



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2006

No. 14

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Reverend John Appel, Senior Pastor, Frederick Seventh-day Adventist Church, Frederick, Maryland, offered the following prayer:

By Your grace we are citizens of this great Nation. Forgive us when we fail to do our part to keep this democracy healthy. Guide us as we work for its well-being. Guard our lips from inflammatory rhetoric which produces much heat, but very little light. Cleanse us from bigotry and self-centeredness in the pursuit of our own narrow interests in the public arena. Your word teaches that the long-term security of all depends on the strength of each. Strengthen, then, our resolve that we may exercise our precious votes for what is right, not just for what is personally advantageous.

Show us how to carry out Your will in the public arena, that we may respectfully and intelligently develop opportunities of liberty and justice for all. Purify our hearts and minds, that we may learn to renounce exploitation and prejudice in all its forms, and so contribute to the well-being of the community in which we live. For we pray this in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

INTRODUCING PASTOR JOHN APPEL

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pastor Appel's ministry extends beyond his congregation to embrace the entire Frederick community, as well as missions abroad. He is currently serving as the president of the Ministerial Association of Frederick County, Maryland. This organization is composed of all of the ministers in the county. It meets monthly to engage in fellowship, dialogue, and to promote interfaith cooperation and activities to meet the spiritual needs of Frederick County residents.

Pastor Appel is also an active supporter of the Adventist Church's Hope for Humanity projects in southern Africa in response to the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Pastor Appel explained: "Hope for Humanity is coming to this program saying, 'Here are some challenges, here are some needs. We are a world church. We just can't stay focused congregationally. We've got to start thinking about our brothers and sisters around the world who need our help.'"

Mr. Speaker, today's prayer continues a tradition that began when Benjamin Franklin spoke during a moment of crisis at the Constitutional Convention, and these are his words: "In the days of our contest with Great Britain when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of superintending providence in our favor. To that kind provi-

dence we owe this happy opportunity to establish our Nation. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men.

"If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that a new Nation can rise without his aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. I therefore beg leave to move that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of heaven and its blessings on our deliberations be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to any business."

Mr. Speaker, I am really honored that my pastor, Pastor John Appel, senior pastor of the Frederick Seventh-day Adventist Church and currently serving as the president of the Ministerial Association of Frederick County, is here today to continue this precedent followed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

2006 WILL BUILD ON LEGISLATIVE SUCCESSES OF 2005

(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, in the past several weeks we have all been back at home spending time in our districts talking with constituents, and I cannot even begin to tell you how energizing that has been. We have talked about tax policy. We have talked about the war or terrorism. We have talked about the ways we can reduce government spending. There are a lot of great ideas out there. And we have discussed the border security issue.

Last year, we enacted several spending cuts. Great work for us. Our men

☐ 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.

H161

and women in uniform eliminated key al Qaeda figures, and we eliminated or cut some duplicative and wasteful government programs. We have a lot more to do. And we also passed legislation to work on our illegal immigration problem.

Mr. Speaker, this is going to be a great year. We are going to build on the successes of 2005, and we are going to act on the issues that matter to our constituents. Let's get to work.

MEDICARE PART D AND THE DONUT HOLE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, the gentlewoman was energized in talking to her constituents and encouraged by it, but I guess she didn't talk to any seniors about Medicare part D.

I have the unfortunate privilege of probably representing the first victim in the United States of America of the so-called donut hole. You don't know what the donut hole is? They wanted to pretend that you could preclude Medicare from negotiating lower drug prices, subsidize the pharmaceutical and insurance industries, and do all this for \$400 billion. Of course, it turns out it will be more like \$800 billion; but in order to get there, they had to create this weird construct. After you pay your payments, your premiums, and all that, you get to a certain point, around \$2,000 or so, where you have to pay everything for the next \$2,850.

This constituent doesn't have \$2,850. The pharmaceutical companies eliminated the compassionate drug programs because they said, hey, these people can get this great Federal benefit. This means, in all likelihood, if we can't get this woman some help, she will die. Medicare part D. I guess she didn't talk to her constituents about that.

