger will receive \$2,500 to share with her school. She plans to enrich the lives of her students by using a vast majority of her award to purchase books for her classroom.

This is not the first national recognition bestowed to Ms. Lineberger. In 2000, she was named the National CHEM, which stands for Chemistry,

Health, Environment, and Me, Teacher of the Year for writing interdisciplinary lessons. She also won the National Science Educator for Public Understanding Award in 1998 and was the Academically Gifted Teacher of the Year for Winston-Salem/Forsyth County in 2002.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Fifth District are fortunate to have many dedicated and talented teachers like Kathy Lineberger teach our children. I congratulate Ms. Lineberger and wish her continued success.

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 THE IMPORTANCE AND POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CHEMISTRY TO OUR EVERY- DAY LIVES AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NA- TIONAL CHEMISTRY WEEK

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 457) recognizing the importance and positive contributions of chemistry to our everyday lives and supporting the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 457

Whereas chemistry is at the core of every technology we benefit from today;

Whereas the power of the chemical sciences is what they create as a whole; an enabling infrastructure that delivers the foods, fuels, medicines, and materials that are the hallmarks of modern life;

Whereas the contributions of chemical scientists and engineers are central to technological progress and to the health of many industries, including the chemical, pharmaceutical, electronics, agricultural, automotive, and aerospace sectors, and these contributions boost economic growth, create new jobs, and improve our health and standard of living;

Whereas the American Chemical Society, the world's largest scientific society, founded National Chemistry Week in 1987 to educate the public, particularly elementary and secondary school children, about the role of chemistry in society and to enhance students' appreciation of the chemical sciences;

Whereas National Chemistry Week is a community-based public awareness campaign conducted by more than 10,000 volunteers in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico;

Whereas National Chemistry Week volunteers from United States industry, government, secondary schools, and institutions of higher education reach and educate millions of children through hands-on science activities in local schools, libraries, and museums;

Whereas the theme of National Chemistry Week in 2005, "The Joy of Toys", was chosen

to emphasize the chemistry involved in the creation and production of toys and the role that chemistry has played in new material development that has helped to make toys safer and more durable; and

Whereas in recognition of National Chemistry Week, volunteers across the United States will teach children about the chemistry involved with the materials, function, and properties of toys during the week beginning October 16, 2005: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes that the important contributions of chemical scientists and engineers to technological progress and the health of many industries have created new jobs, boosted economic growth, and improved the Nation's health and standard of living;

(2) supports the goals of National Chemistry Week as founded by the American Chemical Society; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Chemistry Week with appropriate recognition, ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of chemistry to our everyday lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 457, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 457, a resolution recognizing the importance of chemistry and honoring National Chemistry Week.

The importance of chemistry in our lives cannot be overstated. As H. Res. 457 recognizes, advances in chemistry impact every one of us, from the creation of a safer child's toy to the search for potential cures for cancer. Without a fundamental understanding of the chemistry that undergirds all modern technologies and products, we would not have the success of space travel or the promise of nanotechnology.

Those who work in the chemical sciences are as important as the products that they produce. Chemical scientists are vital to numerous industries, including the pharmaceutical, agricultural, and automotive sectors. This large and diverse workforce is composed of millions of Americans who work to maintain our global leadership in these and other areas.

In addition, the United States has a history of success in the chemical sciences. Since 1992, every Nobel Prize in chemistry has included at least one

scientist from the United States. Most recently, the 2005 Nobel Prize in chemistry was awarded to two American scientists for developing a chemical process that has resulted in the production of cheaper and more environmentally friendly products.

Yet future accolades and our continued global and economic leadership depend on our ability to inspire the next generation of chemical scientists and engineers.

It is for this reason that H. Res. 457 celebrates the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week. This week, children of all ages will be exposed to the wonders of chemistry. This year's theme, The Joy of Toys, was chosen to highlight the impact of chemistry on the creation and improvement of toys. Why do rubber balls bounce and why do paper boats float are just some of the interesting questions that will be explored through hands-on experiments and demonstrations.

□ 1415

These activities will both educate and inspire participants by creating a fun atmosphere in which to understand the role of chemistry in our daily lives.

In conclusion, I thank the American Chemical Society for its ongoing efforts to educate children and adults about the benefits of chemistry. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for their steadfast leadership on this important issue. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the importance of chemistry in our daily lives and the positive impact of National Chemistry Week by voting in favor of H. Res. 457.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 457 to recognize National Chemistry Week. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for introducing this important resolution which highlights the importance of chemistry and chemical engineering.

Chemistry and chemical engineering affect the everyday lives of all Americans. For example, these disciplines contribute to public health through new biomaterials, drug design, drug delivery techniques, and gene therapy. For decades, they have also contributed to public health by helping to keep our water clean and our food pure. In addition, new structural and electronic materials and advanced technologies that improve energy utilization and transportation systems improve our work and home lives. In short, chemistry and chemical engineering contribute in critical ways to the economic strength, security and well-being of the Nation and all its citizens.

National Chemistry Week was started as an annual event in 1987 by the

American Chemical Society. It sponsors activities to make elementary and secondary schoolchildren and the general public more aware of what chemistry is and its importance to our everyday lives. National Chemistry Week activities are carried out by local sections of the American Chemical Society located in all parts of our Nation.

They work with local industry, schools and museums to design hands-on activities, provide chemical demonstrations and develop exhibits. By these means, the local organizations provide opportunities to stimulate the interest of young people in science and in pursuing careers in science and technology, and the activities of National Chemistry Week help advance the important goal of increasing public understanding of science generally.

For 2005, the theme of National Chemistry Week is "The Joy of Toys." This will emphasize how chemistry has led to safer and more durable toys through advances in materials science and will also illustrate chemical principles and concepts through toys.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the American Chemical Society for its efforts to establish and sustain National Chemistry Week. I am a cosponsor of this resolution to recognize the value of chemistry and the goals of National Chemistry Week. I ask for its adoption by the House.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker I would like to thank the leadership for bringing this bill to the floor, recognizing the importance of chemistry in our everyday lives, and supporting National Chemistry Week. The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, has been a strong supporter as an original cosponsor of this bill and helped to move it forward. Mr. EHLERS and I do this again as the two physicists in Congress, with no irony that again we physicists would be sponsoring National Chemistry Week.

I stand here before you happy to state that in 2003, the last time this body recognized the importance of chemistry in our daily lives, and the importance of National Chemistry Week, I had 3 cosponsors, and this year I have 21 cosponsors. With the world unfolding as it is, and with great rapidity, the increase of cosponsors is an indication of the growing understanding of the importance of chemistry, and science, in our daily lives.

JOY OF TOYS THEME FOR NATIONAL CHEMISTRY WEEK

The American Chemical Society should be commended for establishing National Chemistry Week in 1987, to raise the awareness of the chemistry in our daily lives, now in its eighteenth year. In particular this year's theme of the "Joy of Toys", supports the universality of chemistry and its creations, for each of us has played, and I hope continues to play, with toys. Every child on this planet of ours, regardless of location, does several things growing up: we are innate explorers of this world, and we play.

To watch children at play re-ignites in us the joy and wonder that we experienced as we played with toys and created our world understanding. As we grow and learn our toys match our intellectual growth and our physical capabilities. The curiosity that toys ignite through the queries of "why did it do that?" and "how did that happen?" invigorates the

exploration and discovery of the world around us. Many scientists and engineers turn to toys for moments of respite and inspiration. Innovation in technology at times can be traced back to moments with toys.

In fact, BusinessWeek Online ran an article with the subtitle "Toymakers are pushing the boundaries in artificial intelligence, wireless communications, and virtual realities. And the benefits are flowing to other industries as well." The military, the medical field, gamers, chemists, chemical engineers, and material scientists all connect to the toy industry. Chemists and material scientists have created such material as self-healing plastics, prolonging the life of toys and many consumer goods.

Toys spark the imagination, imaginations fuels innovation. Chemistry is a science which is the backbone to the health of many industries including pharmaceuticals, electronics, automotive, agricultural, and aerospace. A fundamental piece of chemistry is the periodic table of the elements, a simple chart whose intricacies determine how atoms bond to create the world around us.

ELEMENTS OFF THE PERIODIC TABLE AND THEIR INNOVATION TECHNOLOGIES

The element hydrogen, the first element on the periodic table and the most abundant element in the universe, has sparked innovation in fuel cells. Hydrogen and oxygen are the fundamental elements involved in fuel cells, an alternative energy source with both low and high temperature functions. Low temperature fuels cells, which work similar to batteries, are being developed for cell phones, laptops, and video cameras. Yet innovations still await the future scientists and engineers of America, as we do not yet know how to make sufficient quantities of hydrogen available, and the tasks of making this a completely clean energy have yet to be fully surmounted to produce commercial goods.

Fluorine, element #9 on the periodic table, is found in toothpaste and liquid crystals found in flat-screen televisions, to give higher resolution, good brightness, and sharp contrast with about half the power consumption! Yet on the frontier of innovation are organic light emitting diodes, which would require far less power and allow us to roll up the screens for our laptops! There is much creativity and unbounded vision necessary for the new products to follow.

The high tech fiber industry has taken science fiction into fashion by creating keyboards in shirtsleeves powered by a thermogenerator chip that converts your body heat into power. More conventionally, micro-fibers are found in fabrics advertised to breathe with you and they stay dry in the rain. Flame-resistant micro fibers found in your curtains, your couches, and your carpets make your home safer. Chemists are now adding titanium dioxide to fabric to make the fabric UV resistant, thus protecting you even further from damaging UV rays. The innovation continues!

The extent to which chemistry and the products, processes, and thinking that chemists create and modify affect our daily lives is undeniable.

CHANGING WORLD & ECONOMY: MOVING AMERICA FORWARD

However, Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate a fundamental science and its engineering applications, we must not forget how these innovative processes and products came to us—

through the work of Americans and people who came to America to work.

Today we are facing a world that is described by Thomas Friedman as flat; that is, the playing field has reasonably flattened, all countries and companies can be at times perceived as on the same level. America has to find its place in this new world, and we must do this rapidly for our economic future.

The goals of National Chemistry week include the invigoration of the curiosity of our youth in chemistry. We must enliven our students to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. We need teachers to share the joy of science, technology, engineering, and math to our students. We ourselves must reflect the necessity and importance of these fields, and the teaching of these fields, to the future of America through legislation and action. Today is a good start to the action which is required.

We must rise up as nation, similarly to the Sputnik era, where there was a goal to have a superior technical workforce, second to none in engineering and science. I raise a hand to move forward with caution, however, as the Sputnik era, I feel, left behind too many Americans. We focused on a segment of the population. Now we must aim to create a scientifically and technically literate nation of citizens who apply critical, creative, and innovative thinking to their work and their everyday lives.

INVESTMENTS IN THE FUTURE: EDUCATION, R & D, ATTRACTING BEST & BRIGHTEST

We begin this through improving our nation's investment in the future. The prime investment any nation can make in its future is investing in education. Teachers create our future, through educating our youth and opening their minds and hearts to the world, and we owe nothing less to our future, our youth, then to invest fully in them. We must enable a teaching core whose education and teaching skills are strong, flexible, and motivating. If we wish our students to rise to college level and beyond, we should expect nothing less from their teachers, and offer the same support for teachers to reach the highest level of educational achievement.

Further investment in America's future must be into research and development. Each product I mentioned today went through a period of research and development. The future of America, like its past, will not be handed to America. As our forefathers did so long ago, we will work hard and create the country in which we will live. Research and development is part of the hard work, the investment in the future. We must additionally make it easier for companies to invest time, energy, and finances into research and development, as there is often loss with unsuccessful innovation.

We must make our country an attractive location for the best and brightest scientists and engineers to live and to work. We must invest in infrastructures including that of research and development, the institutions and physical structures, the U.S. Patent office, the U.S. Department of Immigration, and in the National Science Foundation.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged at the level of support for National Chemistry Week, and the ideals and standards which the "Joy of Toys" represents. I also stand before you all with the expectation that we will carry forward these ideals and invest in America's future through education, research, development, and creative vision.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased that we are considering this resolution recognizing the importance of chemistry in our everyday lives. This resolution supports the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week. It recognizes the important contributions of chemical scientists and engineers to technological progress and the health of many industries. In addition, it encourages the people of the United States to observe National Chemistry Week, which, this year, is October 16–22.

Two weeks ago, the Nobel Prize in Chemistry was awarded to three organic chemists—one of them a former Michigan State University professor—for their work to reduce hazardous waste in forming new chemicals. Their method of organic synthesis, called "metathesis", allows carbon bonds to be broken and reformed to create new compounds. Their pioneering work has resulted in more efficient, safe and cleaner methods of synthesizing new materials and is appropriately classified as "Green Chemistry."

One of these three Nobel Prize winners, Richard Schrock of MIT, noted he became interested in chemistry when he was given a chemistry set as an 8-year-old, and at first liked to "blow things up." His experience parallels the 2005 theme of National Chemistry Week, "The Joy of Toys," which was chosen to highlight the valuable role curiosity plays in developing critical thinking.

I believe there are three main motivations for doing science: (1) The practical need to control, (2) the intellectual urge to understand, and (3) the aesthetic need to enjoy. I believe that the third of these motivations is the strongest, the one that drives the curiosity of young people and future chemists. That enjoyment is often stimulated by the process of playing: the simple action of enjoying a toy that does something fun or unexpected.

When a child plays with a toy, unexplainable behavior leads to questions about the underlying nature of a machine and drives a child to perhaps, like the Nobel Prize winner, deconstruct a toy in an effort to understand it. Getting to the bottom of how something works is, at its very nature, a scientific enterprise. Natural curiosity drives innovative thinking, improvements, and discovery. At a time when our workforce is in great need of increased scientific and mathematic literacy, it is important to stimulate children's interest in the chemical sciences so that they will consider careers in these fields and potentially discover the innovations of the future. What better way to stimulate interest than something fun?

Toys not only make us laugh, they give our minds a chance to view the world in a different way. Chemists provide the substance of toys through materials chemistry and ensure their safety for contact with our skin and in our children's mouths through analytical testing.

I commend the American Chemical Society for establishing National Chemistry Week in 1987. During this year's National Chemistry Week, volunteers from across the United States will engage children in understanding how toys work. Chemistry is used by the pharmaceutical, biotechnology, agricultural and plastics industries to produce drugs, advanced plastics, herbicides, fuel additives and other substances. Chemistry supports our economic infrastructure and improves our lives—and it is fun!

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution recognizing the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 457. This bill recognizes the importance of chemistry in our everyday lives and supports the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week.

The theme of National Chemistry Week for 2005 is "The Joy of Toys." This seemingly comical name belies the hard work and amazing developments in materials science that have gone into the production of safer and more durable toys for children of all ages.

Children have a wide array of choices when it comes to modern toys. Gone are the days of making one's own toys out of sticks and stones. Chemistry has yielded materials that are non-toxic and harbor fewer germs than before. Chemistry has helped develop crazy-shaped materials in colors that change, depending on temperature.

I admire the work of countless chemists, engineers and materials scientists that has produced marvels for the delight of children and the benefit of society.

Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to celebrate National Chemistry Week and urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 457.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 457.

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 Texas. 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.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO RAISING AWARENESS AND ENHANCING STATE OF COMPUTER SECURITY AND SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 491) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to raising awareness and enhancing the state of computer security in the United States, and supporting the goals and ideals of National Cyber Security Awareness Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 491

Whereas over 202,000,000 Americans use the Internet in the United States, including 53 percent of home-users through broadband connections, to communicate with family and friends, manage their finances, pay their bills, improve their education, shop at home, and read about current events;

Whereas the approximately 23,000,000 small businesses in the United States, who represent 99.7 percent of all United States employers and employ 50.1 percent of the private work force, increasingly rely on the Internet to manage their businesses, expand their customer reach, and enhance their connection with their supply chain;

Whereas nearly 100 percent of public schools in the United States have Internet access, with approximately 80 percent of instructional rooms connected to the Internet, to enhance our children's education by providing access to educational online content and encouraging responsible self-initiative to discover research resources;

Whereas almost 9 in 10 teenagers between the ages of 12 and 17, or 87 percent of all youth (approximately 21,000,000 people) use the Internet, and 78 percent (or about 16,000,000 students) say they use the Internet at school;

Whereas teen use of the Internet at school has grown 45 percent since 2000, and educating children of all ages about safe, secure, and ethical practices will not only protect their systems, but will protect our children's physical safety, and help them become good cyber citizens;

Whereas our Nation's critical infrastructures rely on the secure and reliable operation of our information networks to support our Nation's financial services, energy, telecommunications, transportation, health care, and emergency response systems;

Whereas cyber security is a critical part of our Nation's overall homeland security, in particular the control systems that control and monitor our drinking water, dams, and other water management systems; our electricity grids, oil and gas supplies, and pipeline distribution networks; our transportation systems; and other critical manufacturing processes;

Whereas terrorists and others with malicious motives have demonstrated an interest in utilizing cyber means to attack our Nation, and the Department of Homeland Security's mission includes securing the homeland against cyber terrorism and other attacks;

Whereas Internet users and our information infrastructure face an increasing threat of malicious attacks through viruses, worms, Trojans, and unwanted programs such as spyware, adware, hacking tools, and password stealers, that are frequent and fast in propagation, are costly to repair, and disable entire systems;

Whereas consumers face significant financial and personal privacy losses due to identity theft and fraud, as reported in 205,568 complaints in 2004 to the Federal Trade Commission's Consumer Sentinel database; and Internet-related complaints in 2004 accounted for 53 percent of all reported fraud complaints, with monetary losses of over \$265,000,000 and a median loss of \$214;

Whereas our Nation's youth face increasing threats online such as inappropriate content or child predators, with 70 percent of teens having accidentally come across pornography on the Internet, and with one in five children having been approached by a child predator online each year;

Whereas national organizations, policy-makers, government agencies, private sector companies, nonprofit institutions, schools, academic organizations, consumers, and the media recognize the need to increase awareness of computer security and enhance our level of computer and national security in the United States;

Whereas the National Cyber Security Alliance's mission is to increase awareness of cyber security practices and technologies to home users, students, teachers, and small businesses through educational activities,

online resources and checklists, and Public Service Announcements; and

Whereas the National Cyber Security Alliance has designated October as National Cyber Security Awareness Month, which will provide an opportunity to educate the people of the United States about computer security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Cyber Security Awareness Month; and

(2) will work with Federal agencies, national organizations, businesses, and educational institutions to encourage the development and implementation of existing and future computer security voluntary consensus standards, practices, and technologies in order to enhance the state of computer security in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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. 491, the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 491, a resolution to applaud the goals and activities of National Cyber Security Awareness Month. Computers and the Internet have been integrated into our daily routine in our businesses, schools and homes. These information and communication systems underpin our government and they increase the productivity of our industries, financial institutions, and transportation systems. However, our increasing dependence on computers and computer networks exposes our society to the risk of cyber attacks, destructive viruses, malicious hacking and identity theft.

This is why the National Cyber Security Alliance, a cooperative effort between government, academia, and industry, has organized National Cyber Security Awareness Month for this October. As is only proper for a cybersecurity-related effort, there is a central website with online resources that offers tips and tools to help computer users protect themselves from viruses, worms, hacker attacks, phishing, identity theft, spyware and more.

In addition to these online resources, there are weekly events all over the country on specific cybersecurity topics aimed at consumers, students, children, parents, small businesses, and educational institutions. Thirty Governors across the United States have issued proclamations declaring their

support and observance of National Cyber Security Awareness Month. And as part of these activities, Texas State University hosted a "Cyber Security Awareness Day" on October 6. In New York, the Governor will host a conference on protecting our children on the Internet.

Of course, cybersecurity is not just an issue in October but year-round. National Cyber Security Awareness Month is a chance not only to raise awareness about computer vulnerabilities and threats, but also to inform people about programs that exist throughout the U.S. to educate students, parents, business people, law enforcement and government employees about cybersecurity. These include programs like a cybersecurity camp for high school students in Rome, New York, and an Information Technology and Security Academy for high school juniors at the University of Texas at San Antonio.

Cybersecurity is an important part of homeland security. Just last month, the Science Committee heard testimony from energy, electric power and telecommunications companies about their dependence on information systems and their concerns about the Nation's vulnerability to cyber attacks. The connectedness of the Internet means that each person not only must protect himself in cyberspace, but each person's cybersecurity efforts contribute to the Nation's overall status of cyber and homeland security. Progress is being made, but we as a Nation still have a long way to go.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for their leadership on this issue. We applaud the associations, companies, organizations, and agencies involved in National Cyber Security Awareness Month for their efforts to help all of us become more responsible, safer computer users. I urge my colleagues to support adoption of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 491, which expresses the support of Congress for the goals and ideals of National Cyber Security Awareness Month.

This resolution was introduced by Chairman BOEHLERT and Ranking Member GORDON of the Science Committee in an effort to help the Nation become more aware of certain risks lurking in cyberspace and the availability of tools and practices to minimize these dangers.

I want to congratulate the National Cyber Security Alliance for originating the idea for this observance and for its efforts to improve cybersecurity. The National Cyber Security Alliance is a

public-private partnership led by industry that has focused on improving cybersecurity for home users, small businesses and educational institutions. The alliance seeks to alert computer users to such threats as viruses, hack attacks and identity theft, and it provides information to users on best practices and technologies available for countering cyber threats.

National Cyber Security Awareness Month includes a range of special events designed specifically for home users, small businesses, and the educational community. To attain these objectives, the Alliance will be organizing national and regional events, such as small businesses workshops, student assemblies and cybersecurity boot camps which will take consumer education to the grass roots level. The Alliance will also be making public service announcements to urge consumers to protect their valuable personal data through online best practices, and it will publicize its online resources for computer users, including beginner's guides, computer security tips, and free security scans.

The Committee on Science has recognized for some time that cybersecurity is a long-term problem that will require a comprehensive approach by government and the private sector and that will require greater efforts by both. We held a hearing last month to review the security of computer systems on which critical industries rely and found that government has made inadequate progress in the development of national vulnerability assessments and plans for recovery from cyber attacks. We expect and count on the Department of Homeland Security to do a better job, and will be closely following its progress.

Equally important, the general public needs to be made aware of the dangers of cyber vulnerabilities and to be encouraged to learn about and use effective security practices and tools in their homes and businesses. This is the focus of National Cyber Security Awareness Month, and I should add that I was just a speaker at GOSCON which is a government open source conference in my hometown of Portland, Oregon, sponsored by Oregon State University and Portland State University, and while cybersecurity is an issue for both proprietary and open software, open source code is unique in that the source code is available for grass roots users to improve the security of any particular software program.

House Resolution 491 before this Chamber calls attention to and endorses the commendable efforts of the National Cyber Security Alliance to increase awareness of cybersecurity throughout the Nation. This is a message we should all heed.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this resolution to my colleagues, and ask for its support and passage by the House.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.

Res. 491, a bill expressing the sense of Congress regarding the raising awareness and enhancing the state of computer security in the United States, and supporting the goals and ideals of National Cyber Security Awareness Month.