RADICAL ZEALOT

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian president is up to his old tricks again, recently claiming that God has put him on a divine mission to have nuclear weapons. This bizarre banter comes from the same sinister man who called for the destruction and devastation of Israel. This is more than disturbing. Iran's commander in chief is obviously a saber-rattling zealot who puts world security in turmoil.

Mr. Speaker, the President of Iran is defiant and determined to lead his country in a dangerous direction. He supports organizations that kill Americans, like the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, Hezbollah, and encourages the use of violence against Israel. Hopefully, the people of Iran see the de-

structive behavior of their president and want to bring about a free and stable Iran that wants to be a part of the community of nations.

A nuclear-armed Iran is a dangerous and deadly threat to the Middle East and all of the Free World. We must keep America as well as the rest of the world safe from this radical reactionary outlaw with his ridiculous ambitions. This is a matter of world security.

That's just the way it is.

FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because I believe working-class Americans deserve a Federal budget which is compassionate, decent, and provides hope to the American public.

President Bush's budget for fiscal year 2007 fails on all counts and provides insufficient funding for one of our Nation's greatest investments: its health.

Despite the confusing and poorly implemented new Medicare prescription drug benefit program, President Bush's budget cuts Medicare by \$35 billion in the next 5 years, it cuts funding for public health programs by \$126 million, and puts more families at risk of food and security by cutting more than \$706 million in assistance.

Even with the growing problem of health care disparities and lack of insurance for communities of color, the budget slashes the Office of Minority Health Programs by 20 percent.

To our children, to those battling high health care costs, and to the uninsured, this budget, in my opinion, is not compassionate and it doesn't provide the American public with hope.

Americans deserve better. We must not inflict this pain on the most vulnerable populations in our country.

WAR ON TERROR AND BUDGET REQUEST

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as my stepson, Douglas Lehtinen, and his fiancée, Lindsay Nelson, wrap up their mission in Iraq, where they have been serving as Marine officers flying F-18s, I want to thank all of the brave men and women who wear our Nation's uniform for their commitment and the service that they are performing. I am pleased that the President's budget submitted to Congress this week provides more funding for the protection of our troops overseas.

The budget also provides the necessary funds to win the war on terror and enables our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan to defeat the enemy and protect our liberties. The budget calls for

funding that will help our military transform itself to face current and emerging challenges.

Whether conventional military threats to our security interests or unconventional ones from terrorists and their supporters, we must be prepared for what tomorrow brings. Thank you, Mr. President, for supporting our troops.

FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have always been told that budgets are a way of reflecting priorities. And if that is the case, then the budget documents that I have seen are indeed frightening.

The proposed budget I have seen will serve to widen the gap between the rich and the poor, cut vital health services for people who need them the most, and increase the cost of higher education.

I had hoped that the budget this year was going to be something different, but I am afraid it is the same old soup warmed over, the same old lemon with a new twist, and same old trickle-down theory of economics. I hope that we will tear it apart and send it back.

SALUTING THE SOUTH CAROLINA LEUKEMIA AND LYMPHOMA SOCIETY

(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, in 2006, over 1,850 South Carolinians will be diagnosed with leukemia, lymphoma, Hodgkin's disease, or melanoma. Unfortunately, this devastating statistic is reflected in communities throughout our Nation.

While families struggle to cope with these serious diseases, the South Carolina Leukemia and Lymphoma Society is fighting to find cures and improve the quality of life for patients and their families. By focusing their resources on research, patient services, professional education and advocacy, a dedicated group of volunteers and staff are making tremendous progress every day.

Today, I am honored to recognize the South Carolina Leukemia and Lymphoma Society for its service. As blood cancers continue to threaten the lives of our family members and friends, I would like to encourage my colleagues and all Americans to join in this important fight.

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

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET CUTS FEDERAL FUNDING FOR METHAMPHETAMINE PROGRAMS

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of local communities in my State and throughout this country that are fighting a terrible battle against methamphetamine, its production and use. And I rise to express grave concern about the impact of our President's budget proposal on that fight.