As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Cybersecurity of the House Homeland Security Committee, I have had the opportunity to work on the broad Homeland Security aspects of cybersecurity. However, it is important to recognize that cybersecurity includes a wide variety of challenges that affect governments, businesses and individuals on many levels.

The Department of Homeland Security has the considerable responsibility of working to protect the computer systems that operate some of our nation's most critical infrastructure like dams, oil pipelines and water treatment systems. It is essential that the federal government coordinate with state and local governments in addition to the owners, operators, and vendors of the computer control systems. I urge the Department of Homeland Security to act swiftly in building better partnerships and information sharing relationships between the public and private sectors in order to improve cybersecurity.

In addition to the government's responsibilities, private businesses need to recognize the sensitivity of the information that they store and process, and commit to adhering to industry best practices to ensure the security of their computer systems. Consumers should be able to expect that businesses can and will protect sensitive personal and financial information.

National Cyber Security Awareness Month is also an important tool for raising individual citizens' awareness of the steps they need to take to protect their personal computers and files from hackers and viruses. Every individual should consider protecting their computer by:

- (1) Using anti-virus and anti-spyware programs with firewalls to protect against infected incoming files, and outside hacker attempts to control your computer.
- (2) Updating software and operating systems with the most recent patches from the manufacturer.
- (3) Refusing to provide personal information to unknown, online sources.
- (4) Using strong passwords that contain at least 8 characters that include numerals and symbols.
- (5) Backing up computer files.
- (6) Educating kids on how to safely use the Internet, and teaching them not to give out personal information.

I hope that Cyber Security Awareness Month will encourage governments, businesses and individuals to take steps to improve the security of their computer systems, and I urge my colleagues to support this important initiative.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about "National Cyber Security Awareness Month."

In this age of telecommunications, never before has it been easier for people around the globe to communicate, do business, and learn from one another. With the Internet, we can pay our bills, converse electronically with each other in real time, and read millions of articles in almost every publication around the world.

But while the Internet presents us with great opportunities, it also imposes great challenges. As we become increasingly reliant on technology to assist us in our daily lives, we must also increase our vigilance in protecting that technology from those who wish to use it for malevolent purposes.

Individuals should follow some simple, basic steps to protect themselves and their personal information when they use the Internet. Using strong passwords, anti-virus software, and firewalls are all ways to self-secure one's online information. Furthermore, online consumers must be particularly careful about whom they are dealing with to ensure that their information does not wind up in the wrong hands.

While there are many things that individuals should do to protect themselves, our federal government must also remain vigilant in protecting our nation's electronic infrastructure. Across America, millions of people rely on computerized control systems to provide electricity, monitor oil pipelines, distribute water, and harness nuclear power. Though many of these systems are secure, terrorists and hackers presently seek to infiltrate vulnerable computers to wreak havoc and destroy our way of life. The results of a cyber attack against our nation's critical infrastructure could be incredibly damaging to our economy and may possibly result in significant losses of life.

Led by the Department of Homeland Security, the federal government is aware of the harms of a cyber attack and is working to prevent any damaging attacks. But although our nation has thus far avoided becoming the victim of a significant cyber attack, we cannot be complacent. I commend the hard work by DHS to strengthen and secure our cyberspace, but encourage the agency to dedicate more time and resources to this issue.

DHS as a whole has been slow in completing its critical infrastructure protection policies, an important goal in protecting America's cyberspace. In December 2003, President Bush issued Presidential Directive 7: Critical Infrastructure Identification, Prioritization, and Protection (HSPD-7) establishing a national policy for federal departments and agencies to prioritize critical infrastructure, including cyber-related infrastructure. DHS was charged with developing the National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP) to serve as the guide for protecting infrastructure. The NIPP was due in December 2004. In February 2005, an "Interim NIPP" was issued, setting a deadline of November 2005 for the "Final NIPP." According to the General Accounting Office, the "Interim NIPP" was incomplete: it lacked both national-level milestones and sector-specific security plans. The "Final NIPP" remains incomplete to this day.

The GAO has also criticized DHS for failing to build better partnerships and information-sharing relationships between the public and private sectors to improve cyber security. Such partnerships are essential to effective coordination among all levels of government and between the public and private sectors. DHS has also failed to develop or deploy an effective analysis and warning system in the event of a cyber attack. This is an important step in preparing the country for cyber attack.

Securing our cyberspace is not an obligation we can afford to delay. I encourage DHS to act quickly in addressing these issues, just as I encourage all Americans to take pro-active measures in protecting themselves online.

Let's all recommit ourselves to protecting our personal information and our national cyber infrastructure during this "Month of Awareness" and in the years ahead.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 491.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order: the Journal, House Resolution 457, and House Resolution 491, each by the yeas and nays.

The first and third votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second vote in the series will be a 5-minute vote.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 317, nays 52, answered "present" 1, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

YEAS—317

Ackerman	Everett	McMorris
Aderholt	Farr	McNulty
Akin	Ferguson	Meehan
Allen	Flake	Meek (FL)
Andrews	Foley	Melancon
Baca	Forbes	Mica
Bachus	Fortenberry	Michaud
Baker	Fox	Millender-
Barrett (SC)	Frank (MA)	McDonald
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Barton (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)
Bass	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (NC)
Bean	Gilchrest	Miller, Gary
Beauprez	Gillmor	Miller, George
Berkley	Gingrey	Mollohan
Berman	Gohmert	Moore (KS)
Berry	Gonzalez	Moore (WI)
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Murphy
Bishop (GA)	Gordon	Murtha
Bishop (NY)	Granger	Musgrave
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Myrick
Blackburn	Green (WI)	Nadler
Blunt	Green, Al	Napolitano
Boehlert	Gutknecht	Neugebauer
Boehner	Hall	Ney
Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Northup
Bonner	Hayes	Norwood
Bono	Hayworth	Nunes
Boozman	Hensarling	Obey
Boren	Herger	Ortiz
Boustany	Herseth	Osborne
Boyd	Higgins	Otter
Bradley (NH)	Hinchee	Owens
Brady (TX)	Hinojosa	Pallone
Brown (OH)	Hobson	Paul
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Payne
Brown-Waite,	Holt	Pearce
Ginny	Honda	Pelosi
Burgess	Hookey	Pence
Burton (IN)	Hostettler	Peterson (PA)
Buyer	Hoyer	Petri
Camp	Hulshof	Pitts
Cannon	Hunter	Platts
Cantor	Hyde	Poe
Capps	Inglis (SC)	Pombo
Cardoza	Inslee	Pomeroy
Carnahan	Israel	Porter
Carson	Issa	Price (GA)
Carter	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Castle	Jefferson	Pryce (OH)
Chabot	Jenkins	Putnam
Chocola	Jindal	Radanovich
Clay	Johnson (CT)	Rahall
Cleaver	Johnson (IL)	Regula
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Rehberg
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Cole (OK)	Jones (NC)	Renzi
Conaway	Kaptur	Reynolds
Conyers	Kelly	Rogers (AL)
Cooper	Kildee	Rogers (MI)
Costa	Kind	Rohrabacher
Cramer	King (NY)	Ross
Crenshaw	Kingston	Rothman
Crowley	Klaine	Royce
Cubin	Knollenberg	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Kolbe	Ryan (OH)
Culberson	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Cummings	Langevin	Salazar
Cunningham	Lantos	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (AL)	Larsen (WA)	T.
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Saxton
Davis (IL)	LaTourette	Schakowsky
Davis (TN)	Leach	Schmidt
Davis, Jo Ann	Lee	Schwartz (PA)
Davis, Tom	Levin	Schwarz (MI)
Deal (GA)	Lewis (CA)	Scott (GA)
DeGette	Lewis (KY)	Scott (VA)
Delahunt	Linder	Sensenbrenner
DeLauro	Lipinski	Serrano
DeLay	Lofgren, Zoe	Sessions
Dent	Lowey	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas	Shaw
Dicks	Lungren, Daniel	Shays
Dingell	E.	Sherman
Doggett	Lynch	Sherwood
Doolittle	Mack	Shimkus
Doyle	Maloney	Simmons
Drake	Manzullo	Simpson
Dreier	Marchant	Skelton
Duncan	Matsui	Slaughter
Edwards	McCaul (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Ehlers	McCreary	Smith (TX)
Emanuel	McHenry	Smith (WA)
Emerson	McHugh	Snyder
Eshoo	McIntyre	Sodrel
Evans	McKinney	Solis

Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney

Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 366, nays 2, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

YEAS—366

Abercrombie
Baird
Baldwin
Capito
Capuano
Chandler
Costello
Davis (KY)
English (PA)
Etheridge
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Fossella
Green, Gene
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hefley

NAYS—52

Holden
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MN)
Kucinich
Latham
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCullum (MN)
McDermott
Moran (KS)
Nussle
Oberstar
Oliver
Pastor

Peterson (MN)
Ramstad
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Shuster
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Tiberi
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Waters
Weller
Wu

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—63

Alexander
Barrow
Becerra
Biggert
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Cardin
Case
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
Diaz-Balart, L.
Engel
Feeney
Ford
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons

Goode
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Harris
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Keller
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
Kirk
LaHood
McCotter
McGovern
McKeon
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)

Oxley
Pascrell
Pickering
Rangel
Reyes
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sanders
Schiff
Stark
Strickland
Sullivan
Terry
Towns
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt

□ 1853

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 521 regarding the Journal, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE AND POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CHEMISTRY TO OUR EVERYDAY LIVES AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CHEMISTRY WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 457.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 457, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkeley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis,
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell

Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano

Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt

Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Shadegg

NOT VOTING—65

Flake
Alexander
Barrow
Becerra
Biggert
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Cardin
Case
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
Diaz-Balart, L.
Engel
Feeney
Ford
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Goode
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Harris
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Keller
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
LaHood
McCotter
McGovern
McKeon
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)
Oxley
Pascrell
Pickering
Pombo
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Stark
Strickland
Sullivan
Terry
Towns
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1904

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a personal explanation. Today, I was unavoidably detained at Newark International Airport, due to the later arrival of an inbound plane, while traveling back for votes on Rollcall votes Nos. 521–523. Therefore, I was unable to vote on the Journal Vote (Rollcall No. 521) and H. Res. 457, a resolution recognizing the importance and positive contributions of chemistry to our everyday lives and supporting the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week (Rollcall No. 522). Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on both of the measures considered by the House.

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 Nos. 521 and 522.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO RAISING AWARENESS AND ENHANCING STATE OF COMPUTER SECURITY AND SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 491.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 491, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 13, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

YEAS—354

Abercrombie	Chandler	Foley
Ackerman	Chocola	Forbes
Aderholt	Clay	Fortenberry
Akin	Cleaver	Fossella
Allen	Clyburn	Fox
Andrews	Coble	Frank (MA)
Baca	Cole (OK)	Franks (AZ)
Bachus	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Baird	Conyers	Garrett (NJ)
Baker	Cooper	Gilchrest
Baldwin	Costa	Gillmor
Barrett (SC)	Costello	Gingrey
Bartlett (MD)	Cramer	Gohmert
Bass	Crenshaw	Gonzalez
Bean	Crowley	Goodlatte
Beauprez	Cubin	Gordon
Berkley	Cuellar	Granger
Berman	Culberson	Graves
Berry	Cummings	Green (WI)
Billirakis	Cunningham	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Davis (AL)	Green, Gene
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Gutknecht
Bishop (UT)	Davis (IL)	Hall
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Hart
Blunt	Davis (TN)	Hastings (FL)
Boehlert	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastings (WA)
Boehmer	Davis, Tom	Hayes
Bonilla	Deal (GA)	Hayworth
Bonner	DeGette	Hefley
Bono	Delahunt	Hergert
Boozman	DeLauro	Hersteth
Boren	DeLay	Higgins
Boustany	Dent	Hinchee
Boyd	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hinojosa
Bradley (NH)	Dicks	Hobson
Brady (TX)	Dingell	Hoekstra
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Holden
Brown (SC)	Doolittle	Holt
Brown-Waite,	Doyle	Honda
Ginny	Drake	Hooley
Burgess	Dreier	Hostettler
Burton (IN)	Duncan	Hoyer
Buyer	Edwards	Hulshof
Camp	Ehlers	Hunter
Cannon	Emanuel	Hyde
Cantor	Emerson	Inglis (SC)
Capito	English (PA)	Inslee
Capps	Eshoo	Israel
Capuano	Etheridge	Issa
Cardoza	Evans	Jackson (IL)
Carnahan	Everett	Jefferson
Carson	Farr	Jenkins
Carter	Fattah	Jindal
Castle	Filner	Johnson (CT)
Chabot	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Johnson (IL)

Johnson, E. B.	Miller (MI)	Schakowsky
Johnson, Sam	Miller (NC)	Schmidt
Kanjorski	Miller, Gary	Schwartz (PA)
Kaptur	Miller, George	Schwarz (MI)
Kelly	Mollohan	Scott (GA)
Kennedy (MN)	Moore (KS)	Scott (VA)
Kildee	Moore (WI)	Sensenbrenner
Kind	Moran (KS)	Serrano
King (NY)	Murphy	Shaw
Kingston	Musgrave	Shays
Kirk	Myrick	Sherman
Kline	Nadler	Sherwood
Knollenberg	Napolitano	Shuster
Kolbe	Neugebauer	Simmons
Kucinich	Ney	Simpson
Kuhl (NY)	Northup	Skelton
Langevin	Nunes	Slaughter
Lantos	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Larsen (WA)	Oberstar	Smith (WA)
Larson (CT)	Obey	Snyder
Latham	Ortiz	Sodrel
LaTourette	Osborne	Solis
Leach	Otter	Souder
Lee	Owens	Spratt
Levin	Pallone	Stupak
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Sweeney
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Tancredo
Lewis (KY)	Pearce	Tanner
Linder	Pelosi	Tauscher
Lipinski	Pence	Taylor (MS)
LoBiondo	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (NC)
Lofgren, Zoe	Peterson (PA)	Thomas
Lowey	Petri	Thompson (CA)
Lucas	Pitts	Thompson (MS)
Lungren, Daniel	Platts	Thornberry
E.	Poe	Tiberi
Lynch	Pombo	Tierney
Mack	Pomeroy	Turner
Maloney	Porter	Udall (CO)
Manzullo	Price (GA)	Udall (NM)
Marchant	Pryce (OH)	Van Hollen
Markey	Putnam	Velázquez
Marshall	Radanovich	Walsh
Matheson	Rahall	Wamp
Matsui	Ramstad	Waters
McCarthy	Regula	Watson
McCaul (TX)	Rehberg	Waxman
McCollum (MN)	Reichert	Weiner
McCrery	Renzi	Weldon (FL)
McDermott	Reynolds	Weldon (PA)
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Weller
McHugh	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Wexler
McKinney	Ross	Whitfield
McMorris	Rothman	Wicker
McNulty	Royce	Wilson (NM)
Meehan	Ruppersberger	Wilson (SC)
Meek (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Wolf
Melancon	Ryan (WI)	Woolsey
Menendez	Sabo	Wu
Mica	Salazar	Wynn
Michaud	Sánchez, Linda	Young (AK)
Millender-	T.	Young (FL)
McDonald	Sanchez, Loretta	
Miller (FL)	Saxton	

NAYS—13

Barton (TX)	Norwood	Stearns
Ferguson	Paul	Upton
Flake	Sessions	Walden (OR)
Hensarling	Shadegg	
Jones (NC)	Shimkus	

NOT VOTING—66

Alexander	Grijalva	Pickering
Barrow	Gutierrez	Price (NC)
Becerra	Harman	Rangel
Biggett	Harris	Reyes
Blumenauer	Istook	Rogers (KY)
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Boucher	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Keller	Ryun (KS)
Butterfield	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Calvert	Kilpatrick (MI)	Schiff
Cardin	King (IA)	Smith (TX)
Case	LaHood	Stark
Davis (FL)	McCotter	Strickland
DeFazio	McGovern	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, L.	McKeon	Terry
Engel	Meeke (NY)	Tiahrt
Feeney	Moran (VA)	Towns
Ford	Murtha	Visclosky
Gallegly	Neal (MA)	Wasserman
Gerlach	Olver	Schultz
Gibbons	Oxley	Watt
Goode	Pascrell	

□ 1920

Mr. BUYER and Mr. DELAY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, personal reasons require my absence from legislative business today, Monday, October 17, 2005. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on approving the Journal (rollcall No. 521); "yea" on H. Res. 457, recognizing the importance and positive contributions of chemistry (rollcall No. 522); "yea" on H. Res. 491, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to raising awareness and enhancing the state of computer security in the U.S. (rollcall No. 523).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably was absent from votes this evening due to commitment in my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 521 on approving the previous days Journal; "yea" on rollcall No. 522, to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 457 recognizing National Chemistry Week; and "yea" on rollcall No. 523, to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 491, recognizing National Cyber Security Awareness Month.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3954

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) be removed from H.R. 3954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2005.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on October 17, 2005, at 4:42 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President consistent with the Trade Act of 2002 whereby he notifies the Congress of his intention to enter into a Free Trade Agreement with the Sultanate of Oman.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

GERASIMOS VANS,
Deputy Clerk of the House.

NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO ENTER INTO FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE SULTANATE OF OMAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-60)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Trade Act of 2002, (Public Law 107-210) (the "Trade Act"), I am pleased to notify the Congress of my intention to enter into a Free Trade Agreement (FTA) with the Sultanate of Oman.

The Agreement will generate export opportunities for U.S. companies, farmers, and ranchers, help create jobs in the United States, and help American consumers save money while offering them more choices. Entering into an FTA with Oman will build on the FTAs that we already have with Israel, Jordan, and Morocco, as well as the FTA that we have concluded with Bahrain, and will be an important step on the path to fulfilling my vision of developing economic growth and democracy in the Middle East and creating a U.S.—Middle East Free Trade Area (MEFTA) by 2013.

Consistent with the Trade Act, I am sending this notification at least 90 days in advance of signing the FTA. My Administration looks forward to working with the Congress in developing appropriate legislation to approve and implement this Agreement.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 17, 2005.

ON THE IRAQ VOTE

(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, the Washington Post has done it again for us. They ran an article on the retirement of Turkey's ambassador to the United States, and I was struck by a comment that the ambassador made regarding Iraq and our efforts to reshape that country in the Middle East.

This is what he said: "Pessimism debilitates you. Don't ignore the facts, but be optimistic. Some of the apparent clumsiness is democracy in the making." Democracy in the making.

Mr. Speaker, too many in this body and in the media have fed the pessimism. Those of us standing with the President and our military in Iraq are not playing Pollyanna on this. We know it is going to be a tough, tough endeavor. But we believed and we still believe that failing to act was a poor long-term solution to the fundamental crisis of terrorism that exists in the Middle East.

Today, we should all take a moment and praise our troops, our leadership, and the Iraqi people for voting on a constitution last Saturday. Nearly 63 percent of eligible voters cast a ballot. That is tremendous, and it should be cause for celebration both here and around the world.

Again, to quote the ambassador, "Pessimism debilitates you." Let us celebrate this success.

STOP ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

(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, illegal immigration is a huge concern to the vast majority of Americans. Some States are welcoming illegal aliens with driver's licenses, in-State college tuition, and access to social services. One has to wonder how can this be. It appears to many that we are rewarding those that break the laws.

Whoever said crime does not pay must not have been talking about those who enter our country illegally. Crossing the border illegally is a criminal act; however, we give these people access to everything you can imagine. Lax enforcement of our immigration policies is making every day payday for illegal aliens.

States other than Texas, Arizona, and California are now more burdened than ever picking up the tab for illegal aliens, with Georgia, my home State, ranking in the top 10 with illegal alien populations.

Hospitals and others are being forced to scrape the bottom of the barrel to look for money, money that should be spent on American citizens and those here legally.

Mr. Speaker, not tomorrow, not the day after that, not next week, not next month, but today, today is the time to stop illegal immigration. H.R. 3693 will do just that.

IRAQ ELECTION ON CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of the 48th Brigade and the 3rd Infantry Division, I have thousands of constituents in Iraq. I look each day, as most Americans do, for good news to come from that area of the world; and good news did come this weekend with their unprecedented election.

This election, which had a lot of high stakes, will hopefully, when the tally is counted, ratify their constitution, which so many have worked on in the international community for so long.

The election itself, though, was a great success, with an over-60 percent turnout. In over 6,000 different polling places, violence was absent. Compare that to the June election, when there

was a lot more absence and a lot less participation. This Saturday was a success.

Even the Sunni population, the minority population that has a lot of apprehension about this constitution, showed up in record numbers. And, remember, they boycotted the election in June.

There is a lot of progress that is happening in Iraq. I hope that this constitution does pass. I hope that the elections in December are a success. I hope that the new national government takes hold and does a great job of moving this great country to democracy.

America has made this possible, and America is standing behind our friends in Iraq.

□ 1730

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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, this evening I rise to recognize October as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Thankfully, we have made progress in raising awareness and attention of domestic violence and providing assistance to the affected victims. However, it is a problem that has not gone away.

We must not forget about these crimes that disrupt homes and destroy families. It is estimated that over 2 million acts of domestic violence take place each year here in the United States. According to a recent study in my home State of Kansas, one domestic violence act occurs every 24 minutes.

Domestic violence is an issue that affects all aspects of our society and is not bound by race, economics or age. It can be blamed for increased medical care costs, decreased productivity, and increased absence from work. Domestic violence also promotes a culture of depression, hopelessness and fear. One incidence of domestic violence can create a cycle of despair that is difficult for not only the victim but also the entire family to overcome.

In my small hometown of Plainville, Kansas, a family grieves over the loss of their daughter. Patty Kruse-Hicks, a kind, loving daughter, and a devoted mother to her three children, lost her life due to domestic violence. On April 19, 2004, the world changed forever for her family and all those who loved her. Patty is more than a statistic. Her legacy and love will live in the hearts of

all who knew her. Too often we think an act of domestic violence does not occur on our street, in our hometown, or to people and families we know, but this act of violence tells me that no street, no community, no hometown is immune.

There are other victims of domestic violence who are often overlooked. Each year an estimated 3.3 million children are exposed to violence committed by family members against their mother or caretaker. During 2002 in Kansas alone, there were over 8,000 cases where children were the victims of domestic violence. Children who see violence are more likely to commit or suffer violence when they become adults. The cycle of despair continues from one generation to the next.

While the realities of domestic violence are grim, we do have hope. Our hope stems from the belief that with education, resources and support, victims of domestic violence can overcome their circumstances. Hope is what sustains and motivates the nine domestic violence centers I represent in my rural 69-county district. These agencies help advocate for victims, provide essential services, and spearhead efforts to increase domestic violence awareness throughout most part of rural Kansas.

I would like to highlight one such effort. In Emporia, the SOS, Inc., agency recently partnered with the Girl Scout Council of the Flint Hills, and their Studio 2 Be Troop, including 40 girls, ranging from the ages of 11 to 17. This effort focused on teaching these youth about domestic violence and the legal system. The highlight of this year-long project was a mock trial event that the youth participated in during the month of September. The troop girls were the defense and prosecution teams, the jury, and even the victims of crimes. This project was supported by the legal community, and many lawyers and judges gave their time to work with these Girl Scouts. This project taught the participants that domestic violence is not okay and our communities should take it very seriously. This project was a one-of-a-kind experience for these girls, and garnered significant national attention.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to recognize October as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Thankfully, we have made progress in raising awareness and attention to domestic violence and providing assistance to victims. However, it is a problem that certainly has not gone away. We must not forget about these crimes that disrupt homes and destroy families. It is estimated that 2 million acts of domestic violence will take place this year in the United States. According to a recent study, in my home State of Kansas one domestic violence act occurs every 24 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for continued support and assistance for the domestic violence programs we in Congress have responsibility for.

GUN LIABILITY

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take up the National Rifle Association's top legislative priority for the 109th Congress. We will vote on legislation granting the gun industry unprecedented immunity from liability lawsuits. Nearly no other consumer product manufacturers or sellers have this kind of protection.

The NRA says this bill will prevent frivolous lawsuits that may bankrupt the gun industry, but a closer look reveals this bill tries to fix a problem that actually does not exist.

Over the past decade, there have been over 10 million lawsuits filed here in the U.S. and only 57 involved the gun industry. According to the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, no lawsuit against the gun industry has ever been dismissed as frivolous by a judge. Some of these suits have been dismissed for other reasons, and some have been successful. The point is the current system does work.

Unworthy cases are not coming to trial so why do we need to close the courthouse doors to those who were legitimately victimized by gun industry negligence or incompetence? Do not let the NRA rhetoric fool you. This legislation is not about protecting an honest gun dealer who legally sells a gun to someone who later commits a crime. This legislation protects cases of gross negligence that lead to the injuries and death of unsuspecting victims.

For example, the owner of the Bull's Eye Shooter Supply Store in Washington State was successfully sued because he could not account for over 239 guns in his inventory. One of these guns was the Bushmaster used in the D.C. sniper killings. The D.C. sniper murderers were allowed to get their hands on a gun because of a gun seller's negligence. But now, House leadership thinks the D.C. snipers' victims should not have their day in court.

We should not let negligence and incompetence that results in death or injury go unpunished in any industry. Stripping away the threat of legal action will seriously jeopardize efforts to make guns safer. Without the threat of liability suits, the gun industry will have no financial incentive to incorporate gun locks, smart gun technology, and safety triggers into their products.

Imagine if similar legislation were passed 40 years ago to cover the auto industry. Today our cars would not have seat belts, air bags or antilock brakes.

Mr. Speaker, instead of stopping non-existent frivolous lawsuits, we should be protecting the public from gun violence. I submitted amendments to this bill to the Committee on Rules. One amendment will allow liability lawsuits against those who negligently sell cop killer bullets. These are bullets

that are similar to the ones used in the murder of my husband and critically wounded my son in 1993.

I will also seek to continue negligence lawsuits against those who irresponsibly sell large-capacity clips. Large-capacity clips were used in the Long Island shooting which took down my husband and son and many other family members. If we had smaller clips, we would not have had as many killings on that train. If we did not have the cop killer bullets out on the streets, maybe my son would not have been injured so severely, and there is a possibility my husband might be alive.

These clips represent a serious homeland security threat if a terrorist were to use them. Without the threat of lawsuits, guns may end up in the hands of people who should not have them.

Mr. Speaker, we already have lost 33,000 Americans a year to gun violence. We lose 5,200 children per year. Independent studies show that gun violence costs our health care system over \$100 billion a year. The average cost of each firearm fatality, including medical care, police services, and lost productivity is over \$1 million. I can testify because my son's bills are over that.

But the Department of Justice says only 2 percent of Federal gun crimes are prosecuted, and 20 of the 22 Federal gun laws on the books are not effectively enforced. We need to give our law enforcement agencies the tools to do their jobs efficiently.

We cannot proceed with this legislation unless we can ensure the National Instant Background Check is fully effective. Currently, half of the States have entered less than 60 percent of the felony convictions into the NICS system. In 13 States, and my colleague just talked about domestic violence, restraining orders are not accessible through the NICS system.

Too many of those not allowed to buy guns slip through the cracks of our background check system. That is why I submitted an amendment to permit negligence lawsuits against the gun industry until 90 percent of the felony convictions and other disqualifying criteria are included in the NICS database.

I have introduced H.R. 1415, a bill to give grants to help the States keep their NICS information current and accurate. Honest gun sellers do not want to sell criminals guns. My amendment would give them the peace of mind that all of their sales are to responsible gun owners. However, we still should not give breaks to dishonest and incompetent gun sellers by giving them immunity from lawsuits resulting from their negligence.

But if the gun lobby and its faithful servants in leadership insist on taking up this bill, we must make sure safeguards are in place to protect the public.

Mr. Speaker, our priorities are misplaced when it comes to preventing gun violence. We need to change the dialogue.

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

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

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

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

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

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

WE SHOULD NOT CUT FOREIGN MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO EGYPT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration's allies in this Congress are making another truly astounding foreign policy blunder, one that jeopardizes decades of painstaking effort toward peacemaking in the Middle East. Bush allies are proposing to sever our established U.S. military relationship with Egypt at a time when diplomatic ties in the region are more vital than ever.

At great sacrifice, Egypt has forged a leadership role in the region and remains committed to peace and progress. Yet rather than stemming terrorism, Bush congressional allies are doing, with their retrograde proposal, just what they did with Iraq: Miscalculating, failing to shape robust diplomatic initiatives, and setting the region up for more terrorism, more bloodletting, and more instability. They want to act tough first rather than smart first.

They are hastening more instability as antagonism to the United States grows. Does anybody in the White House recognize that Middle East terrorism is going up, not down? Does anybody notice that polls across the Middle East show a majority of Arabs are now opposed to U.S. policy?

Zogby International polls indicate that Arab public attitudes towards the United States are declining. And according to the Pew Research Center, solid majorities in many predominantly Muslim countries surveyed still express unfavorable views of the United States.

At a time like this, cutting foreign military assistance to a strong ally risks a vital blow to our relationship with this most populous Arab nation and friend in the region. Ultimately, our troops cannot win militarily when

the Iraqi war is being lost politically and diplomatically across that region.

The Bush administration's allies in this House are truly ill-advised and ill-timed to sever America's 25-year military commitment with Egypt. Let us remember it was Egypt's valiant President Anwar Sadat who in 1979 stood shoulder to shoulder in peace efforts with President Jimmy Carter and President Menachem Begin of Israel on the White House lawn. I was there as a witness to that majestic day when the most important peace accord of that era was signed, the Camp David Accords.

Yes, Egypt's President walked toward peace, and a few months later was assassinated for his vision. We should honor and remember that sacrifice.

Egypt is the most populous Arab nation and the most influential in the region, strategically positioned adjacent to the Suez Canal on the borders of Gaza, Israel, Libya and Sudan. Egypt is the nation that has sent 750 troops to safeguard the Gaza withdrawal of Israelis to begin historic resettlement of Palestinians.

The Bush allies are not only dead wrong but absolutely wrong; wrong historically, wrong diplomatically, dangerously wrong. Egypt has been a strong ally to the United States and the Middle East for 25 years. Egypt has provided support in the Middle East peace process. The peace between Egypt and Israel is a template for which peace between Israel and other Arab countries can be achieved.

□ 1945

Egypt provided troops and facilitated transportation in the region during Desert Storm, and they continue to provide support in Iraq and Afghanistan today. They stand ready and willing to provide needed training for Afghan and Iraqi troops to aid in the stabilization of those countries at no cost, though neither country has taken them up on this offer yet.

And Egypt has facilitated diplomatic relations among Arab governments and the Iraqi interim government. Not only are they a politically strategic ally; they are also an important economic ally. U.S.-Egypt trade totals almost \$4.5 billion, and last year we had a trade surplus with that country of \$1.8 billion. Funds that we offer in aid to Egypt come back to this country in trade.

Former President Anwar Sadat had the ultimate vision and courage in 1979. He knew peace required courage. It requires international cooperation as well and mutual support. He understood peace assures human progress, and he gave peace a chance.

Let us not be unwise and turn our back on America's military relationship with Egypt, an alliance he helped establish, an alliance that has endured, an alliance that has broadened, an alliance that has made peace across that region possible. Possible in our time.

I would hope that the President's allies in this Congress would remove the

proposal they have on the table to sever our foreign military assistance and our relationship with Egypt. It could not be more wrong and more poorly timed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 397, PROTECTION OF LAWFUL COMMERCE IN ARMS ACT

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-248) on the resolution (H. Res. 493) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 397) to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages, injunctive or other relief resulting from the misuse of their products by others, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 554, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY IN FOOD CONSUMPTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-249) on the resolution (H. Res. 494) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 554) to prevent legislative and regulatory functions from being usurped by civil liability actions brought or continued against food manufacturers, marketers, distributors, advertisers, sellers, and trade associations for claims of injury relating to a person's weight gain, obesity, or any health condition associated with weight gain or obesity, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

IRAQ AND THE "BOLDER APPROACH"

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, appeared on "Meet the Press" yesterday morning and made this assertion, and I quote Dr. Rice: ". . . when we were attacked on September 11, we had a choice to make. We could decide that the proximate cause was al Qaeda and the people who flew those planes into the buildings and, therefore, we would go after al Qaeda and perhaps after the Taliban and then our work would be done . . ."

"Or we could take a bolder approach, which was to say that we had to go after the root causes of the kind of terrorism that was produced there, and that meant a different kind of Middle East. And there is no one who could have imagined a different kind of Middle East with Saddam Hussein still in power."

Mr. Speaker, what happened to the weapons of mass destruction? In the run up to the war, no one said anything about a bolder approach.

We were told about uranium purchases from Niger. We were told about the world's most dangerous weapons falling into the hands of the wrong people. We were told by Dr. Rice herself about the specter of mushroom clouds over American cities. We were treated to a campaign of fear and deception about weapons of mass destruction because the Bush administration knew that was the only way to convince the Nation and the Congress to commit to this war.

They knew that this bolder approach, this ideological pipe dream, was an absolute nonstarter.

So what are we supposed to tell Cindy Sheehan and the thousands of other mothers, fathers, spouses, siblings, and friends of dead soldiers and soldiers who were wounded? That their children died or were wounded not to protect America but for some "bolder approach," because the Middle East is the personal chess board of a gang of neoconservatives who have not had to sacrifice a thing for this war?

Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Iraq a few weeks ago to meet the troops to learn more about their mission. I cannot tell the Members how impressed I was with the courage, the loyalty, and intelligence of our soldiers from the officers down to the citizen soldiers of the National Guard. They are, indeed, the best America has to offer.

My question is: Why can we not have political leaders with the same honor and integrity as the men and women who wear the uniform, who take the risks, who make the sacrifices? It is nothing short of tragic the way the Pentagon and the White House have let down and even exploited the men and women in their charge. They sent them to Iraq on false pretenses, on a poorly

defined mission, without all the tools they needed and without a plan to bring them home.

I have been calling for our troops to come home this entire year. I have called for hearings. I have introduced resolutions. I have forced a vote in this Chamber. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not just speaking for myself. A majority of Americans clearly share this anxiety and skepticism about the war.

I have tried to jumpstart the conversation about how to go about ending the occupation. At the hearing I convened last month, some very sound ideas were laid out about how to end this debacle and how the United States can play a constructive role in the rebuilding of Iraqi society.

But the President will not engage on this level. He will not engage in this conversation. He offers nothing but platitudes and vague assertions. Terrorism is bad and freedom is good, he tells us. We need to stay the course, he tells us. We will be there as long as we need to be there, he tells us.

This is not enough. The American people and our soldiers deserve better. They deserve a plan, an endgame, a clear strategy to return Iraq to the Iraqi people and the troops to their families back home.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

URGING HELP FOR PAKISTAN

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the nation of Pakistan is experiencing the greatest natural disaster

of all time. There is no recorded disaster with the dimensions that the earthquake in Pakistan has produced. Forty thousand at least are already dead. Forty thousand at least are dead already, and with the freezing weather coming and the inaccessibility of the people in the mountains, another 40,000 could easily die, being frozen to death or starved because they cannot be reached. Millions are homeless.

Now is the time for America to come to the aid of this nation in great distress. These are people, first of all; and for humanitarian reasons, we certainly should come to their aid. They are also citizens of Pakistan, a major ally of the United States, a major ally which has done a great deal in the fight against terrorism.

I know disaster fatigue has set in with a lot of Americans and certainly our media. We had the tsunami, an overwhelming disaster. We had Katrina, Rita. In Central America they had Hurricane Stan.

Unfortunately, the media has reached the point of exhaustion too early. Not enough is being said about the great tragedy in Pakistan because I think they just do not want to deal with another great disaster with the kind of coverage it needs. It does not have it.

When we add up all these disasters, the tsunami, Katrina, Rita, and Pakistan, the tragic numbers should not overwhelm us. We should not throw up our hands and say it is just too much, we cannot deal with it. It is the most massive disaster in history, the Pakistani earthquake; but yet 40,000, though it may seem like a lot, and in the case of Katrina we do not know whether it is going to be 10,000 or not, and in the case of the tsunami, if we add them all up, still relative to the population of the world, it is a very small number of people.

We have almost 6 billion people in the world. Surely 6 billion people in the world and almost 200 nations in the world can come to the aid of people who have experienced these disasters this year, can come to the aid of those in Katrina, those in the tsunami, and those in Pakistan. Surely we should not get weary of being weary of disasters so early. We must go to the aid of Pakistan and not write it off because we have had enough disasters. We need more attention paid to this.

When we look at numbers, we lost 600,000 people in the Civil War in America. 600,000. We lost 400,000 or 500,000 in World War II. The Russians lost 18 million people in World War II. Those are numbers which can really overwhelm us. Surely we have dealt with problems on that scale. In World War II we mobilized, and in terms of men and materiel and the effort to win World War II, it was overwhelming.

But it would not take even one-tenth of that effort to go to the aid of Pakistan at this point and deal with getting the practical things that they need. They need helicopters because those

mountains cannot be reached any other way. They have got to have helicopters to transport whatever they are going to transport. They need it, and they need it right away. The people are freezing in the mountains. They need food. The U.S. must lead the way.

I do not want to get into any discussion of competition, what nation is doing what and are we doing less than any other nations. I do not think that is the kind of discussion we ought to have. We ought to just understand we should come to the aid of Pakistan to the extent that we can. We are the greatest. We are the most resourceful. We are the richest Nation that ever existed on the face of the Earth. We should not hesitate to lead on this matter. We should step out there and not yield leadership and wait for someone else.

We have made past mistakes with Pakistan. Pakistan was our ally during the Cold War, and yet we treated them very poorly, and we did not take care of the needs of Pakistan once the war in Afghanistan was over and they had helped us to win the war against the Russians in Afghanistan originally. Now Pakistan has come to our aid in the war against terrorism. The Government of Pakistan teeters on the brink of rebellion because of the fact that large numbers of the Muslim population do not approve of the close friendship of Pakistan with the United States, the alliance with the United States against terrorism.

Let us come to the aid of our friends and make up for past errors. And here is a time when they have this great calamity that we can act and wipe out any harsh feelings about the past. Now is the time to act. For the future, as long as we can see it, I assure the Members that the Pakistani people will be grateful for what we have done. We ought to seal the alliance and make certain that they understand that we are their friends in every way possible. We do not want to just use them to fight the war on terrorism. We do not want to just use them to hunt for Osama bin Laden. We do not want to just use them in a critical time when we are threatened by terrorism. We care about them; and when they need help, we will be there.

Practical help is needed right now. We need cargo planes. At Kennedy Airport they have cargo-loads of material to go to Pakistan. They have no planes to send them there. They need the practical help. We need helicopters in Pakistan right now. Across the border in Afghanistan, we have hundreds of helicopters. We should give up the hunt for Osama bin Laden for a little while if necessary, and those helicopters should go to Pakistan. They need food. They need tents. They need attention from the whole world.

We need our caucus here, Members of Congress. We have a Pakistan Caucus. The Pakistan Caucus needs to meet as soon as possible. I call on the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and

the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who are co-chairs, to call to meet as soon as possible. And let us, as Members of Congress, see what we can do to come to the aid of our friends, to come to the aid of millions of people who are in great distress and they look to the United States for leadership. We should follow that leadership. God expects us to provide leadership to help the people of Pakistan.

□ 2000

PEAK OIL

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have here an article that appeared on the front page of USA Today. It is above the fold. It is the center article. It says: Debate Brews: Has Oil Production Peaked?

The undeniable facts that spawned this article were noted by a number of the leading persons in our country several months ago, Boyden Gray, McFarland, James Woolsey, and a large number of retired four-star admirals and generals when they noted the facts that are on our first chart here: That we have in our country only 2 percent of the world's reserves of oil; we have 8 percent of the world's oil production. Just those two statistics together say something rather interesting. If we have only 2 percent of the oil reserves but are producing 8 percent of the world's oil, that means we are really good at pumping oil, does it not? That means that we are pumping down our reserves four times faster than the rest of the world.

We represent only 5 percent of the population, they noted, and we consume 25 percent of the world's oil and import about two-thirds of what we use. They wrote a letter to the President saying: Mr. President, the fact that we have only 2 percent of the reserves and use 25 percent of the world's oil and import two-thirds of what we use is a very large national security risk. We really need to do something about that as a country.

Whether you believe, as this article points out, that oil has peaked—in just a moment, Mr. Speaker, we will note how this term came into existence—or whether you believe that we need to do something about energy because of this national security concern, what you are going to do is essentially the same thing, because what you need to do, if this is just a national security concern, is to free ourselves from the dependence on foreign oil. That is exactly the thing you have to do. If you believe that we have reached peak oil, you have to free ourselves from the dependence on oil, most of which is foreign oil. In the former, if you just think it is a national security concern, we may

muddle through that and come out okay. If you think that it is a peak oil issue, then there is no way of muddling through that, because unless you forcefully and intelligently approach that problem you are going to have some big problems.

The next chart shows us how this term originated, and we need to go back about six decades to the 1940s and the 1950s when a scientist by the name of M. King Hubbert whose name is widely known. I was reading an article just today. Without ever telling the readers the derivation of the term they were talking about Hubbert's Peak. Well, in 1956, Hubbert as a result of his analysis for nearly two decades of the behavior of oil fields made the prediction that the United States would peak in oil production in about 1970. As it turned out, he was right on target, we did peak in 1970.

He made that prediction because, as he noted, the exploitation and exhaustion of an individual oil field followed a typical not surprising or unsurprising bell curve, that it went up and up as you pumped a field until you reached the peak, and then at that peak about half of the oil had been pumped, and then the last half was more difficult to get and so you came down the other side of that typical bell curve, and that has come in the literature to be known as Hubbert's Peak.

This smooth green line is his prediction for the United States. The rougher green line with the heavy symbols indicates the actual production of oil. What you see, it roughly followed his prediction. The red curve here is for Russia that had more oil than we. They peaked after us. But when the Soviet Union fell apart, you see that they did not reach their potential, and they are now experiencing a second smaller peak that does not show here but it is a peak about like so.

If we look at the next chart, we see where we got the oil from in our country. I am going to spend a couple of minutes just to say what peak oil is, and I have got several colleagues that are going to join us. This shows where we have gotten the oil from in our country, Texas and the rest of the United States and Alaska and natural gas liquids. Notice the small contribution that Prudhoe Bay made, a big source of oil. We were starting down the other side of Hubbert's Peak. Remember, he said we would peak in 1970, and right on target that is when we peaked, and the big Prudhoe Bay oil field was a little blip in our downward coast on Hubbert's Peak. I am sure you can all remember the fabled oil discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico which was going to save us for the future. That is this yellow here. That is all that amounted to. There are 4,000 oil wells out there, I think, and that is their contribution to oil in our country.

The next chart shows the world situation, and this is a too busy chart. It is like reading a textbook. There is really a whole lot of information there. They

spent a lot of time putting this together, and what I have done is to pull out one part of this. This little inset here will be our next chart, and this inset shows two curves. They are really very interesting curves. The bars here show the discovery of oil, and you notice that we were discovering oil way back in the early 1900s and a whole lot of it was discovered in the 1960s and 1970s. The black curve here indicates our consumption of oil. Notice, up until about the early 1980s the world was finding a lot more oil than it was consuming.

Up until this point, this is all history, and from this point on now is a guess as to where we will be going. Because these two curves have the same abscissa, the area under these two curves, and this is one curve, the production curve, and this is the consumption curve. The area under those two curves has to be the same. What that means is that the only oil that we can pump is the oil that we found, and what the authors have done is to make a guesstimate of the oil which is yet to be found, and this is their estimate of what we are yet to find. We may find more, a little, we may find less. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that most of the world's experts agree that we have probably found about 95 percent of the oil that we will find, of the recoverable oil that we will find.

I did a little play with these curves, and I noted that this part of the consumption curve will consume some of this discovery, and I noted that it took all of the discovery to about this point just to make up the difference between the rate at which we are using oil, which you can see is three or four times as high as the rate at which we are finding oil. So what we have got yet to consume is this oil which remains here, and the authors believe that it will follow that kind of a slope.

The next chart shows a simplistic bell curve. By the way, this bell curve can be very sharp. All you have to do is change the ordinate and abscissa, you can make it very short and sharp, or you can make it spread out. This is a 2 percent growth rate in the production and consumption, because up until this point the production of oil and the consumption of oil have been the same thing. There have been no real shortages until currently, and there have been no big surpluses that have been stored away somewhere except for our strategic reserve and some other countries that have some strategic reserve.

This shows that the problem will occur not at peak oil but sometime before peak oil, because you see that the demand curve will separate from the supply curve quite a while before you reach a peak. If this is a 2 percent growth rate, that means you double, that is exponential, you double in 35 years. So that yellow area on the abscissa is 35 years long. What this says is that you should start seeing some little perturbations a decade or so before you reach peak oil.

The next chart kind of puts this in context, and I think that it is good to look back through history to see how we got here. Here we have three little curves, one of which shows our economy, and this starts way back in the 1600s and goes up to the present. This shows the economy of the world with wood, the brown; black appropriately for coal; and then look what happens when we get to oil. It just does not show the quadrillion Btus that the world has produced, that also mirrors pretty much the population growth of the world. We started out back here with less than a billion people for hundreds of years, less than a billion people. When we finally had the energy available from fossil fuels, primarily oil, our population has shot up from about 1 billion people to now almost 7 billion people.

I want to show one more chart before I put one up that we can talk to with the Members that have joined me. This is an interesting one that kind of tells you where we are today. The analogy I use is that we as a country are very much like a young couple that has gotten an inheritance from their grandparents, a pretty good inheritance, and they have established a lavish lifestyle where 85 percent of all the money they spend comes from their grandparents' inheritance and only 15 percent from what they earn, and the grandparents' inheritance is not going to last until they retire at the rate they are spending it. So they have got to do one of two things. Either they have got to spend less money, or they have got to earn more money. I use those numbers, 85 and 15, and some other people may use 86 and 14, by the way, but that is pretty much where we are in our country in terms of energy use. 85 percent of all the energy we use comes from fossil fuels and only 15 percent comes from other sources, a bit more than half of that 15 percent comes from nuclear. That could and probably should grow. There are obviously some problems with using nuclear, but you will make a choice between borrowing those problems or not having energy in the future, I believe.