Let me share with you some troubling figures. The President of the United States has proposed to cut COPS funding by \$376 million, he has proposed to cut the Meth Hot Spots program by \$23.5 million, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program by \$353 million, and he has proposed to completely eliminate Byrne grants.

Now, I can tell you that when I go back home and I talk to my sheriffs and police officers and treatment specialists, they tell me meth is a catastrophe in our communities and we must fight it. Regrettably, this President's budget cuts the funds we need to prevail in that fight.

We need to restore those funds, and we need to emphasize to this administration that we have terrorists operating right here at home in our communities, and methamphetamine is their weapon of choice.

HONORING CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 657, honoring the contributions of our country's nearly 8,000 Catholic schools. Catholic schools provide an invaluable service to our country and offer excellent academic instruction to their students.

Take, for example, St. Leo the Great Catholic School in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. St. Leo was recently named a No Child Left Behind nationally recognized blue ribbon school for its academic superiority. It was one of just 10 North Carolina schools to receive this award and was the only school in the entire State to achieve this recognition.

Not only do Catholic schools provide excellent academic preparation, but they also mold students into upstanding citizens who are strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities.

For this, I am proud to join many of my colleagues in congratulating our Nation's Catholic schools, students, parents, and faculty for the key role they play in promoting a brighter and stronger future for America.

□ 1415

FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the budget the President unveiled this week takes from the poor, gives to the rich, and leaves all of us in a worse fiscal mess.

At a time of war, when our soldiers are risking their lives halfway across the world, where is the call for shared sacrifice? Do millionaires deserve \$50 billion in tax cuts, paid for by reducing services for the lowest-income families? Can we afford to extend tax breaks for the wealthiest 1 percent when our fiscal obligations include spending over \$1 billion a week in Iraq, the rebuilding of the gulf coast, and protecting the homeland from terrorist threats?

Instead of responsibly budgeting for these costs, we are in a fiscal free-fall, giving breaks to those who need it the least while slapping away the hands of those who need help the most.

This administration is the most fiscally irresponsible in U.S. history, responsible for the four largest annual deficits ever. We have gone from a projected 10-year surplus of \$5.6 trillion in 2001 to a projected deficit of \$3.3 trillion, a reversal of \$9 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, this budget lacks compassion, is fiscally irresponsible, and does not reflect the priorities of this great Nation.

THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the President's budget. As a physician who used to take care of a lot of Medicare patients prior to my election in 1994, one of the first things I look at in the budget are the Medicare numbers, after I look at the NASA numbers and a couple of other things.

Members of this body need to know, and the American public, that the President's budget calls for a 15 percent increase in Medicare spending. You may be surprised to hear that because the press is talking about Medicare cuts. Indeed, Democrats are talking about Medicare cuts. You even heard that on the floor today.

It is projected to go from \$396 billion to \$457 billion in 2007, and by 2011 to grow to \$587 billion. Where is the cut? There is no cut. The President is trying to slow the growth of this entitlement program, which is unsustainable in the future unless we can enact significant reforms. God bless us if we are unable to do that.

This is, in my opinion, the right thing to do for the President, and he needs to be commended. And for those who mischaracterize this as a cut, they need to start telling the truth.

THE BUDGET

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, red ink, record budget deficits mount every year. On top of it, America has also been racking up record trade deficits this year, more imports than exports every single day. These twin deficits are stifling real economic growth for our country as we sink deeper and deeper into debt.

Every year, with all the unfair trade agreements that have been signed, the red ink just keeps getting deeper. We are hemorrhaging America's good jobs, with fewer people working at good jobs to create real wealth. It is no surprise we have fewer resources to pay off our debts.

At the same time, the United States becomes more and more beholden to foreign interests that are financing these deficits. We are not only giving them our money, we are giving them our future and paying them hundreds of billions a year in interest. Is it any surprise that retailing of foreign goods is now America's biggest business?

Federal Reserve's former chairman Alan Greenspan warned that this relentless deficit growth cannot persist. How long will it be before we put a foreclosure sign on our U.S. Department of the Treasury? What an embarrassment for a Nation founded in independence.

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President for submitting a budget proposal that will meet America's needs while maintaining fiscal accountability and responsibility. He understands that if you are going to ask everybody to tighten up the purse strings, you have to be at the front of the line.

The American people don't expect us to agree on everything, but as Members of this great body they expect us to stop complaining about the issues before us and start working together to find solutions for our children and our grandchildren.

I hope someday I am down here debating the Government Waste Reduction Act, which would slow the growth of government by 5 percent and reduce the deficit by an estimated \$510 billion over 5 years. But until then, I will look forward to working with my colleagues on the Budget Committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, as we move through this process.

In submitting this budget, President Bush has set the tone and given Congress a great starting point. It is now up to us to act.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESS- WOMAN VIRGINIA SMITH

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, this last month, former Congresswoman Virginia Smith died in Sun City, Arizona, at the age of 94. She served the Third District of Nebraska for 16 years through eight terms. It is a very large district. It covers 80 percent of the State of Nebraska, with 69 counties and 64,000 square miles. She and her husband, Haven, drove county to county, city to city, weekend after weekend; and there was no one who was more faithful in covering that area and being loyal and faithful to her constituents than Virginia Smith.

She served on the Appropriations Committee for several years and was responsible for an animal research center in Clay Center, Nebraska, which really is of worldwide renown. She was tenacious, she was aggressive, and she was very strong in constituent services. Nebraska was very well served by Virginia Smith, and she will be greatly missed.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(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, last week, in this Chamber, the President shared with the American people a reasoned and measured agenda for the future, an agenda that will lead us to meet the challenges of today and seize the opportunity of tomorrow.

The issues that the President addressed are not just his concerns; they are not just Republican concerns. They are the concerns of the American people. We must provide for the reform of our health care system that fixes the problems, not bandages them up, immigration reform that respects our sovereignty, and embrace a policy that will result in energy independence.

The American people want leadership. They want direction, and they want to know that their government is working for them, protecting them and providing a framework that preserves the ideal of the pursuit of happiness for all.

We in Congress have an obligation to our citizens and to the great history of our Nation to provide leadership that is equal to the task at hand. Our Nation, its security, its vitality, its health care and its livelihood depend on it. I urge all of my colleagues to embrace this responsibility together.

ADULT STEM CELL ADVANCES

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of news coming from the field of stem cell research lately, but it is all just a new variation on an old theme: Ethical or "adult stem cell" re-

search is working. Research that kills embryos, embryonic stem cell research, is not. While embryonic stem cell research's leading scientist has been disgraced for his research fabrications, adult stem cell researchers are announcing new breakthroughs.

One research group recently announced the development of a machine capable of taking adult stem cells from fat tissue and adapting them to treat other tissue damaged by heart disease and heart attacks. In a different study released recently, researchers have been able to turn adult muscle stem cells into cartilage, and in animal studies this regenerated cartilage has been used to treat damage caused by arthritis.

These studies add to the ever-growing list of treatments and cures that come from noncontroversial adult stem cells. Meanwhile, stem cell research involving the destruction of human embryos continues to be plagued by tumors, rejection, and research scandals. As we address this issue this year, we would do well to keep this in mind, what is working and what is not.

ADOPT HEALTH IT ACT

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise President Bush for his State of the Union remarks on health information technology, which he rightly noted will help control costs and reduce dangerous medical errors.

I would also like to encourage my colleagues to support health IT legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 4641, the ADOPT HIT Act.

Consider this: I can go to Antarctica and get cash from an ATM without a glitch, but should I fall ill during my travels, a hospital there could not access my medical records or know what medications I am on.

Right now the health care sector is woefully behind in using modern technology to reduce errors and save money, and that is why I introduced H.R. 4641. It provides increased tax breaks for physicians who invest in new health information technology.

As a physician, I know many doctors want to utilize new technology, but they find the cost prohibitive. Doctors will be more likely to adopt this technology if our Tax Code helps offset the substantial initial cost. By adopting the ADOPT HIT Act, by passing that act, we can move one step closer to a health care system that saves time, money and, most importantly, lives.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 8, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
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, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 8, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4636.