The 7 percent which is what we call renewables has been blown up here so that we can see what it consists of. Notice that the biggest part, nearly half of that renewable energy, is hydro. That is probably not going to grow in our country, we are breaching more dams than we are making now and so hydro has probably peaked out in our country.

The next biggest source is wood. That is not rural people burning wood to keep warm. That is the paper industry and the timber industry wisely using what would otherwise be a waste product and they are using it to produce energy. Then, waste. That is a really interesting one because that is pretty big, well, pretty big compared to other things in renewables but not very big compared to the total amount of energy that we use. That is municipal

waste being burned. The county instead of a landfill ought to have a generating plant that is burning this waste. There is a very good one, by the way, up at Dickerson not very far from here that they would be happy to show you.

Now we get down to those renewables that are talked about as the sources of energy that we are going to have to increasingly turn to as we slide down the other side of Hubbert's Peak. They are solar, 1 percent. That is 1 percent of 7 percent, which is .07 percent. Wind, 1 percent of 7 percent, .07 percent, more than that of electricity, because this nuclear power which is 8 percent of total energy is 20 percent of electricity in our country. Then agriculture.

□ 2015

By the way, there are two ways we use geothermal. One is the true geothermal where you are tapping into the molten core of the Earth and getting heat there. There is not a chimney, I believe, in Iceland, because they get all of their energy that way. We are now using that term "geothermal" in another way where you wisely couple not to the air, which you are trying to heat in the wintertime and cool in the summertime to condition your house, but you are coupling your heat pump to the ground or ground water which stays a constant temperature. Fifty-six degrees seems pretty cool in the summertime and pretty warm in the wintertime, does it not, and that is ground water temperature here.

Then we get to agriculture, and what we can expect to get from agriculture. I know one of the Members who has joined us is going to talk about agriculture. Let me just call on the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) because he wants to talk about agriculture. Let me put the next chart up here, because what we are going to be speaking to now is the finite resources we have, the things we can turn to; but they are finite. They will not last forever, and then the renewable resources, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is interested in one of those down here in the agricultural resources area.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland. I am so delighted that the gentleman took this hour tonight, because this is an issue that every American is thinking about, in terms of our energy, and the gentleman has probably done more research on overall energy and energy policy, how much good we get out of a barrel of oil. I apologize for being a little late, but I do want to talk just for a minute, because there are so many misunderstandings about ethanol and other renewable energies.

This is a chart based on numbers from the United States Department of Agriculture, and they have part of their numbers, I think, from the United States Energy Department, but it is a chart that most Americans would be surprised to learn. Frankly,

even back in my own district of Minnesota, many people are surprised that right now, in Claremont, Minnesota at the Alcorn ethanol plant, we are producing ethanol for 95 cents a gallon. That number reflects a higher price for corn than corn is today. Actually, corn is dirt cheap, as they say out in the Midwest. But the price right now is at about \$60 a barrel for oil, and to produce a gallon of unleaded gasoline is \$1.65.

Now, the truth of the matter is, we have to be honest, we get fewer Btus out of a gallon of alcohol than we do out of a gallon of gasoline; but even when you make that comparison, ethanol today is cheaper than gasoline on a Btu basis. On a Btu basis, \$60 for oil, \$2.25 for corn, these are the raw costs of that product.

Now, there are a lot of other benefits to using more ethanol. One, of course, is we become less dependent on foreign sources of energy. I think even if these numbers were reversed, it seems to me it would be worthwhile for us at the Federal level to do more to encourage more use of renewable energies like ethanol.

The other thing about ethanol is it is better for the environment, and perhaps the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) can talk about this sometime now or later, but ethanol is an oxygenate. It is roughly 30 to 35 percent oxygen, which means that it burns far leaner than unleaded gasoline. More importantly, one of the by-products, of course, is carbon dioxide; but that gets used the next year in growing the next crop of corn. So in many respects, it is a perfect carbon dioxide cycle, if you will. So it is better for the environment; it is better for our economy, because in the month of August we spent \$22 billion, over \$22 billion, the United States, in buying oil from countries that are not particularly friendly to us.

I think we ought to set as a vision that we are going to become energy independent.

Now, I was taught many years ago in sales training class that a goal is a dream with a deadline, and so I tried to offer last week in the energy bill that we had what we described as a 10-by-10 amendment mandating that by the year 2010, 10 percent of our gasoline will be renewable energy. We did not get a chance to offer that amendment, so now I am having it redrafted as a bill. I am planning to offer it as a bipartisan effort. I think energy policy does not have to be partisan. But these numbers, I think, speak for themselves. Even if ethanol were more expensive, because of the environment and in terms of keeping more of those dollars rotating through our economy, it makes sense to use more renewable energy.

So I want to thank the gentleman for what he is doing tonight, I want to thank him for what he has done in the past, and I want to encourage Members, if they would like more information, because there are so many myths

about renewable energy and particularly about ethanol, if they would like a fact sheet, we have some in our office, get ahold of my office or go to my Web site at gil.house.gov. We have some great information, and we have sources for all of it. This is from the actual people who produce it, and it was authenticated and authorized by the United States Department of Agriculture. Ethanol is cheaper than gasoline. I yield back to the gentleman, and I thank him for having this Special Order.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us this evening.

Ethanol is certainly one of the alternatives to which we can turn. But if there were some here on the other side, let me just indicate what they would probably say because, as a friend told me a number of years ago, the thinnest sheet of paper has two sides, and so let us look at what they would say on the other side.

I have here a chart which shows the energy input for producing a million Btus from gasoline and the energy input for producing a million Btus from ethanol. And to get a million Btus out of gasoline, we have to input 1.23 million, because you are not going to get it all. You have to transport it and refine it and you are going to lose something in the process. But for ethanol, we have the happy consequence of getting a lot of energy from the sun. So this chart says that for every million Btus you get from ethanol, it takes only .74 million Btus of fossil energy to produce it, and that is a good bet.

But, there are others, Dr. Pimentel, for instance, and his colleague from the West Coast. About 6 weeks ago I attended an all-day conference at the National Press Club, and their argument was that if you really look at all of the fossil fuel energy that goes into producing ethanol, you use more fossil fuel energy in producing ethanol than you get out of it. I hope they are wrong; but even if they are not wrong, the energy profit ratio is not going to be really large.

Let me look at this next chart for just a moment, and then I am going to come back to this one for a minute, because both of these relate to ethanol. This is an interesting chart. What it shows is energy profit ratios for several fuels. This is energy profit ratio.

Now, what the gentleman was looking at was dollar profit ratio. It is really profitable dollar-wise to produce ethanol today because it takes less money to produce it than you would pay for an equivalent gallon of gasoline. This is the energy profit ratio, and this is contrasted with a quality, economic effectiveness in transport, how feasible is it to use over a wide range of uses. Of course, the source that tops the list is the giant oil fields. We do not have any of those, by the way; they are all in the Middle East. But the energy profit ratio is very high: if you put in \$1 you get out \$60.

And they are very economically useful, because you can make a whole lot of things out of it. You can make pharmaceuticals out of it, you can heat your house with it, you can run your car with it, you can make plastics out of it, do a whole lot of things with oil.

This shows the other compounds. Here is U.S. oil. We never were very good, and now we are getting on down further, tar sands and ethanol. Ethanol is way down here at the bottom because they say there is not a big energy profit ratio. But if it is even positive, it is really good, because when you use ethanol, it is relatively nonpolluting as compared to fossil fuels.

As the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) properly pointed out, there is no CO₂ penalty for that, because every bit of CO₂ you get out of it, next year's plant is going to absorb in growing it. We use oxygen, produce CO₂, the plants, happy neighbors; they use our CO₂ to produce oxygen which we then can breathe. But you must be very careful with the energy profit ratio. The dollar profit ratio is one thing; and, today, that is about all economists look at. But energy profit ratio, at the end of the day, if we really have finite sources of these fossil fuels, is going to be important.

Let us go back now to the previous chart. I just want to take a quick look at the bottom of it because this shows something that most people have no idea about. This is the energy that goes into producing a bushel of corn which you are using for your ethanol, and notice that nearly half of all of the energy that goes into producing a bushel of corn comes from natural gas. And the other sources are the tractor that guides it, the seed, the phosphates, the diesel fuel, the gasoline, the electricity, natural gases and so forth.

But nearly half the energy comes from natural gas which produces nitrogen, and most people have no concept of that. Before we learned how to do that, the only nitrogen sources we had in the world were barnyard manures and guano, and it was a big industry a number of years ago. Guano, of course, is the droppings of bats and birds over tens of thousands of years that accumulated, and that is gone. If we wait a couple of hundred thousand more years, there will be some more. But ethanol is certainly something we ought to look at. It is one of a number of things on this list and it is down here in ethanol, and it is one of the things we can get out of agriculture. We will come back a little later in the hour to talk more about agriculture. Several other Members have joined us, and let me let them speak in terms of the time they appeared. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his initiative to give us an insight into the world of peak oil and all its ramifications. I just wanted to speak briefly tonight in support of the gentleman's effort to bring this information across

the board to the administration, to Members of Congress, and to the country as a whole so that all of us can understand what is transpiring over the next couple of decades to have an enormous impact on not only our Nation's economy but on the world's economy.

The question that I would pose that I think everybody should think about is what is at the bottom of the bottomless well. I think most people think that oil will go on forever, that there is plenty of reserves out there, that they will never dry up, they are not a finite resource, they are there for the foreseeable future, and that nature is not dynamic, but it is static.

Well, I think the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is bringing to the forefront that what is at the bottomless well is not oil; and if it is not initiative, ingenuity, and intellect, we are in for a lot of problems in the very near future. If, at the bottom of the bottomless well is initiative, ingenuity, and intellect, we will take the next logical step in cultural evolution.

We all used to burn wood for thousands of years. People burned wood for energy, for heat to make their communities whole. Then we discovered coal, and coal was a lot more efficient. It burned a lot better, and our industries prospered, plus we had better uses for wood than just to burn it. Coal was then, to a large extent, supplemented by oil, and oil was more efficient. Our industries could prosper even more, and it increased the ability to advance technology.

Now, coal has more hydrogen than wood. Oil has more hydrogen in it than coal. And then we discovered natural gas, which was even more efficient than oil or coal, and that expanded our markets for our economic progress even more, and natural gas has more hydrogen than oil.

We are running out of oil, and I think the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) said we have about 2 percent of the known reserves in the United States. Many people say it is a little bit more than that; but whether it is 2 percent or 3 percent or 4 percent or whatever, it is a limited resource. In 1970, we produced in the United States 11 million barrels of oil a day, in 1970. In the year 2004, we produced 5 million barrels a day. We produce less than half now than we did 30 years ago, and yet we are burning a lot more. We burn 20 million barrels of oil a day. Now, if we compared what we have done in the last 100 years in BTUs as far as oil energy use is concerned, we can put it into the number quadrillion. This is what a quadrillion looks like.

In 1910, our BTU energy output from oil was 7 quadrillion BTUs, 7 quadrillion. In 1930, it was 35 quadrillion BTUs. In 2004, it was 100 quadrillion BTUs. The point here is that as supplies go down from this finite resource, demand goes up exponentially.

□ 2030

And what are we going to do? I would just like us to think about a couple of

things. Oil is not going to last forever. The horizon is seeing to its completion in a number of decades, and so the transition to find alternatives to that type of fossil fuel is now.

There are a number of alternatives that some of the other Members will talk about, whether it is solar or even hydrogen or using soybeans or corn or wind or other technologies, advancing nuclear. The idea that we need to transition and find alternatives to our transportation needs is vital.

The second thing is we have the technology right now to more than double our efficiency across the board. The technology exists right now to more than double what you can get out of an automobile, from 20 miles a gallon to 50 miles a gallon. We have the technology to make all of our appliances way more efficient.

When we burned coal, we found a lot better uses for wood. If we know what uses there are for oil, other than burning it, we would be astounded. Our whole economy, our medical field, our industry, our clothes, our trinkets, the things that we have in our house, it is all a byproduct of oil.

So we have better uses for oil than putting it in, pardon the expression, a gas hog, so we can run off to the 7-Eleven and buy a cup of coffee and maybe some item that is made in some other part of the world.

So think about peak oil. Think about energy efficiency. Think about alternatives. These are not 100 years away. And think about your own lifestyle and how that fits into the mix.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, thank you very much for joining us. You mentioned gas hog. The other day my wife read a new definition for SUV, it was a suddenly useless vehicle with the high gas prices we have now.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) mentioned conservation and efficiency. I just wanted to come back for a moment to this chart to point out something that is quite obvious when you think about it.

If we are here, and I am going to call next on my colleague from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). And I see he has the same article that I started with. But here we have a curve that shows that as we approach peak oil that our demands for oil are going to exceed the supplies of oil. What that means is that there will not even be enough oil to fuel our present economies.

And if we are going to have any oil to invest, any energy to invest in alternatives, we are going to have to reduce our use of oil. Now we have blown, if you will excuse the term, 25 years. We absolutely knew in 1980 that M. King Hubbert was right about his 1970 prediction that we would peak.

By the way he predicted the world would peak about now, and we knew in 1980 that he was right about our country. Should not we have assumed that maybe, just maybe, he was right about the world and we ought to do something about that? We did absolutely

nothing about that except grow an ever more and more lavish lifestyle that used ever more and more oil.

And so now just emphasizing what this curve tells us is if we are going to have any energy to invest in the renewables, we should have been investing for the last 25 years at least. We were not doing it. If we are going to have any to invest now, we would like to use this much oil, only this much is available totally so we cannot even use that much for ordinary activities, we are going to have to reduce that so that we have something to invest in the alternatives.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I hope I am wrong. I hope all of these experts are wrong. Because if we are not wrong, the world and the United States mostly, because we are the biggest consumers of energy, are in for a very rough ride.

Let me turn now to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, we must have both had our eyes drawn to the same article in USA Today that ran where it talks about the debate brews. Has oil production peaked?

As my colleague has pointed out, there are those that would advocate that say we have not reached the peak yet, that I think one of the authors or one of the people quoted in here says we have run out of oil five times since 1890 and we always find additional sources.

But it also goes on to say that the only debate should be over when we peak, not whether we will or will not peak. It is going to happen. And as we have seen over the last 12 months, especially the last 6 months, all of the indications are that we are going to continue to feel significant stresses with oil prices and the demand for oil.

With gasoline at one time having been close to \$3 a gallon, now being back in the \$2 and a half range, you know, we can see that perhaps at least for the short term some of the problems have been alleviated. But that only provides us what I believe is a short window, a very small window of opportunity for Congress and the United States to address this issue.

We know that our demand is going to continue increasing. We know that global demand is going to continue increasing, especially for two significant countries like China and India coming on-stream, their demand for fossil fuels is going to increase dramatically.

With increased demand, probably static production, we know that we are going to continue seeing increases in the pressure for the prices of fossil fuels.

You know I chair the Intelligence Committee. One of the things that I look at this as, I think this is a national security issue. We are extremely vulnerable. Today we import about 60 percent of our fossil fuels.

Who do we import from? Well, we import from our southern and our northern neighbors. We get 16 percent of our

imports from Canada. We get almost exactly that same amount from Mexico. And after that, we have got to be really careful in terms of how we describe these countries, but the next three countries, Saudi Arabia, roughly 15 percent. Venezuela, Hugo Chavez who has shown himself to be not a great friend of the United States, we get about 13 percent from Venezuela, and we get about 11 percent from Nigeria, and then you know a much lesser extent from a whole long list of countries.

But it becomes a national security issue, because at any particular given time, if these countries believe, or their leaders believe that they want to hold us hostage, they have the potential to perhaps do that.

So it is a national security issue. It is an economic issue. I agree with my colleagues and the comments made by my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), earlier that we ought to establish a goal, with a firm implementation date of when we will be energy independent. We ought to define exactly what that means and then we ought to develop those strategies to get there.

You know, he talked about ethanol. My friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) has talked about various conservation methods. There is probably no single magic bullet to solving this crisis, but if we push a whole range of efforts forward at the same time, there is no reason why by 2010 we could not be using 10 percent of our gasoline, or that all of our gasoline would be a 90/10 mix, 90 percent gasoline, 10 percent ethanol.

We just need to have a will to make it happen. Ford and GM, you talked about the SUVs, the interesting thing today about the automobiles that are being produced, I believe that every automobile being produced today can burn a mix of 90 percent gas, 10 percent ethanol. It is not a technology problem for the automotive companies.

As a matter of fact, everybody who is driving a relatively new car, something that has been produced in the last 5 to 7 years, can burn a 90/10 mix. The other interesting thing is all of the SUVs, the bigger vehicles with the bigger engines, because of some quirk in technology that my colleague from Maryland or my colleague from Michigan can maybe explain to me exactly how it works, but all of the larger engines today can burn a mix of 85/15, and that is 85 percent ethanol and 15 percent gasoline.

So the industry has come a long way. They have come a long way in moving forward on hybrids. And as much as I am against mandates, this may be an area, because I do not believe the oil companies, as I have talked to folks in my district who produce biodiesel, who produce the ethanol and these type of things, and I am asking if these are things are more economical to produce than fossil fuels why do not we see a richer mix of these fuels available at the pump?

And the answer is very clear. It is not a priority for the oil companies. They do not want to make it happen. They like selling fossil fuels and making significant profits. Maybe it is time for us to mandate that some of these products move forward so that we can facilitate the type of change that we really need.

Technology has moved forward. You know, we need alternatives. It is a national security issue. It is only going to become a larger national security issue in the future.

I thank my colleagues for allowing me to participate. I thank my colleague for his deep in-depth knowledge on these issues, and for bringing it forward. When I take a look at the mix of Members that we have here, we have got a great cross-section of the Republican Conference, I am optimistic that we actually can come together with a legislative fix to address this issue and hopefully do it in this Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Thank you very much. You mentioned prioritizing. And, you know, if we are going to avoid a really rough landing here, we need as a country, indeed as a world society, we need to have a mentality like the Manhattan Project or putting a man on the moon. This is a big, big challenge.

I just wanted to note your observation about we would reach peak oil. I come back to this chart for just a moment. This is only since 1630. We had a lot of recorded history about, what, 4,000 years before that of recorded history. Out of 5,000 years of recorded history we have been about 100 years in the Age of Oil, and we are probably about half way through the Age of Oil. There is a little argument whether it is 50 percent through, 40 percent through the Age of Oil. But we are roughly half-way through the Age of Oil. And during this Age of Oil, now we have permitted the world's population to grow to almost 7 billion people.

We will come down the other side. This will reach a peak. It will come down the other side. What will we do as we come down that other side? Now we can avoid catastrophic consequences of this, but we really must anticipate them to do that. Let me go back for just a quick moment to the analogy of the thinnest sheet of paper has two sides.

The argument for ethanol is great, and we need to go to ethanol. But I just want to dissuade people from believing that this is the solution to our problem. We are barely able to feed the world today. Tonight I understand maybe a fifth of the world will go to bed hungry.

We are just barely able to maintain the quality of our topsoils. Now taking corn does not degrade that, because we are taking the corn off anyhow. But ethanol will be a really meaningful contribution when we have drastically reduced our total need for energy, because to produce enough ethanol to make a dent in the amount of energy

we use now is just going to take more corn than there is out there to do that.

Let me give you a real quick example of the energy density of these fossil fuels. One barrel of oil, the refined product of which will cost you a little over \$100 will buy you the work output of 12 people working all year for you. We have some difficulty getting our arms around that. Imagine how far one gallon of gas or diesel fuel takes whatever you drive, from a big SUV that gets 8, 10 miles a gallon to I drive a Prius that gets 45 miles per gallon.

How long would it take me to pull my Prius 45 miles? How long would it take you to pull an SUV 8 or 10 miles? If you can do it with a come-along and chains and guardrail you can get it there. It would take you a long time.

Something, another analogy to help you understand how energy rich these fossil fuels are. If you work in your yard real hard all day long, I will get more work out of an electric motor with less than 25 cents worth of electricity. So in terms of fossil fuel energy, we are worth less than 25 cents a day in terms of work output.

So that is the challenge we have. Now ethanol is nearly as good as gasoline. But as I showed on the chart before, it takes an enormous amount of fossil fuel input to produce the ethanol.

You know all of these are solutions, but I tell you, none of them will work with the amount of energy that the world is presently using, particularly in the United States.

Now we turn now to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT). I know that he has had a long-time concern about energy and particular concerns that we ought to be getting more mileage from our motor vehicles.

□ 2045

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Dr. BARTLETT). You will notice during this presentation the colleagues of the gentleman have constantly, as I have, referred to him as doctor. The reason we do so is out of respect for his background, his knowledge; because that Ph.D. that he has indicates he is a very distinguished scientist. So he is not just talking about some pet theory or some gut reaction. He is talking about facts, scientifically produced evidence; and I applaud the gentleman for that, and I want to compliment all of my colleagues for participating in this special order.

In sum and substance, I think the viewers might say, what do I take out of this tutorial? It has been a great academic exercise and the gentleman from Maryland (Dr. BARTLETT) has presented a compelling case why we should all be concerned about peak oil. But if you are watching this in your living room someplace across America you might say, what does it mean to me right now? What does it mean to my family right now and what can I do about it?

Let me suggest something that everyone can do. They can write their

Representative in Congress and urge their Representative to support CAFE standards. What are CAFE standards? Corporate Average Fuel Economy, CAFE. That is where you get the acronym. That is, the Federal Government should require the automobile industry, the manufacturers of automobiles, SUVs, light trucks, all of these vehicles that traverse our Nation's highways which we are so dependent on, we should require them to be more fuel efficient.

We have tried mightily to convince our colleagues of that basic fact using some of the facts that the gentleman from Maryland (Dr. BARTLETT) made in his presentation about peak oil, pointing out that we have 25 percent of the world's energy consumption but we have only 5 percent of the population and only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, yet we are consuming 25 percent of the world's energy output. Now, something is wrong there.

I would suggest we are on a collision course with disaster and we have to do something very meaningful about it. We are consuming 21 million barrels of oil a day in the United States. 21 million. We import 14 million barrels of oil a day. So we are starting every single day with a couple of problems on our hands.

Number one, if we are importing 14 million barrels of oil a day and oil is costing \$60, \$65 a barrel, that means we start each and every day somewhere in the neighborhood of \$750 million, three-quarters of a billion dollars in the hole, in the red in our balance of trade deficit. And ironically, we are sending, as you have heard from previous speakers, so much of that money to countries where we are not quite certain what they are doing with the money. And the saddest part, as we have heard from our chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, some of that money that we send abroad to purchase this oil from less than enthusiastic embracers of our democratic ways, ends up in the hands of people who are trying to undermine everything that is so dear to us that we cherish.

So, in effect, you could make an argument that we are helping to sponsor terrorism by sending so much of that money abroad to countries that do not really give two hoots about our way of life, and some of that money ends up in hands that are intent on doing us harm. That is established. That is a fact. That is not just a pet theory.