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 69
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Tuesday, February 7, 2006:

S. 1932, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95).

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Budget:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 8, 2006.

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: I respectfully resign my seat on the House Budget Committee effective immediately. Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to serve on this important committee.

Sincerely,

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

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.

□ 1430

CONGRATULATING THE PITTSBURGH STEELERS FOR WINNING SUPER BOWL XL

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 670) congratulating the National Football League champion Pittsburgh Steelers for winning Super Bowl XL and completing one of the

greatest postseason runs in professional sports history.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 670

Whereas the Pittsburgh Steelers won Super Bowl XL by defeating the Seattle Seahawks 21–10 in Detroit, Michigan, on February 5, 2006;

Whereas, with this victory, the Pittsburgh Steelers franchise has tied the San Francisco 49ers and the Dallas Cowboys for the most Super Bowl championships in National Football League history with 5 each;

Whereas the Steelers became the first 6th-seed in the playoffs to not only reach the Super Bowl, but to win the Super Bowl;

Whereas the Steelers closed their season by winning 8 consecutive games, including the Super Bowl, and became the first team to win 3 playoff games and the Super Bowl away from their home field;

Whereas the Steelers' path to the championship required defeating the top 3 teams in the American Football Conference—the Cincinnati Bengals, the Indianapolis Colts and the Denver Broncos—at their respective home fields;

Whereas finally, in the Super Bowl, the Steelers faced and overcame the National Football Conference champion Seahawks and the year's Most Valuable Player in the National Football League, Shaun Alexander;

Whereas team owner Dan Rooney and team president Art Rooney II, the son and grandson, respectively, of Pittsburgh Steelers' founder Art Rooney, have remarkable loyalty to Steelers fans and the City of Pittsburgh, and have assembled a tremendous team of coaches, players, and staff that made achieving the championship victory possible;

Whereas head coach Bill Cowher won his first Super Bowl in 14 seasons of leading the Pittsburgh Steelers, and brought the Vince Lombardi Trophy back to his hometown of Pittsburgh;

Whereas defensive coordinator Dick LeBeau orchestrated a defensive unit including stars Troy Polamalu, Deshaea Townsend, Chris Hope, Ike Taylor, Joey Porter, Larry Foote, Clark Haggans, James Farrior, Kimo von Oelhoffen, Aaron Smith, and Casey Hampton, that personified the blue-collar work ethic of Pittsburghers;

Whereas offensive coordinator Ken Whisenhunt's creativity and attention to detail helped the Steelers' offense, featuring starters Ben Roethlisberger—the youngest starting quarterback ever to win a Super Bowl—Dan Kreider, Willie Parker, Heath Miller, Max Starks, Kendall Simmons, Jeff Hartings, Alan Faneca, Marvel Smith, and Antwaan Randle El, to take the team to unexpected success;

Whereas the Most Valuable Player of the Super Bowl, Hines Ward, led the offense during the championship game by catching 5 passes for 123 yards and 1 touchdown;

Whereas running back Jerome Bettis, one of the National Football League's all-time leading rushers, returned to his hometown of Detroit to win his first Super Bowl, and then announced his retirement following the game;

Whereas the Steeler Nation is comprised of the greatest fans in professional football; and

Whereas for 73 years, the people of the City of Pittsburgh have seen themselves in the grit, tenacity, and achievement of the Pittsburgh Steelers franchise, and they proudly celebrate the team's 5th Super Bowl championship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the National Football League champion Pittsburgh Steelers for winning Super Bowl XL and completing one

of the greatest postseason runs in professional sports history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 670, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), would congratulate the Pittsburgh Steelers on winning the 2006 National Football League title.

For the city of Pittsburgh, winning Super Bowl XL filled its residents with pride, the kind of pride that is only shared with two other teams in history. The Pittsburgh Steelers have joined the ranks of the elite. Only the San Francisco 49ers, the Dallas Cowboys, and now the Steelers have succeeded in winning five Super Bowl titles.