Now, in addition to creating further pressure on our balance of trade, sending all of this money abroad, we are also doing something that is mind boggling to me. We are concentrating all of our efforts not on how we can conserve energy, but how we can consume more and find new sources of energy. Now, that is important. We have got to constantly be searching for new sources of energy but we ought to think in terms of how we can conserve energy, and making our vehicles more fuel efficient is a way to do it.

Now, back in the mid-seventies I was a member of the staff here in Congress at that time when CAFE standards were first introduced into the American lexicon. The opponents of that fought every step of the way, screaming and scratching, do not do it. If you force CAFE standards, and we only did it minimally, very modestly initially, said the opponent, that will put a death knell in the domestic auto industry. As a matter of fact, they asserted, if you do that, within 10 years all Americans will be driving compacts or subcompacts. That did not happen. You know it did not. So do I. So do the facts verify that. But they opposed it every step of the way, and these same forces are trying to oppose it today.

Now, what are their arguments? Well, the one argument they trot out is to make vehicles more fuel efficient the only way to do it is to make them less safe under the theory that you have to make them lighter, therefore less safe. Unmitigated nonsense. That is not my theory. That is not the theory developed by the Committee on Science of which I am privileged to share. That is the scientific consensus embodied in papers produced by the National Academy of Science, the most distinguished scientists in America.

Now, everybody in this body loves to say "we are for science-based decision making" until the scientific consensus leads to a politically inconvenient conclusion. Then they want to go to plan B. So the safety argument is phony on its surface.

The next big argument, well, if you require the American domestic auto industry to make more fuel efficient vehicles, SUVs, light trucks, passenger cars, well, that is going to cost jobs. How is it going to cost jobs? I think the American public would challenge more to go to the showroom to buy vehicles that are more fuel efficient because you know what? At today's price when you fill up, I filled up my vehicle today, \$56 for one tank of gasoline. Do you know what \$56 means to a lot of families in America? It means, boy, they have got to make some hard choices and they are going to have to go without something just to pay the gas bill. And most Americans just are not driving around on a Sunday afternoon drive to look at the scenery. They are going to work. They are going to church. They are taking the kids to school. They are going to the doctors. They are doing what they have to do. They do not have a choice. They have got to fill up their vehicle and they have to drive to places their family has to go.

So if you make more fuel efficient vehicles, they are not going to stop suddenly buying the vehicles. They are going to buy more because they are going to see, wow, this will get me farther on a gallon of gasoline. This will mean I do not have to fill up every week. Maybe I can fill up every 2 weeks. My family budget will be stretched.

Then the argument, the business, if it requires to make them more fuel efficient, and I have shot down the safety argument and I have shot down the jobs argument and they say we do not have the technology. The technology is there, it is on the shelf. We have got to continue research to develop new ways to do things even more efficiently. But the fact of the matter is off-the-shelf technology is there that if employed by the domestic manufacturers or by manufacturers any place, we can make the vehicles more fuel efficient.

So we work to the advantage of national security, make us less dependent on foreign source oil. Incidentally, I do not like the fact, I do not think any American likes the fact that a group of people can get together someplace a half a world away, they can get together and decide to turn off the spigot or reduce the flow on the spigot. That plays havoc on the domestic economy. The prices go up through the ceiling. We have all experienced \$3 plus a gallon for gasoline. Some predictions indicate that it is going to go even higher. It is down temporarily.

I filled up today and it is down to \$2.89 a gallon. I thought, gee, some relief is on the way, but 2 weeks ago it was \$3.29 a gallon. But the fact is if we deal in a responsible way with the CAFE standards, we will provide a benefit to the consuming public from coast to coast. Not that the Federal Government is saying, look it, Detroit, and I use that as a euphemism for the domestic manufacturers, you cannot make SUVs anymore. That is nonsense. There are a lot of people that want SUVs. They have got families. They have got things they cart around in addition to the kids and all the supplies for all the events. They need bigger vehicles. But they want bigger vehicles that are more fuel efficient. You can get them with existing technology. So I would argue that this is an idea whose time long since has come and we are making progress.

In the 107th Congress when I first offered my amendment to increase the CAFE standards from an average of 25 miles per gallon up to 33, that is the current version of it. It was somewhat different back in the 107th Congress. We got 160 votes from Republicans and Democrats alike. And then in the 108th Congress we went up to 162 votes. Not much progress. Then at the beginning of 109th Congress we got 177 votes. Guess what? That was before we had \$3 a gallon gasoline.

Now, I would submit that the votes are there to finally pass CAFE standards but what happened? We had a vote last week on another energy bill and my amendment to increase CAFE standards was not given a rule which would allow open, public debate on the floor and a vote by the people's House. I was denied that opportunity. But I am going to be persistent. I am going to keep at it. One of the reasons I am going to keep at it is because the gentleman from Maryland (Dr. BARTLETT)

has pointed out with his presentation on peak oil this is a serious matter that demands our collective attention and we have got to deal with it in a responsible way.

So I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Dr. BARTLETT) for his support, for his leadership in dealing with a very important issue for all Americans, energy.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. The gentleman mentioned a collision course with catastrophe. I just wanted to make a quick quote from the article in the paper that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) was mentioning.

“The least-bad scenario is a hard landing, global recession worse than the 1930s,” says Kenneth Deffeyes, a Princeton University professor emeritus of geosciences.”

He goes on to say that he made that prediction because “the worst case borrows from the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse.” That is better than war, famine, pestilence, and death.

It is interesting that the gentleman’s “collision course with catastrophe” is mirrored by what he said.

I want to yield the remainder of my time to a colleague who has a fascinating Energy 101. We will only get partway through it today and we will give him a chance for a full explanation of this.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank him for organizing this session.

I want to go very quickly through one item, and as we said we will continue later. I am a physicist. As a physicist, energy is tangible to me but to most people energy is intangible. You cannot touch it, see it, feel it, smell it or taste it. In other words, with our senses we cannot detect it. The only tangible aspect of energy for most people is the price at the gas pump and the utility bill at the end of the month.

But I have a wish and I wish it were true but my wish would be that energy would be purple. If energy would be purple it would be tangible. We could see it. And if you drive up to your house in the middle of the winter and saw the purple oozing through the walls and coming out in rivulets around the doors and windows where they are not sealed properly, you would say, oh, that is horrible. I am wasting all that energy. It is costing me money. So we would make sure that we would get the house sealed up.

Or if we were driving down the road and a Toyota Prius such as is owned by the gentleman from Maryland (Dr. BARTLETT) or Honda Insight or some other hybrid vehicle went past us, there would be just a little bit of purple around the outside of it because it is very energy efficient. But if an SUV roared by there would be a huge cloud of purple. You could hardly see it. If people saw that they would say, why, that is foolish. Why would I want an SUV that is using all that energy? We are wasting energy. We are wasting

money. Why do I not get a hybrid vehicle?

My point is simply because energy is intangible, it is very difficult for people to understand the problem and to deal with it. But if we can believe the experts who tell us about energy, it would be just as good if we saw it because energy is purple.

□ 2100

I am wearing a purple tie for a reason. First of all, I like it. But, secondly, it keeps reminding me if energy were purple, we would certainly change our energy use habits and we would do a much better job of conserving, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) observed earlier about conservation. That is very important.

And I have to tell everyone in this Chamber and all of my colleagues, there is no faster, cheaper way to increase our oil supply than to conserve what we use. Because we can get the use of more energy at lower cost by doing that than by any oil exploration scheme and refinery-building scheme or anything else you wish to do. It costs less to conserve energy than it does to produce more. That is a very important principle to remember.

So I hope that everyone in this Nation and certainly everyone in this Congress recognizes the importance of energy efficiency. Conservation is just one part of energy efficiency, but we can certainly use our energy more efficiently than we have in the past. We can get more bang for the buck because we have the technological capability to do that today.

And it is absolutely essential to do that because, as you heard, we are being held hostage by other countries. Our energy costs are being used against us in various ways, and we simply have to start conserving energy, using it more efficiently, imagining that it is purple and keep trying to reduce the amount of purple that we produce by our use of energy. Then we have a chance of balancing our import-export balance, reducing the deficit of payments, and having a better economy at home because our money will be staying here rather than going abroad.

30—SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor to come to the floor. We would like to thank the Democratic leader as well as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our Democratic whip, for allowing us to have this hour here to talk about the issues that are facing Americans and the issues that we feel should be brought to the forefront which are not being addressed.

Tonight I am joined by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and also by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN). I am glad to be joined by them once again because, as we have said before, we are going to come to the floor night after night to try to push the American agenda forward as best we can.

As my colleagues know, being in the minority here in the House of Representatives does not bring about the kind of power one needs to be able to respond to the needs of Americans. But I can say that being in the minority and pointing out these issues of how we could do the job better than the majority side has done, I think is not only educational for the Members of this House but also should bring about some kind of change so that we can have better representation here in Washington, DC, especially representation in terms of legislation that passes from this floor and out of this Congress and on to the White House.

We have been out for a week on the Columbus Day break, and I know the gentleman and his constituents have been getting lots of rain in New Jersey, so my prayers go out to your constituents and many others. Being from Florida, as you know we receive our fair share of good and bad weather. Mainly good, and so we want folks to come to Florida; but we know the Garden State has been hammered, along with other States around it, for quite a few days now. So I hope all is well with those counties that are trying to survive some of the flood waters.

I think it is important to begin where we left off almost a week ago, Mr. Speaker, and to address the issue of having an independent commission for the aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita and making sure that not only are those Americans not forgotten but that we not forget the mistakes that took place during the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina so that they never happen again. Never again in the United States.

I think it is important for us to also realize, Mr. Speaker, that it was not just a storm. It was the aftermath of the storm and the lack of governance on the front end, making sure that our levee systems were where they should have been and the issues as relates to those buffer islands in the gulf coast area, especially in Louisiana. Those issues should have been addressed by the Federal Government in making sure that we have the kind of buffer to protect one of our greatest U.S. cities.

As my colleagues may know, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and also the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) on our side of the aisle have introduced an independent commission bill that we have been working to get to the floor for some time now. I think that not only the Members but the American people need to realize that the power of this House, if we were in the majority, and this is not a partisan issue, but if we were in

the majority, because there is a bill that is there that almost every Member, if not every Member from the Democratic Caucus, has signed on to this bill calling for a 9/11-like commission to deal with the issues that are facing the Katrina victims and to be able to analyze in an independent way outside of this process, outside of the partisanship, to make sure we do what we did for the 9/11 victims, to give them their fair share of representation and insight; making sure that they are not dragged through the mud, becoming victims once again.

Mr. Speaker, as we open our discussions here tonight, I also wanted to make sure that we deal with the issue of corruption and cronyism. When we left here over a week ago, we were dealing with that issue; and I wanted to make sure that we talk about that a little tonight with my colleagues.

I also brought some articles with me that I think Members should be made aware of, and that we share with them the importance of governance and oversight. So there are a number of issues that we are going to talk about, and I just wanted to make some opening comments regarding those items, but I will be happy to yield to my colleagues at any time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome our newest 30-something member joining us from New Jersey this evening; but before I get into it, I want to make an announcement. Since we left here last week, we had last week off, and since we left here, there has been an addition to the Ryan family. My brother had a baby last Friday night on his birthday. Nicholas John Ryan. So I want to welcome him into the world officially, and say hello to his first two friends, Zack and Molly Leonard, who were all over to the house the other day, and I fed the baby for the first time the other day. So here I had the bottle, and I fed him. It was great.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, A, congratulations; and, B, because you were feeding the baby for the first time yesterday, I hope that you knew what to do when you were feeding the baby.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, see, I took a week and I watched. I was very timid. I did not want to make any mistakes, so I watched for a while. I watched my brother. I was being a little hesitant with the bottle, and my brother is like, jam it in there, you are not going to hurt the kid. So you pick up and gain a little confidence, and then I burped the kid. It was great. Bingo.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. There you go. Great uncle.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And the godfather. I am also going to be the godfather.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Two-fer.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes. So this is a lot of pressure. You think being a Member of Congress is a lot of pressure, try being the godfather to the first new baby in the family.

So that for me has kind of changed my perspective, and it makes all of the

stuff we talk about here that much more important because you begin to see the timetable, the effect our decisions have over the long term.

I know a couple weeks ago when we left, we were talking about this administration, this Congress putting people in charge of key positions, in charge of key processes that need to happen here, whether it was in FEMA, Medicare, or regardless of what it is. There has been, over the past 5 to 10 years in this body and now in the executive branch, a host of cronyistic appointments to key positions. There have been people put in key positions, like FEMA, that have absolutely no experience whatsoever. All we are saying in this Chamber from the Democratic side is give us a chance to run this place. Give us an opportunity to be able to handle the levers of government and allow us to lead.

That is the opportunity that we are asking the American people for, my good friends, because our colleagues who have had the levers of government over the past, since 1994 in the House and since 2000 in the White House and in the Senate, have not been able to govern. They just have not been able to do it.

You do not have to look very far. Ask yourself sitting at home, what is going on here? I mean, we have higher energy costs, we have more people in poverty, we have tuition costs that have doubled, we have our FEMA administration that has been devastated financially. We have put cronies in key governmental positions. We are leaking information about CIA agents. I mean, what good is going on right now? Somebody please help me.

We are bogged down in a war that is costing us \$1.5 billion a week. I repeat, \$1.5 billion a week. We are getting our clock cleaned by China. Delphi, the largest auto supplier in the country, filed for bankruptcy. They are asking their workers to take 60 percent pay cuts. I have over 5,000 workers in my district, in Warren, Ohio. What positive is happening today due to the Republican leadership in the House, Republican leadership in the Senate, and the Republican leadership in the White House? I cannot seem to find anything.

I think this country deserves a lot better, and I think we need to start talking about that, my good friends. This country deserves better. After September 11, this President had more political capital than any President probably since FDR after Pearl Harbor, and he asked the American people to go shopping. That is the best leadership you can come up with in the United States of America? We deserve a little better than that, I think.

He did not start an alternative energy policy, not to fix the health care system that is a mess, not to take care of the millions and millions of young kids that live in poverty, not fund No Child Left Behind. What are we doing? The biggest leadership move is to ask the country to go shopping? What is

that? That is terrible. That is terrible leadership.

We have given this President the opportunity time and time and time again to lead, and he has not done it. He has not done it. And now the whole Delphi situation, which I am a little too intimate with because of the workers in my district. And General Motors. I have a General Motors plant in my district. Believe me, I understand why the corporations are doing what they are doing. The rising costs of health care are crippling the American businessperson. Crippling the corporation and the small businessperson.

So now they are trying to squeeze blood out of a turnip in the form of asking middle-class citizens in the United States of America to get less health care or to pay for more health care, whether they are in a union or not in a union, instead of addressing the key issue, which is that the insurance lobby and the health care lobby and the pharmaceutical lobby which has a stranglehold around the United States Congress.

Let us be honest. How about a little straight talk from the House floor tonight? Check it out. When you are passing the Medicare prescription drug bill, there are four lobbyists for every one Member of Congress; and I know I did not have a lobbyist, I did not have one, let alone four, so somebody had eight. Now, imagine that. When we get this health care issue under control, that will release a lot of potential that can get freed up, investments that could be made back in the United States of America.

□ 2115

For example, and I am sorry because we have been dealing with this for the last week, with the Delphi situation, this money that this corporation saves, and we all want to save Delphi. We want it to be a solvent company and we want them to maintain the work that they have in Ohio. Of course we do. The way the system is set up is any savings that they get, they are going to invest that money into China. That is what they are going to do. So the whole system is screwed up to where you are forcing corporations to invest into these other countries.

Here we have an opportunity with this independent commission to oversee a problem with the government through FEMA, the problems that FEMA had, to oversee it in an independent manner like the 9/11 Commission, and the Republican leadership put the kibosh on it. They put together a bust-out committee that is 11 Republicans, 9 Democrats, that is going to totally, totally, whitewash this thing. Get out the Brillo pads because they do not want the truth to come out. The Democrats will not have any subpoena power. Get a Republican Governor, a Democratic former Member of Congress, put together an independent commission and let us try to fix this problem. Let us try to fix this in a way that we are putting partisanship aside.

Mr. Speaker, next we will hear from the newest member of the 30-Some-things, and we charge him two sets of dues because he is almost 30-Something twice.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times I am going to have to endure these comments about my age.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I never say anything about the gentleman's age.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that is because the gentleman is almost his age. Tell the American people how old you are.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am 39.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. See, he graduates out of the 30-somethings next year. I am going to be a one-man show.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is at the younger end, he wants to talk more about the older people that are involved and the wiser people. And I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), we will not prolong it any more.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that one way to deal with the age problem is to hang out with the younger people so I feel younger.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You are welcome here every time we are here, my friend.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, let me follow up on what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) said because he certainly was right. We had a week when we were back in our districts doing things locally. I was thinking when I was listening to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) about three events that I attended in the last 48 hours in my district or nearby which point to this whole idea of what is good and what is the Republican leadership and what is President Bush doing because all I hear are complaints about his policies.

For example, on Sunday, I went to a senior complex for a group of seniors that were meeting in Lakewood, New Jersey, which is a community just outside my district. It used to be in my district until redistricting a few years ago. What I heard was how expensive it is for seniors to buy their prescription drugs, and how they did not feel that the President's new program, which goes into effect in January, was going to help them in any way.

One gentleman in particular, I remember, was one of these guys who was essentially forced into early retirement and promised a fairly generous health care plan that included prescription drugs. What he has found since he retired is that every year the cost goes up and the whole agreement, if you will, that was initially set out has essentially made it so he really cannot afford to buy the prescription drugs even though he has the coverage under a plan for his early retirement.

The other seniors were talking how the Federal Government should negotiate price reductions like they do for the VA or the Department of Defense.

My answer was that is what the Democrats wanted to do. The reason it did not become law was because the Republicans opposed it. I remember in the Committee on Energy and Commerce I had an amendment that would have required negotiated prices by the Medicare Administrator, and it was defeated on a party line vote.

The bottom line is Republicans are so aligned with lobbyists and the cronyism they do not want to do anything that is going to be helpful to the average person. This prescription drug bill is a perfect example.

In addition, all the seniors were saying as of October 1, all these different private drug plans are being promoted on television and they have no idea what they are all about. I said be very, very careful. Do not sign up for these things until you really look at the details because they may not be helpful to you.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to highlight that fact. This totally puts into perspective what happens down here under their leadership.

We have a prescription drug bill that we spent \$700-some billion over the next 10 years on, but we were told it was \$400 billion. So that is another issue, to start a prescription drug Medicare program, and we are not doing anything to control the costs, whether it is reimportation from Canada or to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to buy in bulk.

There would be every Medicare beneficiary behind that proposal. And you can say Merck, you want to negotiate this, we want 30 to 40 percent chopped off, and they would do it because they want the contract. We would not have to create a new bureaucracy. If people think the old Democrat Party wants to create a new bureaucracy, they are wrong. This is a progressive idea of giving the Administrator already in place the power. It is a progressive idea that makes sense, but you can only do it if you are not tied to the pharmaceutical lobby like our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have ceased even referring to this program as Medicare because as far as I am concerned there is nothing Medicare about it. You said we need to show to the American people how we would do things differently because we want a chance to be in the majority and to run the country.

Here we had a clear contrast. The fact of the matter is every Democrat, or maybe one or two that did not vote for a substitute, that basically would have been just like we do now with Medicare Part B, how seniors pay for their doctor bills, and that would have been under Medicare as a regular government program. They would have paid a \$25 premium per month, and had their choice of whatever prescription drugs they wanted. They would not have to go out privately and shop around. They would have had a \$100 deductible and 80 percent of the cost paid

for by the Federal Government, 20 percent copay. We already have it for Part B, and the Republicans rejected that to a person. There is clear contrast. This is the kind of thing we would do if we were in the majority and in charge.

I want to use another example. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) talked about the rain and the storms in New Jersey. There was a senior complex in my district that was near a brook where a number of homes were completely destroyed and people had to be moved out. I went there this morning with the Army Corps of Engineers because the Corps has a project that would correct the situation that we would like to do. It would cost about \$8 million to do it. What I am hearing from the Corps, we would like to do it but we have to see if we have the money.

What happened with those levees in New Orleans is no different from what is happening around the country. We are not funding these infrastructure needs, whether flood control or whatever it happens to be. The reason, and I am going to go back to another forum, right after I met with the Corps this morning and talked about this flood control project which has been delayed for a number of years now, I met with students at Rutgers, a State university in my district, and we talked about the Iraq war.

I started out talking about an exit strategy and what needed to be done. A lot of the students were talking about the cost of the war, not only cost in terms of the lives and the wounded, but also the cost of the actual dollars we were spending and the fact that because we were spending so much money on the Iraq war, we were not able to pay for a lot of domestic needs, whether it be student financial aid. They were stressing that, of course. But I was thinking about my flood control project which would have avoided all of the damage and all of the people who had to move out if it had been in place.

The bottom line is we are spending all of this money on the Iraq war. The President does not have an exit strategy. He keeps talking about how everything is going to get better, and the cost is not only lives and the wounded, but also in terms of the dollars we are not spending here domestically, and we are not investing in the future to remain competitive with China and the other countries competing with us.

People get this. I am not making this up. This is within the last 48 hours at three different forums or opportunities I had to meet with my constituents, and this is what they are saying. They are not happy. They realize there are alternatives. The bottom line is some of those alternatives are easy, some are hard. Democrats are saying we have alternatives, whether it is prescription drugs or any of the other topics.

Many of us voted against all these tax breaks that the President gave because we knew it would put us into debt and we would not have money to

pay for a lot of the domestic programs, and most of the money went to the wealthy rather than the average person.

One more thing, and that is when we were here last time, the week before being back in our districts, I think it was the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) talking about the energy bill because the next day we voted on the Republican energy bill. She pointed out there was no benefit from this bill. It would not do anything to reduce gas prices or reduce our dependence on foreign oil. All of the things that people would like us to do, the Republicans were not doing.

What it was doing, two things she mentioned, one was it was going to allow for offshore drilling off the coast of Florida and New Jersey, all these sensitive areas. The second thing the gentlewoman mentioned was it was going to weaken the Clean Air Act. Lo and behold, the interesting thing was the next day the Republicans took those provisions out of their energy bill because there was such a hue and cry. When they finally passed the energy bill, they barely were able to pass it. We had to wait an hour for them to get the votes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ninety minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. The bottom line is that this Republican majority is starting to fall apart because their policies are not good for the American people. Even some of the Republicans are starting to realize it and are not willing to vote for some of the junk bills that come to this floor with the Republican leadership.

I just mention that because I think there is hope here. I left last Friday thinking maybe now because of yourselves getting on the floor, maybe because Democrats are speaking out and talking about why these Republican initiatives are not helpful, maybe people are starting to realize it. Maybe some Republicans are starting to realize it. That is why I admire what you are doing because I think it is making a difference.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) has been resilient in pushing us to get up to the floor once or twice a week. I just saw a poll last week that had 60 percent of the independent voters in the country are sick and tired of what has been going on in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Wagner from General Motors said D.C. better do something about health care. We are not doing anything. What we are doing seems like we are doing something, but the energy bill is not really doing anything.