The Steelers had one of the most impressive runs through the postseason in NFL history by claiming victory as a sixth seed, having to play three consecutive games away from home. In doing so, the Steelers beat the top three teams in the AFC: the Cincinnati Bengals, the Indianapolis Colts, and finally the Denver Broncos. However, these contests seemed far in the past on February 5 as they geared up to tackle the Seattle Seahawks for the NFL title. In a fight to the end, the Steelers claimed the victory of 21–10 and clinched, surprisingly, the first Super Bowl win for each and every member of the team.

I urge all Members to come together to honor the Pittsburgh Steelers in overcoming the odds to become the champions of the National Football League.

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

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

On February 5, 2006, the Pittsburgh Steelers beat the odds as they defeated the Seattle Seahawks to win "one for the thumb" by becoming only the third team in National Football League history to take a fifth Super Bowl championship home to its fans.

The greatest tribute to possibly the most loyal fans in professional football is a franchise and owners who have great respect for the hometown. The

Rooney family has owned the Steelers from the beginning and is respected throughout professional football as being among the most honorable, ethical, and successful owners in the history of the game. It is no surprise that the Steelers are one of the most beloved sporting franchises in the country, and you would be hard pressed to find a community in this vast land that does not claim at least a few avid Steelers fans.

Despite the support of the fans and the Rooney family, the Steelers' eventual Super Bowl championship was far from a foregone conclusion. Going into their December 11 game against Chicago, the Steelers were faced with the reality that they would have to win their four remaining games to have any chance of making the playoffs. Coach Bill Cowher inspired his players to win those four games and to win three more games on the road to the Super Bowl. Of course, all Chicagoans were disheartened when the Chicago Bears gave them the impetus that they needed to be successful.

These victories were not only impressive; they were achieved as the team traveled the most difficult road any team has traveled to a Super Bowl championship in the 40-year history of the championship game. When the team arrived in Detroit, the Steelers still had to contend with the best team in the National Football Conference, the Seattle Seahawks. The Seahawks came into the game with the most prolific offense in the NFL. They scored the most points during the regular season and featured the NFL's Most Valuable Player as their starting running back.

Despite these challenges and many predictions to the contrary, the Steelers walked away champions and the first sixth-seeded team to win the Super Bowl. They add this Super Bowl victory to the many great moments that have made up the storied 73-year history of the Steelers franchise.

I certainly take this opportunity to congratulate the Pittsburgh Steelers on their against-all-odds accomplishment and Super Bowl victory. I encourage the House to adopt H. Res. 670.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania, I want to note that Willie Parker, who is an alum of my alma matter, UNC Chapel Hill, had the longest run in Super Bowl history, and I want to congratulate him on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. The super Steelers, Mr. Speaker, are super again. And as Myron Cope would say, yoi and double yoi. For Sunday night, the Steelers won Super Bowl XL, otherwise in town we call it Super Bowl extra large, over the Seattle Seahawks by a score of 21–10.

This monumental win was the fifth National Football League championship for the Steelers franchise, tied now for the most in pro football history. And as we say in the 'Burgh, this win signified one for the thumb as it provided Pittsburgh with a fifth championship ring for their last finger on the city's collective hand.

The amazing Steelers finished their season by winning their final eight games, including the Super Bowl. And when the Steelers had a 7-5 record during the regular season, it looked like they might miss the playoffs completely unless they won each of their final four regular season games. But this team, like this city, does not give up. And the fans of the Steeler nation never give up on them. So the Steelers won their final four games. Then after clinching the sixth and final AFC playoff seed, the Steelers became the first team to win three road playoff games and then the Super Bowl.

And they were confronted with the toughest possible road to get there. The Steelers had to beat the top three teams in the AFC, the Cincinnati Bengals, the Indianapolis Colts and the Denver Broncos, each on their respective home fields.

No other team ever did this. No sixth-seeded playoff team ever made it to the Super Bowl. But then again, no other team is the Pittsburgh Steelers.