The gentleman mentioned the \$1.5 billion a week that we are spending in Iraq. I want to share one thing. This is a great article today in the Washington Post. The first line says it feels like the 1990s minus the good parts, all of the scandals that were going on, but the economy, energy costs and everything is bad.

There was a proposal made, and talking about dealing with the Chinese, we

need to offer, and that is what we are doing as Democrats, we just need to convince the American people that we are offering alternatives and do have ideas, whether it is prescription drugs or alternative energy.

I want to share a proposal from the National Academies and it is a combination of a variety of different things to get our math scores up. Our math scores in 8th grade, we ranked 15th internationally and in the 9th grade we ranked 24th internationally. We are not going to stimulate the economy if we do not have engineers and math and science majors, and the 30-Something Group is calling for a million new engineers and scientists over the next 10 years because we believe that is going to be the greatest stimulus.

But let me share the proposal from the National Academies to spend money on math prizes for high schoolers, pay raises for math teachers and to boost Federal research funding by 10 percent annually for 7 years. That would cost \$10 billion a year. That is it. We are spending \$1.5 billion a week in Iraq. The American people judge, \$10 billion a year on increased Federal funding for research and development and targeted investments to increase math and science scores in the United States of America among K-12 school kids. That is what the Democrats want to do, versus \$1.5 billion a week in Iraq, versus hundreds of thousands and millions and trillions of dollars over the next 10 years in tax cuts for people who make more than \$600,000 a year.

□ 2130

Pick what they want. Democrats, increased funding for Pell grants to lower tuition costs. Republicans, cut taxes for the top 1 percent. Trillions.

Democrats, fully fund No Child Left Behind, make sure every kid who is eligible for more funding, for afterschool tutoring, summer school, before school; Democrats are for full funding of that. Republicans, no. We have to give our tax cuts to our buddies.

And that is the difference. Time and time again and over the course of the next year, we are just going to hammer the differences between the two parties.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) brought up some interesting points; and I can tell him, as a parent myself, this issue of No Child Left Behind, we would talk to our Republican leadership colleagues and they would say, well, that was a bipartisan bill and over on the opposite side, in the Senate, folks were having press conferences and bill-signing ceremonies and everything.

But we believed that we were going to see full funding of No Child Left Behind and that this Congress would go down in history as the education Congress, and we are not even close to fulfilling our obligations. As a matter of fact, we have about eight States that are suing the Federal Government over

No Child Left Behind unfunded mandates. These are States. These are not other countries. These are States here in the United States that taxpayers pay money.

We have a number of school districts that say, listen, if we can opt out of it, we want to opt out. We do not want to opt in. That is not a federalized education program to help local communities and chambers and all the other do-gooders in small communities and big communities who want to make sure they have an educated workforce. It is not that same theory.

We have one other issue that is here. The gentleman mentioned the issue of the energy bill. I am glad that resurfaced because I am going to tell the Members the reason why that is important. The energy bill came to this floor, and for 90 minutes we sat and stood here on this floor waiting for the board to close. What we call the board here in Congress is a voting board. For several minutes, almost 1 hour. The bill was defeated. And, Mr. Speaker, I think this is where if I had a yellow flag and I was a referee or an official on the 40 yard line that I would actually throw a flag. I would have thrown the flag because the spirit of the rules were violated because when the board opens up and there are 15 minutes to vote, there are 15 minutes to vote, give or take 1 or 2 or 3. But when they say the board is open for 15 minutes and we will close it when we win, then that is a violation of the spirit of the rules of this House. And it feeds into the whole issue of the corruption and cronyism.

I have two young children; and if there were a homework assignment that was due, and my wife and I have to sign their reading stuff and say that it is done, but it would not be fair if my children were to do their homework and there were two other children in the same classroom or in the same school that say, Well, I do not have to do my homework. I will just do it two nights from now because my father or my mother is a chairperson of the PTA and we have power like that. We can do it. That would not be fair to the children who actually did their homework.

I use that analogy because I want to make sure that the Members and the American people understand what we are talking about. Yes, it is a bad thing dealing with children, but it is a horrible thing when we are talking about national policy for the greatest country on the face of the Earth, the shining example of democracy. Now, we salute one flag. And my colleagues heard me speak a couple of weeks ago about those Americans; and, yes, we think about those 2,000-plus individuals who have fallen in this war, but for those Americans who are still here who are voting for representation and fair play, they are individuals that are without limbs now.

We have all gone to Walter Reed. We have all gone to these hospitals in our own communities, these VA hospitals, watching these men and women come

back, half of their head blown off, legs and arms missing. And we are here and we walk through this door and we put our voting cards in these machines to represent them and the Americans that they fought for. And then we come to the floor because the majority did not get what they wanted when they wanted it, to say that they will hold this vote open as long as they have to to make sure that they twist enough arms on the Republican side because every Democrat voted against the bad policy, this bill.

I do not even want to address it as an energy bill because basically it was just a giveaway to the industry. That is all it was. Everything, 7 months prior, that could not go straight-faced into the "energy bill" at that time they got in this last time right before we took a break of the bill that just passed recently. And the reason why they got it: A, Hurricane Katrina came through. Hurricane Rita was on its way. The bill was already being marked up before Rita came, but it was on its way to help deal with the issue of price gouging and making sure that we are able to provide energy for our country and hopefully bring down the price of gas, and it did not do that. What it did was it raped our environmental laws. It raped the process of fair play in this institution.

There are certain things, as Members of Congress, we cannot allow to happen on behalf of the institution. When the record books are opened, the annals of history of the 109th Congress, yes, there will be individuals that will be mentioned; but also it will be that day that we were on the floor and the spirit of the rules of the House were violated in the worst way, time after time again. Time after time again.

The leadership from this side, Mr. Speaker, came to the floor with a parliamentary inquiry. The clock was at triple zero. Obviously, the measure did not pass, Mr. Speaker. Can we ask for the Speaker to call the vote? And each person was gavelled down for not making a parliamentary inquiry, and the Speaker said what he had to say at that particular time to keep it going. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader, came to the floor, gavelled down for asking the question and then pointing out the fact this is what is wrong with Washington now, the culture of corruption and cronyism, not in the dark corners of Congress but under the lights on international, not national, but international television that we are willing to rape the spirit of the rules of this House and the spirit of fair play in America. Not something that we watched on cable television in some foreign land somewhere in a Third World country. Not there. But right here for the world to see. I would not say the hypocrisy of the democracy of everyday Americans, but because of the leaders who allowed it to happen here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, last point, I just want to make sure that we understand, as

Members of Congress, that we have a responsibility in the majority and minority. I take full responsibility for what took place, Mr. Speaker, here on this floor, yes. Did I do everything I could? Of course I did. Did I walk over to the other side of the aisle and talk to some of my friends over there that are level-minded individuals, who will go unnamed because we do not want them to receive any repercussions for speaking out, who said, I think that the vote should have been called. Well, you need to go tell your leadership that the vote needs to be called.

I mean, we want to do it in a gentlemanly way. We call ourselves, Mr. Speaker, gentlemen and gentlewomen, respect for the institution, and still the vote was not called. I mean, individuals' arms were twisted. You vote, hurry up, and trying to call the vote while they went. And it almost happened once, and then the conscience kicked in of some Members and they changed their vote and it went back to a losing vote again, and they said we have to hold the board open another 20 minutes because we did not get our way.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, he is absolutely right. This is strictly an abuse of power. That is what is going on here. This is the majority, the Republican majority, abusing their power. And I think that last Friday was the perfect example of it. And it was not the first time. I have to say one thing that was interesting that he pointed out was that was the first time I remember that they did it in broad daylight, because if the gentleman remembers, most of the time when we had to deal with these major policy initiatives, which that was not, they waited until 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning so nobody was watching. And, of course, the best example of that was the Medicare prescription drug bill, which, as the gentleman knows, was voted on at 3 o'clock in the morning. We had to wait here for hours while they were twisting arms all night for that too and even lied about the fact of how much it was going to cost; otherwise they would have never passed it. Remember when they said it was only going to cost, I guess, 400 billion, and then it ended up being 600 or 700 billion?

We see this abuse of power constantly. I see it in my committee because what happens is when bills come to committee, they do not go to a subcommittee. They do not have a hearing. When the Democrats were in the majority, every time we had a bill that we wanted to move, we had a hearing, sometimes several hearings, in the subcommittee. Then we would have a markup in the subcommittee. Then it would go to the full committee. Then it would go to the Committee on Rules. And at every point there was an opportunity not only for the majority but also for the minority to have some input into what went on.

But that does not go on around here. A lot of bills just go to the floor with-

out even having a hearing or even go into committee, and then they change it when they get to the Committee on Rules. They do not allow us the opportunity to offer an amendment or to offer a substitute so that our voice is not even heard. And what is going on, the reason why they have these closed votes and have to do this arm-twisting is because these are bad bills. These are not bills that are good for the average American, and they can barely get enough people to make a majority and they are even starting to lose some of their own Republicans.

If the gentleman noticed, a lot of Republicans voted "no" on that energy bill, and then they had to twist their arms to get them to come back and barely pass the bill. This is happening all the time. It is an absolute abuse of power. It is not letting the minority have its say, not letting the minority have a voice. And I think it is very important that we get that out there.

This is procedure and a lot of times people maybe listen and maybe they get bored or they yawn because they say this is just procedure, but in a democracy these kinds of procedures are very important. And when the Republicans are abusing the procedure, it is really bad.

And I want to mention one more thing. I cannot help but mention it. The other day when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, was forced to step down because of the indictment by the grand jury, a lot of people forgot that the only reason why that happened was because Democrats insisted that the Republicans go back to the original rules. They tried to change the rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct at the beginning of this Congress to say that if somebody was indicted in leadership that they did not have to step down. And we came here, and the gentleman was part of it too, and insisted that we go back to the old rules, the bipartisan rules, that had that type of provision in it. And there were other changes as well that we insisted on.

So, again, it is important that we speak out because we can make a difference and the public needs to understand the abuse of power and the cronyism that is going on here.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just want to share something with the gentleman, because this is serious business when we come to the floor to talk about these issues. We always say we were elected to represent not only our constituents but also the American people. When they voted for us, they federalized us. They allowed us to come here to vote on policy and to create policy on behalf of the betterment of this country.

The gentleman mentioned something and we do a lot of work here. We have information. We meet off the floor to be able to talk about some of these issues. The Washington Post Federal

Page, I just want to take this and make sure everyone understands this is about saluting one flag. This is not about what side of the aisle we are on. But the reason why we point out the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the majority leadership has not taken leadership to lead us in a way that we should be led in fair play when we are saluting one flag on issues that are facing national security, I am on the Committee on Homeland Security and I am on the Committee on Armed Services with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN); and I can tell the Members right now that energy, as far as I am concerned, is a national security issue.

□ 2145

So when folks come to the floor not on behalf of the American people and national security but on behalf of special interests, I personally have a problem with it.

I take the Federal Page from the Washington Post. This is actually from October 5. This story here talks about: Storms show system out of balance. GOP Congress has reduced agency oversight.

I think it is important that we pay very close attention to not only this article. It names not only three Republicans, one on the other side of the body in the Senate and two here in this body. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), two of my colleagues, called for hearings, Mr. Speaker, on FEMA, the money that was spent last year in Florida on counties that were not truly affected by the four storms that came through, the money that was just given out without any oversight, just simply, for the committees wrote a letter, which one I sent on, to have oversight hearings on FEMA. I agreed with that, yes, we should have oversight hearings. If something went wrong, that is the thing that the Congressperson does, call for oversight hearings.

These are Members that are in the majority. These are not Democratic Members that have said we need to have oversight hearings. These are the Members in the majority side that said we need oversight hearings. Guess what. They did not happen, and this was last year. This was the story that they asked for the hearings last year. It still did not happen.

The point I am making on this article, it goes on to say that it took an analysis of the first 6 months of Congress between 1983 and 1997, to make a comparison. This researcher found that both Chambers of Congress both reduced their numbers of hearings. Actually, in the House, there were 782 hearings in 1983 of oversight, and it went down in 1997 to 287. In the Senate, they had 439 hearings on oversight, and in 1997 it went down to 175.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I want to say, because I have been here longer than the gentleman, and he has already told

me that many times, the fact of the matter is I remember when the Democrats were in the majority. I was here from 1988 to 1994 when we were in the majority. The core of our being in the majority was oversight. That is what we did. That was our life blood. We spent more time on oversight than anything else.

I remember specifically in my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, every one of the subcommittees had oversight on health care, environment, consumer issues, energy, you name it. That was our MO. For all practical purposes, the Republicans have eliminated any real oversight. So you are absolutely right.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We have said it 1 million times. Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution creates the House of Representatives. The people of the country govern. Anything that is created from there we have oversight of, and that is the essence of this democracy. We try to represent the republic that we have. This is our job, overseeing FEMA.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Overseeing the Federal Government, but see, the issue that is so difficult here is the fact that this is our main job, and we are not doing it.

It takes a while to get a culture. If it is corruption, it comes and it goes. When you have a culture of corruption and cronyism, that means two things. Someone has not been overseeing the rules. Someone has not been saying listen, no, I am sorry. We have the Department of Transportation. This is what you are supposed to be doing because we are the oversight committee of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and we have oversight over you and we are elected by the American people to make sure that your tax dollar is being spent in the appropriate way.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We write the checks out of this body. The checks come if you are going to write the checks but not oversight.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This is what we have done, and in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, in the aftermath of Hurricane Rita. We are living with the highest deficit in the history of the republic. We are standing and we are doing this, and what goes back to this article that I was addressing a little while ago, it talked about the fact that there is no checks and balances.

I just want to remind the Members, since some might have maybe not fully focused on what is happening, the Senate is Republican-controlled. The House is definitely Republican-controlled. The White House, we know for sure that it is under Republican control, and when we see the amount of money that is now having to be spent, I am just going to take Katrina. I do want to talk about health care, and I know the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) has the next hour, and I just want to talk a little bit about health care again.

But I can tell you this, I am going to take Katrina for an instance, \$200 billion plus. A big part of that is the fact that Louisiana or New Orleans were flooded, under water. Hundreds of thousands of Americans were displaced.

Two things happened there. Americans died but two things happened there. There was a lack of governance, and I can tell you that if we had the right kind of oversight, if maybe that Army Corps of Engineers captain or commander would have gotten what he needed to do exactly what the National Hurricane Center called for or to do exactly what Members of Congress from that area asked for, or to say that since we are doing all of these strategic review of vulnerabilities, I am on Homeland Security so I know the language, since we are doing all of that and we did all these things when we knew when we were vulnerable, then we are supposed to respond to that, and we did not. That is where the lack of governance comes in.

So this whole issue of oversight is a big issue, and if folks feel that it is not going to be in a community by you, it is already there. Katrina knocked the scab off of the Department of Homeland Security and others that have said that we are ready for anything that happens. It is a perfect example that we are not and we were not. Communities should not have to go through it to learn it, and we are the Congress and we are supposed to do better when we know better, and we know better, and we are not doing better because we are not willing to lead.

On this side of the aisle, we are here at some couple of minutes before 10:00 saying that we are ready and willing to lead or share in the leadership. What is important here is that we allow a bipartisan nature in dealing with some of the issues that we pointed out here tonight, and that is not happening. That is where it comes in.

So I am glad historically that the gentleman was able to share with us what happened when Democrats were in control, how many opportunities that the minority had an opportunity to be a part of legislation and inclusion.

Mr. PALLONE. If I could just say, that is the other part that is so important is, again going back when the Democrats were in the majority, most legislation was done on a consensus, bipartisan basis. In other words, you would find in my committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, who of course was the chairman, and legislation, if it was an energy bill, if it was a health care bill, he would start by going to the ranking member, the Republican man, the minority, and saying what input do you want into this bill and let us sit down and there would be meetings, and they would try to build a consensus on legislation.

That does not happen anymore around here. I mean, it is very rare to

see someone who is the chairman of the committee on the Republican side reaching out to the Democrat on the committee and saying let us see if we can work together and come to a consensus on a bill. That is why most of the time you did not have to have these situations where you would vote in the middle of the night and have to get people to change votes because, if the bill came to the floor most likely it was a consensus measure and most people voted for it.

Some people may say not everything has to be that way, and not everything was that way, but the bottom line is when someone is elected, when you are elected or I am elected, our constituents send us down here. They do not expect us to just come down here and object to everything because we do not have input. They expect that we are going to have some input on what goes on, and to deny us that, which is what the Republican leadership does for the most part now, I think denies the basic principle of democracy.

We are not supposed to be coming down here and just objecting. We are supposed to be part of what goes on, but we are not allowed to for the most part. We cannot bring up amendments or ask for hearings. So this is the problem.

I just want to go back and say one more thing. The reason why the Republicans do not want the oversight and do not want the accountability is because they are doing bad things. The reason they do not want to have this bipartisan Katrina Commission is because they do not want the commission to come back and report that there were problems in what the FEMA Director and the administration did during the hurricane.

It is pretty simple stuff, because if it is bipartisan and it has equal members and there is a lot of oversight, they are going to show what the problems were. They want to whitewash. That is the bottom line. That is why they do not want this independent commission. It is uncovering things.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Exactly. So they are picking their own personal political situation over what is best for the American people. Can you think of a better reason to take someone out of their leadership position?

We all play politics here. We are just here. You get 435 people in a room, there is going to be politics. We understand that, but when you consistently and constantly pick your own personal political interests over the public interests, even if it means not getting to the bottom line, not getting to the kind of reforms that are going to be needed, then that is a real problem, I think, and I think the American people from the polls and from the people we talk to in our district seem to feel the same way.

Mr. PALLONE. There was an editorial in the New York Times on September 26 about faking the Katrina inquiry. The last paragraph, if I could

just read it, said this. It says, There is no way to whitewash a hurricane. A government dominated by one party should be disqualified from investigating itself. Just as President Bush repeatedly fought the creation of the 9/11 Commission until public pressure forced him to yield, so should the public now demand the administration and Congress get real about Katrina.

That is what we are getting with this Republican-dominated committee. It is just going to be another whitewash, and we cannot allow it. So I appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I think what is important here are several points that the gentleman has already made.

You have this chart here dealing with the whole gas price issue on the middle class, and I just want to take a couple of minutes of this hour just to talk a little bit more about what is called an energy bill.

We had an alternative, and the reason why I call it an alternative to the gas or to the energy bill is the fact that we were in the majority and it would be called an energy bill dealing with price gouging and also making future investments and bringing out alternative fuels to be done by a certain date. Also, our alternative said if you price gouge, we are not talking about someone at the pump, we are talking about the oil industry that has soaring, through-the-roof profits in a time that we have individuals who cannot even make it to work now because they cannot afford to buy a tank of gas. They did not get an increase. Their employer did not say, listen, we are going to give you about three hundred more dollars a month so you can pay for gas. They did not say that.

So we dealt with those individuals in our alternative by saying that if you price gouge the American people, not only will it allow State Attorneys General to enforce the law, but you will pay serious fines, up to \$3 million a day. Every day you price gouge, you pay. You do not get your profits and run off and the stockholders are happy. No, you are punished, and it not only dealt with gas. It dealt with oil and LP Gas and heating gas.

I think it is important for folks to understand that we were for real about it, and the majority side was really defending the industry. I know we are going to have more time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let me do this, we want to give the e-mail address, 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov.

□ 2200

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP: REFORMING GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be back

and continue our discussion here. I hope for the next hour, my good friend, we can talk about something that I think is very important for the Democratic Party and what the future of the Democratic Party is all about, and that is reforming government. We are the party of reform. We have offered alternatives, as we have talked about in the past hour and over the past several weeks, that have been ignored; but we are not going to let that stop us. We are going to continue to talk throughout the rest of this year and into next year about the different reform measures that we are going to propose, and we are going to be critical of what we think is a broken system in general and broken systems in general, all of these different systems in our government.

I was thinking about this and talking about this last night, about how our government runs today; and our government really runs today totally designed like an industrial-age system. It is almost like an assembly line. We have our health care over here and our education is over here and our foreign policy is over here and our research is over here, and none of the component parts are allowed to ever come together. That is an old assembly line kind of system. You deal with this part and you put that part on and then that part, and everything is separated.

Government in the 21st century needs to be integrated and unified. A health care system that does not teach healthy eating habits and has a diverse physical education requirement in our schools or gives our kids good food in our schools, that is not a comprehensive health care system. Because at some point we are going to pay the bill for obesity or diabetes, or whatever may come from the long-term effects of not having a healthy diet. And one day, somebody is going to be on Medicare, and we are going to have to pay the price.

I want to just talk for a couple of minutes about what is going on with Delphi and their bankruptcy and how I think the system right now is a bit broken. Basically, over the last 30 years or so, this company and their workers have generated a lot of wealth over the past 30 years. A lot of people in Ohio and in Mississippi and all over the country have made money. Workers were paid well, and they had pensions and benefits and health care coverage and everything else. The wealth that these workers created was taken and invested in China, first in Mexico, then in China. And now, because of all of that that has happened, we increased the global supply of labor, that is driving down the wages here in the United States of America, which leads to Delphi filing bankruptcy because they cannot compete with their competitors who are doing a lot of business in China.

It just is something broken when a worker or a group of workers who create wealth and that money is taken

and invested somewhere else comes back to bite you on the behind. And now their company is filing for bankruptcy. The workers are going to be asked to take, they are asking them now to take about a 60 percent pay cut. Now, there is not a person in the world, there is not a person in the United States for sure who could take a 60 percent pay cut in the course of a few months and not file bankruptcy. How do you do that? I do not care if you are making \$40,000 or \$200,000 a year. If you are asked to take a 60 percent pay cut, you are going to have to file bankruptcy.

So the squeeze is on the workers here in the United States. Many people may say, well, those workers are making \$27 an hour, that is a lot of money; and that is a whole other argument. But the bottom line is, there is going to be in my community \$150 million pulled out of our local economy.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, let us just think about that for a minute. A 60 percent pay cut, the gentleman does know that a 60 percent pay cut, some folks are going to lose their homes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely, they are going to lose their homes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The media quick-fix probably would be to try to go out and get a loan. Now you make a little bit less than what you used to make, and you may not be able to get the loan because you do not make the money you used to make and the uncertainty of how long your company is going to be able to provide the money that you thought that you were going to be able to make. I think this is a real issue. I think it is a real issue, and I think it is something that we need to be very concerned about.

I agree with the gentleman 110 percent. I have been reading in the paper what is going on. The gentleman from Ohio is living it because it is right there in his district. But guess what, I say to the gentleman, it is happening throughout America. A number of other communities are going through it. And once again, I think it is important, it falls back on the heels of governance again, and also our stronghold and our love affair with China.

I mean, it goes far beyond, far beyond that particular company and the relationship with China. It is almost like if China was to make some sort of move, it would affect the United States of America, whether it be in manufacturing, or if they were to make an issue as it relates to debt, call in some of those chits that they have out there with us as it relates to the debt, because they are buying our debt. If they were to deal with other countries as it relates to oil, it would have some issues and would deal with our economy.