In the Super Bowl the Steelers faced the mighty Seattle Seahawks who possessed the highest scoring offense in the league, the NFL Most Valuable Player, running back Shaun Alexander. The Steelers' dominant defense, however, led by Troy Polamalu and Joey Porter limited the prolific Seahawks to just 10 points.

The Steelers offense was led by Super Bowl MVP Hines Ward who is here on the cover of the Tribune Review.

Mr. Speaker, you might be interested to know, as you probably already do, that Hines Ward is a graduate from the University of Georgia. He caught five passes for 123 yards and one touchdown which was thrown by wide receiver Antwaan Randle-El on a classic reverse pass.

Running back Willie Parker scored a Super Bowl record 75-yard run. Quarterback Ben Roethlisberger started the scoring with the second-quarter touchdown, was also known as having that play called the "tackle against the Colts," which kept the Steelers' dream alive.

This was a remarkable fifth Super Bowl victory for a team that personifies grit, tenacity, and excellence with the city of Pittsburgh and members of the Steeler nation from around the world. It was a particularly great accomplishment for a team that was originally purchased by founder Art Rooney in 1933 for \$2,500. At that time the Steelers were one of 10 charter members of the National Football League.

Today, the Steelers are operated by team owner Dan Rooney, his son and

team president Art Rooney II, all from the offspring of Art Rooney.

Congratulations also go to head coach Bill Cowher who finally made it to the top of the mountain, as Dan Rooney says, for this win of the Vince Lombardi Trophy to bring it back to his hometown of Pittsburgh.

I know every coach from defensive coordinator Dick LeBeau, offensive coordinator Ken Whisenhunt, to the training staff and every front office staff member is reveling in this win, as they should.

Congratulations to running back and fan favorite Jerome Bettis. The Bus, the fifth leading rusher in NFL history, went out on top in story-book fashion, winning his first Super Bowl in his hometown of Detroit in the final game of his 13-year career. The Steelers kept their promise to him and brought him back to his hometown.

And finally, congratulations to the millions of Steelers fans from throughout the world that make up the Steeler nation. They were there, we were there at every home game and every away game, every household waving our terrible towels here. When I was over in Iraq and I was over in Afghanistan, there they were with their Myron Cope official terrible towels as well. They were there 250,000 strong at a parade Monday in Pittsburgh to welcome the team back. The fans were there over the years, thick and thin, like the Steelers, believing in the best, always strong, never satisfied with just being there. And now, as Dan Rooney has said, now that we have one for the thumb and the ring let us start on the next hand. Congratulations to the super Steelers, and let us make it another one for the next hand next year.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to an avid patron of the game, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Resolution 670, congratulating the Pittsburgh Steelers for winning Super Bowl XL in Detroit, Michigan. On February 5, 2006, the Pittsburgh Steelers defeated the Seattle Seahawks by a score of 21-10. And by winning their impressive fifth Super Bowl, the Steelers tied the Dallas Cowboys and the San Francisco 49ers in the record books for the most Super Bowl championship wins in NFL history.

On Super Bowl Sunday, the Pittsburgh Steelers exemplified their blue-collar style of play that represents the great city of Pittsburgh. The Steelers completed the successful season utilizing their resilient defense and tenacious defense. They accomplished a tremendous feat by being the fourth wildcard playoff team to ever win a Super Bowl especially after defeating the top teams of the Cincinnati Bengals, the Indianapolis Colts, and the Denver Broncos.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the efforts of the Seattle Seahawks for making it to the Super Bowl after going through a very tough season.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to personally congratulate the efforts of the seven Asian Pacific Americans who are Polynesians and were participants in this year's Super Bowl: Lota Tatupu, Itula Mili, Wayne Hunter of the Seattle Seahawks and Troy Polamalu, Shaun Nua, Chris Kemoatu and Kimo von Oelhoffen of the Pittsburgh Steelers. I want to emphasize how much they have accomplished in life by overcoming such a great feat in succeeding in the National Football League.