So it is almost like we have to be very, very careful, because the U.S. taxpayers are not only, obviously, the main contributor to many of our trade policies, because it is, unfortunately, a

negative trade policy, and that we are having to take in space where U.S. jobs have been lost, people cannot provide for their families like they used to, so then government has to try to be there to be able to assist not only local governments but State governments in areas where individuals through even their payroll taxes could cover some of the costs of some of these unfunded mandates that are now out there, and the Federal Government has to rise up and be a part of that experience.

But I wanted to just, I want the gentleman to finish his point on sharing with us what is happening in your district, and then I want to go back to an article that talks about the issue of not only health care, but where our priorities are as a Congress when it comes down to dealing with the American people. Because that is what the gentleman is talking about right now.

The gentleman is talking about the American people, and the gentleman has a lot of individuals that are deployed out of the State of Ohio that are in harm's way right now, and some of their families are tied up in this. And I can tell my colleagues right now, I am here, I am with my family; but what if I were not and something like this were to happen to a spouse or a loved one or a significant other or a brother or a sister. We are going have to all come together to try to help that individual financially.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, the ultimate question is, and that is why we need to issue a reform agenda for the country, because it just seems like nothing is really working right now the way the system is currently set up, and there are a lot of arguments against it, but it is based on a world that really no longer exists.

The idea of comparative advantage, the great free trade concept of comparative advantage is from the 1800s. I mean, trying to apply it to a society today that is so much different than it was a few hundred years ago. So our reform agenda that the Democrats are promoting is to reform the way government works. Whether it is the way workers here who have created a lot of wealth and their wealth is then invested into China, to steal their own jobs and wages and benefits and everything else, or to argue literally for a supply-side economic theory where you cut taxes for the top 1 percent, and, the theory goes, they invest in the United States and that creates wealth here.

Well, who in their right mind thinks a millionaire who gets a couple hundred thousand dollars back is investing in the United States? They are investing the money in China or they are going to invest it in mutual funds in different investment schemes in China. They are not investing it in the United States. If people were investing in the United States, companies like Delphi would not be going bankrupt. And that is the bottom line.

The question for America is, Who is investing in the United States today?

We have cut taxes; we have a huge budget deficit, so the government does not have any money to make any progressive investments like magnetic levitation trains or education or scientists and engineers, or research and development. And then you cut taxes for the top 1 percent, and they take that money and they invest it in China. Who is investing in the United States? That is the ultimate question. I think that the government has a responsibility. It cannot do it all, but we need to certainly create an environment in which it is okay to do business and it is worthwhile for people to make the proper investments, and that brings up why we need to reform the health care system.

I was just talking to a gentleman who runs a hospital in Youngstown, Ohio. The one hospital left in Youngstown, with a population of about between 80,000 and 90,000, almost 90,000, they do about \$50 million a year in charity care. \$50 million. These are people who walk into the emergency room because they have nowhere to go. Do you know how much money we are wasting by waiting until they come into the emergency room? That makes no business sense at all. You cannot be a businessperson and analyze our health care system and think in any way, shape, or form it makes any sense.

Would it not be smarter to maybe give them access to a clinic to where they could take some preventive measures, get their antibiotics, take care of a cold instead of pneumonia. Pregnancies, as far as pregnancies go, have the prenatal care, whatever it takes, expand SCHIPS, do these things that will take care of the preventive side, instead of emergency room care. The taxpayer is paying either way. The current system is cheating the taxpayer. It is no good.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, that is the reason why people elected us to come up here and govern, to make sure that we stand up and forecast future issues. Now, that hospital had to close, I am pretty sure, because the funding just was not there in the preventive way to be able to deal with the issues that are facing indigent patients, or everyday working folks.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. They are open. They are open.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. But what I am saying is that we do not do things because we are supposed to do them; we respond to it after it happens.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Examples are the health care system, and New Orleans.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Bingo.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, \$14 billion to make ready for a category 5 storm, \$200 billion later, or several, up into the \$60 billion and \$70 billion to not only fix it, but also deal with other issues, because of a result of the fact that we did not do what we were supposed to do when we were supposed to do it. Going back to

vulnerabilities here in the United States, that community was ranked number one as it relates to a storm, a natural disaster in a catastrophic way as it relates to the damage that would be done.

Madam Speaker, I think it is also important for me to point out, when we start talking about this issue, the gentleman mentioned Democrats having to stand up and make sure that we deal with the whole corruption and cronyism issue, and I think that that is important.

□ 2215

And I think it is also important to make sure that we deal with that, but to deal with that, A, we are trying to deal with it by calling out some of this stuff out here on the floor.

We are trying to do the best we can. And there are others who are trying to do the best they can. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Government Reform, can only do all that he can do to point out some of these issues.

And I have a number of reports as it relates to contracting under the Bush administration. But guess what? If we were in the majority we could do these things and make sure that we save the Federal taxpayer money, we save those dollars. We make sure that they are paying taxes, which we all are, okay, that it is being spent in the way that the American people want us to spend it, in a responsible way.

Now, this whole issue, once again, this corruption and cronyism issue is so deep here in Washington, DC, I do not even have to say, well, let me pick up the paper a week ago because there were some stories in there that I think I need to bring to your attention, or I hear there is a story coming out on Thursday about some of this stuff that is going on here in the Capitol.

You can just walk out the door here in Washington, DC or in your local community and pick up the paper on any given day, be it a Saturday or Sunday or Monday or Tuesday, it does not matter what day, there is always something here, because there are several things that are here because there are several things that are going on in this town, and that is just in the present.

That is just what has happened already. Think about what is happening as we speak, and what is not happening under the culture of corruption of cronyism. What do not we know about now that we will know 6 months from now, because it will have worked on someone's conscience to be able to say, hey, you know something, this is wrong. And it is not wrong because of a personal decision that someone has made, it is wrong because they made a decision that changed the very fiber of the Congress. I mean changed the culture of Congress, I mean, what we are supposed to be doing and not doing.

Yes, we know we have individuals that make bad independent decisions.

Oh, I have made some. But they were independent. Did not affect my constituents. Did not affect this country, a bad decision that I have made.

But you have folks that are knowingly and willfully making bad decisions that are altering this Congress, and that will alter many Americans' lives and the way they live and the way they provide for their children, and it is happening every day without a conscience.

Now in the Washington Post, there are some folks here, and we know that there are some folks here in the Capitol that have said, okay, we have to deal with this Katrina issue. It is \$200 billion and we are going to have offsets and we are going to deal with it.

Where are we going go for the offsets? Well, in this story, it is not saying, well, maybe we need to look at some of our advanced weapons systems that possibly may be useful to us sometime in the future. Maybe we need to say that we are spending \$50 million or \$50 billion or \$130 billion out there on advanced weapons systems, maybe since they are, you know, advanced, maybe there are some other areas we can take 5 billion here or ten billion there and then maybe we can come up with some offset.

No, not that. Maybe we can go to the tax cuts that we gave to the billionaires. All right. I am not even talking about the millionaires. I am talking about the billionaires. Maybe ask them to give a little sacrifice under this time that the country is going through a lot. Maybe, you know, maybe just a 5 or 2 percent cut from there.

No, they are not mentioned. No, where we are going to go, this is the Republican leadership. This is the discussion that is taking place over there. This is not my report, because I am going to tell you right now this is the Washington Post. House GOP leaders are setting up third party validator, set to cut spending as it relates to Medicaid.

Wow. Let us go after the big people. Let us, you know, the folks that catch the early bus in the morning. Let us go after them. Yeah. They are really strong. In a program that has already been cut.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And the poverty numbers are up so there are going to be more people applying for this or qualify for this program.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let us go pick on someone that is not our own size. Yeah, let us go after individuals and make them, because they are not giving in the way maybe some of these other folks are. Okay. Let us go after them.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. They are not pharmaceutical lobbyists.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, let us go after some folks that we were sent up here to protect. Let us go after them. Let us turn on our own. I am bigger than that person. So maybe that guy, you know, that is driving the pickup truck running around here shopping

where he is bundling T-shirts and clothes and leaving the truck now parked because he cannot take the kids to the recreation center where they can stay out of trouble, let us beat up on them.

Let us deal with the individuals that the company that they went to work for, said maybe you need to go get on Medicaid because it is better than what we have to provide, because there is really no incentive as a business person for me to provide health care for you, because there is no national policy.

Let us pick on them. Let us take Title I lunch programs to help poor kids to have the nutrition to be able to go to school and think correctly so that they can learn, and so they have to pass a standardized test that this Congress has called for to make sure that they learn, or they retain, whatever the test is supposed to pull out of them, let us take that, let us reduce that.

Yeah. Let us take away from the kids, because guess what, they cannot vote. They are definitely not going to give a campaign contribution. Let us deal with them.

Now I am going to tell you something. And I know there are some well-intended Members here in this Congress. And I know that there are some leadership individuals that are saying, well, you know, maybe that is a great idea. But I can tell you right now, if you are going to do it, we are not going to be sitting here watching and allowing you to do it. You are not going to talk about it in the back halls of Congress and then come to this floor under regular order and say, well, we are doing this because we have to help the people in the devastated area.

As a matter of fact, not only are we helping you, the folks in the devastated area, and I must add there is no discussion in here, well, we are going to take away from the Democratic areas, we are going to carve out those counties and parishes and we are going to cut them. No, no, we are going to do it to you all. We are going to make sure, and this is a national blanket cut, so if you are sitting in Illinois tonight, Member, or if you are down the street, you know, at your apartment or house, I want you to realize that what some Members of the Republican Congress are talking about is cutting programs in your district.

This story goes further on to talk about small farming programs. Okay, so if you are sitting there, Member of Congress, saying, well, they are not talking about me, they might be talking about those folks that are on Medicaid, that I must add if a Member is saying they are talking about those folks on Medicaid, they are talking about your constituents too, but they are going to cut that.

Meanwhile, whatever Mr. Rumsfeld calls for out of the Pentagon, and whatever the White House says that needs to happen, without an exit strategy or even a discussion of the exit

strategy on what is our goals and objectives outside of the several elections that are going on in Iraq and that will continue to go on. What we are going to need as long as we are going to need it. Do not ask any questions. What are you asking questions about?

You are asking a question of me about what I am asking for for the troops as it relates to money? My question is, is it really for the troops or is it really to continue to feed family and friends that are out there making billions on this war, billions they are making?

And I will tell you this also. They can run commercials, I know Halliburton is the shining example of what goes on under a culture of cronyism and corruption and a lack of oversight. I just gave an analysis of what took place of oversight hearings and how the decline has taken place, because no one wants to call out the next person, because we have an oversight hearing, oh, my goodness, we may start to govern around here.

I think it is important for us to also understand that we are sitting here talking about we are for the troops and you know all of this kind of stuff, but we are not willing to lead in a way to say that, hey, excuse me, excuse me, Mr. President, can we talk about maybe when will this be over? Or maybe what is the strategy?

Is the strategy as long as there is an insurgency, we are going to be there? Well, that is a 20-year strategy, Madam Speaker, because we are spending billions to fight an insurgency, not the troops, not the individuals that a train was not ready.

The individuals that said that we should go did not do what they were supposed to do as it relates to the planning. We are going to run to Baghdad, we are going to have bombs and stuff. We are going to get there and this is a race and everybody has a clock going, and the news media like we are here now. Wow, record time. Wow.

There was nothing after that. And because of that, hundreds upon hundreds of Americans have lost their lives, thousands upon thousands of Americans are injured that have come back to their community, that have served their country because their country asked them to serve.

And I am going to tell you, and I want to make sure that we get clarity on this, that it is our job to govern here in the Congress. It is our job to protect these individuals. It is not our job to continue to hold on and to cover for individuals that are making bad ideas or that are sharing bad ideas and continuing to compound on these ideas, and to continue to come here and say, well, you know, why are you asking me the question, and with great arrogance.

Now I am going to share this with you. It is our job, and you know it, for us to not only call out the fact of a lack of governance, a look of oversight, a lack of bipartisan working on these very issues, and bringing to a head of

what is important here. The head is, is making sure that we govern in the way we are supposed to govern.

And for some of the individuals that are calling out saying that we have to have offsets, Hey, we have been calling for offsets. We have been saying, if you are going to spend it, you better have a plan on how you are going to pay for it but, listen, did not get religion now when we are talking about the American people.

Do not stand up and say, well, I am going to get religion on this week. I am going to make them pay when you will not even stand up to big companies, when you come to the floor with an energy bill that is a gift to the industry.

You did not come here on behalf of the American people. You came here on behalf of oil company profits. Tell the truth. At least come to the floor and be straight with the American people. Because if you are not, we will. And let me tell you something. It really infuriates me that folks will run around here and even hold their head up going after poverty programs saying that we are going to balance the budget on the back of poverty.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Can I ask a question? Where is the Christian Coalition? Where is the Christian Coalition when you are cutting poverty programs? Where are you? You know, they are fighting over Supreme Court justices and meanwhile poverty programs are being cut for poor people.

Now I do not know. 12 years of Catholic school, and I know you had a religious upbringing as well. Where is the Christian voice in all of this? All of a sudden silence. Medicare, Head Start, No Child Left Behind, which would help more in high poverty schools than any other. Where is the Christian right? Silence. Silence. Because they are getting overrun by the corporate greed and the corruption and the cronyism that is going on here. That is the problem. Right under their nose.

Join us. You talked about Medicaid. You talked about poverty. You talked about Head Start. You talked about helping people that cannot help themselves. I cannot think of anything more Christian. I do not want to get religious, because this is a public forum. But it has been invoked time and time again from the other side.

□ 2230

We hear it every day.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I will put it to you pointblank. Never apologize for representing not only what you feel spiritually about what is going on, because I think your spirit makes religion act right. That is the bottom line. Spirit brings about the kind of change that we call and pray for in government and in our regular lives.

When we talk about young children, when we talk about the weak, physically, maybe financially, these are individuals that are going to pay the high prices for the heating oil. These

are the individuals that we ask to go out and vote. They do not need to be Democrat, Republican or Independent, Reform Party, Green Party or no party; and we ask them to go out and take part in this democracy. They are the first ones on the chopping block. As a matter of fact, they were the first under regular order when it came down to even working the budget out in the first place.

Now, when it comes down to responding, going back to what is the federal Commitment to the South, I would add also the poor in this country, and then the first time out of the blocks we are going to go after Medicaid? We are going to cut it. We are going to go after reducing free lunch. We are to go after Head Start. We are going to go after small farming programs. We are going to go after those individuals who cannot hit back.

That is almost like someone who cannot move their arms and their legs, and we get the world heavy weight champion of the world and he hits them and beats them up and it is over in one round and he jumps up and waves his hand and says, I am the heavy weight champion of the world. They expected you to win because you are the heavy weight champion of the world. But the bottom line is, it is okay to have offsets. Goodness gracious, we are calling for offsets. Let us call for some offsets in some other areas so we can ask some Americans who can afford to take the sacrifice of an offset, or a particular program that this Congress has put forth that has very little to do with right now but it has something to do, hopefully, dealing with the future.

And if it is something that is dealing with the future, okay; and we are the superpower of the world, and there is an advanced weapons system that somebody in Congress likes, maybe we need to go to that person in Congress or that person in the other body over there and say, you know something, you know that project we passed, the \$400 billion, the advanced weapons project for several million dollars that you wanted, maybe we need to try to offset that. Maybe we can try to do it verses 5 years, we can do it in 8 years. With that money we can have some offsets for the Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita package to help us as it relates to bringing about offsets.

No, that conversation was not in The Washington Post. But we are going to take people, real Americans, and say we are going to make you pay because we are not big enough to stand up to the special interests here in Washington, D.C. Let me just take that way out. The majority leadership of opening discussions, this is the opening discussion, this is not even the "maybe there was a small discussion." No, this is a serious discussion within the leadership of the Republican Caucus in this House about cutting those programs. That is a serious discussion.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let us put all this together here because as I am listening

here; I am beginning to see how this is coming together. Let us see if we can outline this here. If you are poor or working poor, which is the dark underbelly of the United States of America, the working poor that do not qualify for Medicaid so they do not have health care but they are working a couple of jobs and they are trying to make ends meet. So if you are in that class, this outfit, the Republican outfit that we have in right now wants to cut Medicaid, is not funding No Child Left Behind, they are cutting Head Start and we have a health care system that is a wreck. Watching health care in America is like watching a train wreck happen. It is terrible.

So if you are poor or working poor, those programs are getting cut, school lunches, all the other good stuff. And you probably live in a community where you are having criminal justice issues like we are having in a lot of our communities where you cannot afford the prison, the jail. You do not have enough sheriffs, deputies to run the jail. You do not have enough police on the beat. And if you do, you put them in the court system and they wait and wait and they get back on the street. A whole other set of the issues.

If you are in the middle class, the Republican majority has done nothing for Pell grants to try to reduce the cost of college tuition when tuition has doubled in just about every State in the Union in the past 5 years.

If you are in the middle class trying to provide health care, if you are a union worker in Delphi or some other UAW or something else, you are getting squeezed. If you are part of the 45 million or 50 million now that do not have health care, you are getting squeezed. If you are a middle-class small businessperson, you are getting squeezed. We get calls every day in my office about small businessmen and women who cannot afford to provide health care for their workers. Squeezed.

If you are in the upper middle class and you are trying to provide health care, it is not working. These systems that we have in place are broken; and instead of fixing them, instead of reforming the system or the systems, our ideas are so antiquated, old school, supply-side economics in a world where that does not work. Look around. I mean, look around. This does not work. It is crazy.

What are we doing here? We have a reform agenda that invests in education, invests in research and development, helps kids with math and science, fully funds No Child Left Behind, puts money into the Pell grants so your kids can go to college and afford it, reforms the health care system to move the investment on the preventative side instead of on the tail end when people are so sick and acutely ill that it costs so much more money.

The reforms that we want to make on the preventative side provide for

mental health coverage so people do not go out and commit crimes who are mentally ill because they have medication or they have some basic counseling which saves us money. We are cheating the taxpayer right now. They want to tell us we were tax and spend. They are borrow and spend. And they are not even spending it right. They are spending at a billion and a half a week in Iraq. They are giving it to billionaires. That is not good government.

That stinks. That is not right. It is just not right because average people are suffering. Let me say this, we do not come to this floor for what this week will probably be 3 or 4 hours. All day we are here and we get an opportunity to come at night. We are not doing this for therapy. We are not doing this because we like to come down here and listen to each other talk. If we wanted to do that, we would go out and grab a hamburger and a Starbucks and go talk and drink some green tea. We are here because the country is unraveling before our very eyes, and the Republican leadership is either doing nothing or doing something to make it worse.

The Democrats have an agenda on health care, education. We are ready to reform. We are ready to take over. We just need the chance. And I know from people in my district and from the gentleman's district and from the district of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), people are suffering; and the government is part of the problem now. Maybe Ronald Reagan was right, government is the problem. Right now it is. But I think government can be a positive, progressive leading force in society with the proper leadership. And right now it is just not happening. But we are not doing this stuff for therapy.

We could be going out and having dinners and everything else. We have come here because this country needs reform; and if no one else is going to talk about it, then the 30-something group is going to step up and implement an agenda and talk about the agenda that is going to make this country better.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just say that it is important that we realize the time that we are in now. I think the gentleman is 110 percent right.

I was in my district recently and I went to New Shiloh Baptist Church. One of my local pastors was celebrating his third pastoral anniversary of the church. And I went over and worshipped with him and some parishioners. When I was there, a couple of folks came up to me and said, It is really something that is going on in Washington right now. Are you not shocked? And I am, like, I am not. Oh, no, I am not. No. Not only did I see it coming, but some more is to come.

How do you know that? Well, I am not a prophet, but I am your Congressman. And when we are not doing our job as Members of Congress, not individuals. Folks make sure to keep the district offices open, respond to con-

stituent mail, return phone calls, this, that and the other, not the individual policing of our own districts, but the policing of the Federal budget, the policing of having oversight over all the Federal agencies. When we are not doing that, then that means we are not doing our job. When we are not doing our job that the Constitution calls for and that the rules of the House calls for of how we do our job and conduct our job and we violate the rules of this House, then we have issues.

When we violate the spirit, I must add, of the rules, then we violate this country. When we violate the spirit of the rules of this House and we violate the spirit of fair play and also our oversight responsibilities through a lack of governance or the lack of oversight, then we will see what we see now.

Now, I am here to say that I think it is very, very important, we have talked and covered a lot of ground here this evening, but I can tell you that there is so much more to be covered. There is so much more work to be done. I wish, because it gives me no pleasure to come to the floor and to just point out the obvious of what is not happening and what is happening to a certain group of people, and guess what, that certain group of people are the American people.

It is not like you start saying, well, there is something happening to the folks over in Iowa. No, it is not. It is happening to the American people. It is happening to your constituents. It is happening to my constituents. It is happening to the Member's constituent that sits right there, and the one that was here a minute ago, and the one that is back in their apartment and the other that is back in their office right now; it can either be a he or she. It is happening to them.

So when the historians start looking at what happened and how did we get to the point where we are now when someone turns the lights on here in the Congress, I mean, the real lights, and that ember starts to hit the floor and they start to look and say, goodness, how did this happen, then we want to make sure that there were Members of this House, need it be those Members that put together reports in minority committees of what is happening and should be happening; need it be our friends on the other side of the aisle that are lathered up enough that will stand up to the majority and that will say, you know something, we are doing this wrong and I will use my voice the best way to use it. And I want to say as an American, I thank you.

The gentleman talked about religion a moment ago. I talked about this article about where we will make these off-sets here in The Washington Post: \$50 billion, how are we going to find it?

The first thing mentioned is Medicaid. The second thing mentioned is reducing free lunch for poor children, for Head Start and small farming programs. Yes, let us go for those. How are we going to get there?

This is just in today's Washington Post. It is not an article found just the other day. It is important. And we talked about sitting in church or a synagogue or a mosque or whatever the religion may be of policymakers here in Congress and you hear about the ills of our society. You hear about the tragedies and the tough times that parishioners are going through. The only difference between the average American that goes to those institutions of religious practice, the only difference between them and the rest of the American people is that they could have done something about it. That is the bottom line.

Now, that is not about how I feel about it or how you feel about it. Because I could walk into any religious institution and say, you know something, we are here to govern on behalf of the American people. Period. Dot. If given the opportunity to do more we will do more.

□ 2245

Matter of fact, we want to do more. You need us to do more. But I feel for that Member that goes into these religious institutions in their mind knowing that they could have done more and they could have stood up at such a time as this.

So there is a spiritual component to what we do. We cannot get religion on certain things and not have it on others. That is what my colleague pointed out when he said where is the faith community when it comes down to dealing with issues such as this. For openers, we will start with the poor. That is what we are going to do, we are going to start with them first.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Where is the outrage? Where is the outrage? They are outraged about Harriet Miers? Wait a minute, here is a woman who has a distinguished legal career. And I do not want to give the whole Supreme Court thing here, because that happens on the other side of the Capitol, but here is a distinguished lawyer. Now, I am not so convinced that she may be the best Supreme Court Justice pick, but, my goodness, to be outraged at that? How about being outraged at both? How about that? Be outraged at both. Be outraged about Harriet Miers, and be outraged about this too. My goodness.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just say this. There are faith-based groups that are very concerned about cuts to Medicaid and will speak out, that will come to Washington and will talk to the appropriators and to some of the individuals who want cuts; but those individuals that have relationships with the President of the United States, those very high individuals within the very, very conservative groups should go and say this is wrong, in my opinion.

I think that those voices on a spiritual level need to be worked on, and also in this House. We need to be worked on about making the right de-

isions as it relates to the masses of Americans who need us the most. That is just where it is. So that is where the responsibility is.

But guess what? Ultimately, we make the decision. They do not. We are elected to make the decision; they are not. And I do not want to put this on an outside group saying it is their responsibility, but as it relates to what people are reacting to here in Washington, DC, as it relates to the leadership and what the leadership is reacting to here in Washington, DC, we just may need that intervention.

We may very well need that intervention on behalf of individuals who cannot fight for themselves. And they have a lobbyist. It is supposed to be Members of Congress. All Members of Congress. Not folks that are saying that, well, we care more about our philosophy and we are going to start with the individuals who cannot protect themselves, because I am their lobbyist. They have the power to elect or unelect individuals, but they do not have the money to send a lobbyist knocking on my door saying, No, I know you want to start offsets, but do not start with us. Matter of fact, do not even look at us. Do not even come this way.

They do not have that. We are here as Members of Congress to make sure they have lobbyists, because we are their lobbyists. We sit at the table. We come to the floor on their behalf. So when we back out, when we see the majority side and this philosophy being pushed onto the front page of the local paper here and other papers throughout the United States that this is where we are going to start, and we are the individuals that are supposed to be here blocking on behalf of the folks that need us most, then we are in trouble.

So we need to start talking about leadership and standing on behalf of every American. We need to start talking about oversight. And tomorrow, if we can, I want us to talk more about this oversight committee, talk about House Resolution 3838 that has this commission that is looking at fraud over contracting. I have a report here that has been put together by the minority side on the committee dealing with the whole issue of protecting against contractor fraud, making sure the American taxpayers are not made victims due to a lack of oversight.

One thing I do know is that the majority, not the White House, not any other group here in Washington, DC, has the ability to oversee the Federal tax dollar in an administrative no-bid contract scenario. They do not have it. They are not moving fast enough to be able to protect the Federal tax dollar.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I want to just go back, and I think this week, whenever we get our next hour to come this week, I think that is a great idea, to talk about that. As you were going through the poor and the middle class that is getting squeezed harder and

harder, you made a great point that it is our job as Members of Congress to advocate on behalf of those people. I think that has a moral component to it. I want to set that moral component aside. I want to talk for 2 minutes, because we are wrapping up here, about economics.

We talked about who is investing in the United States. Not many people. We are talking about even the government now is cutting programs that would invest in these young people and these poor middle-class people that we need economically, like the 30-some-things are calling for a million new scientists and engineers over the next decade in the United States of America to generate our economy again. That is what we are saying. That is investment into human capital here in the United States.

We need these poor people to turn into with health care, education, and we are going to talk a little this week or next week about the arts programs that we believe if started at an early age, afterschool programs, will increase math and science scores. And we are going to bring some third-party validators and some studies that have been done to back up that argument and why the arts are a good component of feeding into this math and science goal that we have.

We have to recognize that investments into Medicaid, with reform, and we need to reform the system too, do not get me wrong; but investments in Medicaid, and investments in Head Start, and investments in the No Child Left Behind, and investments in the Pell grants are going to lead to more wealth in the United States of America. We are going on the field right now with half of our society not eligible to play in the game.

All these poor kids that we saw down in New Orleans, it is the same in Miami, it is the same in Youngstown, Cleveland, Akron, Canton, Toledo, Cincinnati, and Columbus. There are core pockets of very, very poor people in our country. And all we are saying is, invest in those people so that they can go out and create wealth for the United States of America.

The Ohio State football team would not go on the field with five players. It does not make sense. You need to have everybody on your team. And quite frankly, our country is only 300 million. We are competing against over a billion Chinese citizens and over a billion Indian citizens. If you are going to compete with them, you better have every single player on the field prepared, conditioned, and ready to move forward.

So when we talk about Medicaid, Head Start, No Child Left Behind, and Pell grants, we want reform on these systems because we want to make them better and convert them into the 21st century, but we have to make the proper investments into our people. That is the bottom line.

There is the moral component that we talk about, hopefully not just on

Sundays, but there is also this economic component too that I think is going to help stimulate the economy in the 21st century if we make those investments. But today we are not making them. So we cannot expect something to happen when we are not doing anything. It just does not make any sense.

I will let my colleague make a final comment or two and then we will wrap it up and give out the e-mail address.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I want to thank my colleague for bearing with me.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I hope you feel better. My colleague from Florida was down last week, sick as a dog.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Down last week, but came back in on behalf of the country. The fact is we have to continue to do what we have to do as Members of Congress. I think that it is very, very important that we continue to pay very close attention to these issues.

I want to commend many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle for standing up in ways that are unprecedented in this institution and trying to change the tide of not only thinking but also making sure that we get back to governing this country of ours and that we stand up on behalf of those Americans who need us to stand up for them. I can tell you right now they come in all ages and all economic backgrounds, and some of them are even children. It is important that we work on their behalf in an honest way.

If anything comes out of this, I would be happy if the leadership on the Republican side was to say, you know, I think there are some points that have been made and I think we need to implement some of those things; or at least have a fair discussion on some of those issues to make sure that we will govern in a way that does not violate the spirit of our existing rules. That would be a victory.

Or if the American people were to say enough is enough, it has affected my household personally, and make other decisions based on the representation here in Washington, D.C. And this will not be a discussion; it will be action on what we are talking about. So there is a long time before that happens, because the election is not up until 2006.

But on behalf of the country, there are some things that just cannot wait that long, and there are some issues that need to be brought to the forefront and hopefully change will come out. So my spirit is the American spirit and dream that things will get better and should get better because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, we are going to do our best. If you are not watching baseball tonight and you were watching the 30-something Dems, our e-mail is the 30somethingdems@ mail.house.gov. We have been getting a ton of e-mails lately, so do not be afraid to drop us an e-mail. We appreciate everybody who is listening and

watching, and I appreciate my colleague fighting through a cold to be down here with us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Members are reminded that their remarks are to be addressed to the Chair and not to the television audience.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. CARDIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. GRIJALVA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 18 on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. SCHIFF (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 18 on account of attending a soldier's funeral in California.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mrs. BIGGERT (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. KING of Iowa (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, October 19 and 20.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today and October 18 and 19.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and October 18.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and October 18 and 20.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and October 18 and 19.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1858. An act to provide for community disaster loans.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 18, 2005, at 10:30 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:

[Omitted from the Record of October 7, 2005]

4443. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Multifamily Accelerated Processing (MAP); MAP Lender Quality Assurance Enforcement [Docket No. FR-4836-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AI01) received August 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4444. A letter from the Acting Director, OSHA Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Department of the Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Updating OSHA Standards Based On Natural Consensus Standards; General, Incorporation by Reference; Hazardous Materials, Flammable and Combustible Liquids; General Environmental Controls, Temporary Labor Camps; Hand and Portable Powered Tools and Other Hand-Held Equipment, Guarding of Portable Powered Tools; Welding, Cutting and Brazing, Arc Welding and Cutting; Special Industries, Sawmills. [Docket No. S-023A] (RIN: 1218-AC08) received September 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4445. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Prohibited Transaction Exemption (PTE) 84-14 for Plan Asset Transactions Determined by Independent Qualified Professional Asset Managers [Application Number D-11047] received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4446. A letter from the Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulations Implementing the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act and Related Statutes (RIN:

1215-AB38) received July 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4447. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Development Division, OSRV, MSHA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Diesel Particulate Matter Exposure of Underground Metal and Nonmetal Miners (RIN: 1219-AB29) received July 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4448. A letter from the Senior Regulatory Officer, Wage & Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Service Contract Act Wage Determination OnLine Request Process (RIN: 1215-AB47) received September 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4449. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Jacksonville, Texas) [MB Docket No. 05-129; RM-11201] received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4450. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Strong, Arkansas) [MB Docket No. 05-141; RM-11219]; (Silver Springs, Nevada) [MB Docket No. 05-76; RM-11167]; (Covington, Oklahoma) [MB Docket No. 05-77; RM 11168]; (Spur, Texas) [MB Docket No. 05-87; RM-11166]; (Poultney, Vermont) [MB Docket No. 05-78; RM-11169]; received July 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4451. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Chillicothe, Dublin, Hillsboro, and Marion, Ohio) [MB Docket No. 02-266; RM-10557] received August 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4452. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Gunnison, Crawford, and Olathe, Breckinridge, Eagle, Fort Morgan, Greenwood Village, Loveland, and Strasburg, Colorado, and Laramie, Wyoming) [MB Docket No. 03-144; RM-10733; RM-10788; RM-10789] received August 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4453. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations; and Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Columbia and Edenton, North Carolina) [MB Docket No. 04-289; RM-10802] received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4454. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Provision of Improved Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CC Docket No. 98-67] received August 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4455. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Knox City, Texas) [MM Docket No. 01-199; RM-10213]; (Gunnison, Colorado) [MB Docket No. 02-171; RM-10483]; (Red Oak, Oklahoma) [MB Docket No. 02-174; MB-10486]; (Tignall, Georgia) [MB Docket No. 02-288; RM-10525]; (Rosebud, South Dakota) [MB Docket No. 04-170; RM-10766]; received August 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4456. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Iraqi Debt Unblocked—September 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4457. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Burmese Sanctions Regulations—August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4458. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions and Clarifications to the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No. 050803216-5216-01] (RIN: 0694-AD30) received September 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4459. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of the Understandings Reached at the April 2005 Australia Group (AG) Plenary Meeting [Docket No. 050719191-5191-01] (RIN: 0694-AD51) received August 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4460. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exports of Nuclear Grade Graphite: Change in Licensing Jurisdiction. [Docket No. 050707179-5179-01] (RIN: 0694-AD28) received July 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4461. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—International Services Surveys: Cancellation of Five Annual Surveys [Docket No. 050406094-5201-02] (RIN: 0691-AA59) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4462. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of *Helianthus eggertii* (Eggert's Sunflower) from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants (RIN: 1018-AJ08) received August 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4463. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Approval of Iron-Tungsten-Nickel Shot as Nontoxic for Hunting Waterfowl and Coots (RIN: 1018-AT87) received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4464. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and

Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Exclusion of U.S. Captive-Bred Scimitar-Horned Oryx, Addax, and Dama Gazelle From Certain Prohibitions (RIN: 1018-AT95) received September 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4465. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oil and Gas Leasing: Onshore Oil and Gas Operations—Fees, Rentals and Royalty Stripper Well Royalty Reductions Retention of Records [WO-310-1310-PB-24 1A] (RIN: 1004-AD71) received September 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4466. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Mining Claim and Site Maintenance and Location Fees—Fee Adjustment [WO-620-1990-00-24 1A] (RIN: 1004-AD75) received September 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4467. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Bureau of Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds (Department of the Treasury Circular, Public Debt Series No. 1-93); Regulations Governing Book-Entry Treasury Bonds, Notes and Bills Held in Legacy Treasury Direct; Regulations Governing Securities Held in TreasuryDirect—received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4468. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Bureau of Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Regulations Governing U.S. Securities; Regulations Governing U.S. Savings Bonds, Series A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J, and K, and U.S. Savings Notes; Regulations Governing United States Savings Bonds, Series EE and HH; Regulations Governing Book-Entry Treasury Bonds, Notes and Bills (Department of the Treasury Circular, Public Debt Series No. 2-86); Regulations Governing Definitive United States Savings Bonds, Series I; Regulations Governing Securities Held in the New Treasury Direct System. Received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4469. A letter from the Legal Information Assistant, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—EGRPRA Regulatory Review—Application and Reporting Requirements [No. 2005-34] (RIN: 1550-AB93) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4470. A letter from the Director, NIST, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fastener Quality Act [Docket No. 050705177-5177-01] (RIN: 0693-AB55) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Science and Energy and Commerce.

[Submitted October 17, 2005]

4471. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2005-0260; FRL-7738-8] received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4472. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with

title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4473. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Major General Roger C. Schultz, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4474. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Lieutenant General Duncan J. McNabb, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4475. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Lieutenant General William S. Wallace, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4476. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Ann E. Dunwoody, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10 United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4477. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Douglas M. Fraser, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10 United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4478. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Lieutenant General Duncan J. McNabb, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4479. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Gary L. North, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10 United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4480. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Frank G. Klotz, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10 United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4481. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Stephen R. Lorenz, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10 United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4482. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report to Congress in response to the Electromagnets Pulse (EMP) Commission's report, pursuant to Section 1403 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4483. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation

Research—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects—received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4484. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers—received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4485. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Education; Notice of Funding of Continuation Grants and Waiver for the Career Resources Network (CRN) Program—September 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4486. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Interim Guidance on Control of Volatile Organic Compounds in Ozone State Implementation Plans [OAR-2003-0032; FRL-7965-4] received September 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4487. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program; Chemical Selection Approach for Initial Round of Screening [OPPT-2004-0109 FRL-7716-9] received September 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4488. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nashville-Davidson County; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference [TN-200507; FRL-7972-5] received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4489. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Texas Low-Emission Diesel Fuel Program [R06-OAR-2005-TX-0020; FRL-7982-2] received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4490. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Massachusetts; Negative Declaration [R01-OAR-2005-MA-0002; FRL-7981-5] received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4491. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Control of Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants From Mobile Sources; Default Baseline Revision [OAR-2002-0042; FRL-7981-4] (RIN: 2060-AJ97) received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4492. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Prevention of Significant De-

terioration for Nitrogen Oxides [AD-FRL-7981-1; E-Docket ID No. OAR-2004-0013 (Legacy Docket No. A-87-16)] (RIN: 2060-AM33) received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4493. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Revision to the Motor Vehicle Enhanced I/M Program—Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, South Central, and Northern Regions and Safety Inspection Program Enhancements for Non-I/M Regions [R03-OAR-2004-PA-0001, R03-OAR-2004-PA-0002; FRL-7980-5] received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4494. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Kentucky; Inspection and Maintenance Program Removal for Northern Kentucky; New Solvent Metal Cleaning Equipment; Commercial Motor Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Refinishing Operations [R04-OAR-2004-KY-0003-200529; FRL-7979-7-A] received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4495. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York State Implementation Plan Revision; [Region 2 Docket No. R02-OAR-2005-NY-0003, FRL-7971-5] received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4496. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Negative Declaration [R06-OAR-2004-NM-0002; FRL-7979-3] received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4497. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Secondary Aluminum Production [OAR-2002-0084; FRL-7978-4] (RIN: 2060-AN38) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4498. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Permits by Rule [R06-OAR-2005-TX-0016; FRL-7975-9] received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4499. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho; Correcting Amendment [R10-OAR-2005-ID-0002; FRL-7977-5] received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4500. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; North Carolina [R04-OAR-2005-NC-0003-200532(a); FRL-7976-5] received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4501. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cross-Media Electronic Reporting [FRL-7977-1] (RIN: 2025-AA07) received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4502. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Montana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7977-4] received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4503. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Reimbursement to Local Governments for Emergency Responses to Hazardous Substances Releases [SFUND-2005-0009; FRL-7976-2] (RIN: 2050-AE36) received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4504. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Oklahoma; Plan for Controlling Emissions From Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units [R06-OAR-2005-OK-0004; FRL-7979-7] received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4505. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 08-05 which informs of an intent to sign Amendment Number Six to the Arrow System Improvement Program (ASIP) Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the United States and Israel, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

4506. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 09-05 which informs of an intent to sign the Ballistic Missile Defense Technology (BMDT) Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the United States and Denmark, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

4507. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 05-36, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on International Relations.

4508. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 06-06, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on International Relations.

4509. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 06-05, con-

cerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on International Relations.

4510. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 06-04, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on International Relations.

4511. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting reports pursuant to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005, Public Law 109-13; to the Committee on International Relations.

4512. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on International Relations.

4513. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the manufacture of defense equipment from the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 030-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

4514. 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 equipment (Transmittal No. DDTC 045-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

4515. 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 and services to the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 027-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

4516. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Accountability Review Board report and recommendations concerning serious injury, loss of life or significant destruction of property at a U.S. mission abroad, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 4831 et seq.; to the Committee on International Relations.

4517. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer/Director, HCM, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4518. A letter from the Asst. Secretary for Administration & Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4519. A letter from the Asst. Secretary for Administration & Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4520. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4521. A letter from the Associate Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4522. A letter from the General Counsel (Acting), Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4523. A letter from the General Counsel (Acting), Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4524. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Streamlining the General Pretreatment Regulations for Existing and New Sources of Pollution [OW-2002-0007; FRL-7980-4] (RIN: 2040-AC58) received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4525. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revision of Wastewater Treatment Exemptions for Hazardous Waste Mixtures ("Headworks Exemptions") [RCRA-2002-0028; FRL-7980-1] (RIN: 2050-AE84) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2383. A bill to redesignate the facility of the Bureau of Reclamation located at 19550 Kelso Road in Byron, California, as the "C.W. 'Bill' Jones Pumping Plant" (Rept. 109-247). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 493. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 397) to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages, injunctive or other relief resulting from the misuse of their products by others (Rept. 109-248). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 494. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 554) to prevent legislative and regulatory functions from being usurped by civil liability actions brought or continued against food manufacturers, marketers, distributors, advertisers, sellers, and trade associations for claims of injury relating to a person's weight gain, obesity, or any health condition associated with weight gain or obesity (Rept. 109-249). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 4057. A bill to provide that attorneys employed by the Department of Justice shall be eligible for compensatory time off for travel under section 5550b of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 4058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the construction

contract exception to the percentage of completion method for determining income under long-term contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 4059. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to enhance educational services for persons with autism spectrum disorders, to expand loan forgiveness for teachers of autistic children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE:

H.R. 4060. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a 100 percent deduction for meal and entertainment expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUYER (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. REYES, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4061. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the management of information technology within the Department of Veterans Affairs by providing for the Chief Information Officer of that Department to have authority over resources, budget, and personnel related to the support function of information technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. CASE, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BEAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 4062. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to preparation for an influenza pandemic, including an avian influenza pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 4063. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a policy for managing the risk of food allergy and anaphylaxis in schools; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4064. A bill to provide for the inclusion of Department of Defense property on Santa Rosa and Okaloosa Island, Florida, in the Gulf Islands National Seashore if the property is ever excess to the needs of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for

consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OSBORNE:

H.R. 4065. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide certain undocumented workers with temporary work visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 4066. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals either a credit against income tax or a deduction for expenses paid or incurred by reason of a voluntary or mandatory evacuation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 4067. A bill to reform the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 4068. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease a portion of a visitor center to be constructed outside the boundary of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in Porter County, Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the period that regulated investment companies may carry-over capital losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMBO:

H. Con. Res. 267. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress upholding the Makah Tribe treaty rights; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. UPTON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WU, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H. Res. 491. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to raising awareness and enhancing the state of computer security in the United States, and supporting the goals and ideals of National Cyber Security Awareness Month; to the Committee on Science, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

H. Res. 492. A resolution mourning the loss of life caused by the earthquake that occurred on October 8, 2005, in Pakistan and India, expressing the condolences of the American people to the families of the victims, and urging assistance to those affected; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H. Res. 495. A resolution commending the people of the Republic of Albania on the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II for protecting and saving the lives of the majority of Jews living in Albania during the Holocaust; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 496. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of the late Dr. John

Garang de Mabior and reaffirming the continued commitment of the House of Representatives to a just and lasting peace in the Republic of the Sudan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 497. A resolution recognizing and honoring the life and achievements of Constance Baker Motley, a judge for the United States District Court, Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 49: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 219: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
 H.R. 226: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 302: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 305: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 311: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 500: Mrs. CUBIN.
 H.R. 503: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 517: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 535: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 583: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 602: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 615: Mr. ROSS and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 668: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 759: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 777: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.
 H.R. 813: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 872: Mr. COOPER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 874: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 884: Mr. SWEENEY.
 H.R. 887: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 920: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 923: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. FORTUÑO.
 H.R. 949: Ms. LEE and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 972: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 986: Mr. REYES and Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 994: Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BONNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
 H.R. 998: Mr. SODREL.
 H.R. 1000: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1002: Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1010: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 1227: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ORTIZ.
 H.R. 1246: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. BECERRA.
 H.R. 1251: Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1298: Mr. ISSA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. LOBONDO.
 H.R. 1329: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1369: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1409: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 1426: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1510: Mr. SODREL and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1526: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 1578: Mr. LINDER.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 1591: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 1621: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 1636: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 1664: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

- H.R. 1681: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 1696: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
 H.R. 1736: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1742: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1819: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 1849: Mr. FORTUÑO.
 H.R. 1859: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 1864: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 1973: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 2048: Mr. HOLT and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2199: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 2238: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2294: Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 2421: Mr. TURNER, Mr. BACA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. FOLEY.
 H.R. 2669: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 2682: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 2694: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 2721: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 2793: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H.R. 2803: Mr. PENCE, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mrs. BONO.
 H.R. 2804: Mr. SOUDER and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 2811: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 2830: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2835: Mr. HONDA and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 2841: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 2861: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 2874: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. REYES, and Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 2892: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 2961: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 2971: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 2989: Mr. ROSS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 3127: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3150: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 3162: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 3255: Mr. TANNER.
 H.R. 3276: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
 H.R. 3333: Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 3352: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 3361: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Ms. MATSUL.
 H.R. 3373: Mr. MICA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 3405: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARROW, Mr. KLINE, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 3417: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 3492: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 3548: Mr. SWEENEY.
 H.R. 3561: Mr. CLAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 3579: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3582: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 3601: Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 3616: Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 3617: Mr. WALSH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 3644: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 3700: Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 3704: Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 3710: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 H.R. 3758: Mr. BERMAN and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 3764: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 H.R. 3800: Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 3832: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 3852: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 3917: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 3918: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 3936: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 3953: Mr. FEENEY, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 3954: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
 H.R. 3974: Mr. BACA, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 4012: Mr. OWENS, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 4018: Mr. NORWOOD and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
 H.R. 4021: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 4025: Mr. BACA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 4030: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BACA, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 4033: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 4052: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.J. Res. 138: Mr. DOYLE.
 H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. DOYLE.
 H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H. Con. Res. 197: Mrs. MALONEY and Ms. HARMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 230: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. MACK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. POE.
 H. Con. Res. 231: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H. Con. Res. 234: Mr. OLVER and Mr. SANDERS.
 H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. LANTOS.
 H. Con. Res. 262: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H. Res. 31: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H. Res. 76: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. FILNER.
 H. Res. 97: Mr. PLATTS.
 H. Res. 223: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H. Res. 316: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H. Res. 404: Mr. SPRATT.
 H. Res. 449: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. KIND.
 H. Res. 457: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. HONDA.
 H. Res. 458: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. DOYLE.
 H. Res. 472: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
 H. Res. 477: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3954: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.