It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that from a population of approximately 300 million of our fellow Americans, there are 600,000 Polynesians living in the United States today of Tongan, native Hawaiian and Samoan descent; and 35 currently play in the National Football League. It is interesting to know that of the 35 players that currently play in the National Football League, Mr. Speaker, 24 are Samoans, four Tongans and seven Native Hawaiians.

It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, that from a population, as I noted earlier, in our country today that out of this 35 and interesting to note too that the 24 Samoans who currently play in the NFL, five are high school graduates from my humble district of American Samoa. And of the 24 Samoans that currently play in the NFL, Mr. Speaker, five are graduates from my alma mater, my humble high school Kahuku High School in Hawaii. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to especially commend my fellow Samoan, Pittsburgh Steeler player Troy Polamalu, and fellow Native Hawaiian Kimo von Oelhoffen for their outstanding performance at the Super Bowl. I also want to commend my fellow Samoan, linebacker with the Seattle Seahawks, Lota Tatupu. Again, I offer my congratulations to the Pittsburgh Steelers for winning their fifth Super Bowl game.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of House Resolution 670 as a native Pittsburgher and still a Pittsburgher. I am fortunate to represent six of the counties around Pittsburgh and many Steeler fans.

□ 1445

It is with great honor that I stand here today to salute my hometown Super Bowl XL champion Pittsburgh Steelers. In fact, they won their first four Super Bowls when I was much younger, and the chant I have heard most of my life is, "Let's win one for the thumb." Arguably, that is what we did on Sunday. They won their first four Super Bowls, though, with a very different team than the team that they

won with this year, but in a lot of ways the teams are related.

First, the same owners have continued to be the owners of the Steelers from the very beginning. I salute the Rooney family, Art Rooney, Art Rooney II, for their dedication to this team; the entire Steelers organization, which has been committed to this team like the owners of no other professional football organization. In fact, I think they have been more committed to this team than any other pro sports ownership family.

I also rise to congratulate the team, especially Jerome Bettis, also known as the "Bus," for achieving a much deserved championship. Few could write a storybook ending as good as the one provided for Jerome Bettis. Jerome is a consummate professional and a refreshing example of what an athlete should be, even taking pay cuts over the last 2 years just to be a part of his beloved Steelers team to help them win their Super Bowl championship.

I also want to thank the city of Detroit, Jerome Bettis' hometown, where he got to win his Super Bowl ring. It was almost like a home game for everyone that watched the game, watching the Terrible Towels in the stands. The Steelers clearly felt very much at home.

Like Detroit, Pittsburgh is a football town. Our Steelers have been a source of identity and cohesion for a community that has gone through ups and downs in recent years. In the good times and in bad, though, the Steelers have always been a uniting force for the people of the Pittsburgh region.

I congratulate our young quarterback Ben Roethlisberger, who played even through a broken thumb toward the end of the season in some very tough games to come out on top.

I also congratulate the Most Valuable Player, Hines Ward, who received that award very deservedly. My mom identified him as the Most Valuable Player by the end of the first half.

There is a whole list of wonderful coaches, but I especially want to congratulate my constituent Coach Bill Cowher for finally being able to hoist the Vince Lombardi trophy after 14 seasons as head coach of the Steelers, where he maintains the distinction of being the longest-tenured head coach in the league and ranks fourth amongst active coaches in wins and winning percentage. He is a committed coach and family man. And all Bill Cowher wanted to do when they handed him the Lombardi trophy was to share it with Dan Rooney, the Steelers' owner.

Finally and most importantly of all, I salute the city of Pittsburgh and the fans of "Steelers Nation." For those who are not aware of it, you are probably aware of it now. Steelers Nation extends from coast to coast and around the world. Unfortunately, because we had tough economic times, a lot of Pittsburghers do not live in Pittsburgh anymore, but they are all still Steeler fans. And after this weekend, there is

really no question why. The grittiness, the strength, the cohesion, the humility, all the things that make Pittsburghers so wonderful translate very well into what these folks are around the country: committed, dedicated hometown people.

It is an honor to salute this team. They have overcome the longest odds in history to win the Super Bowl. They had their backs up against the wall, but they showed that Pittsburgh grit and that Pittsburgh tenacity, and I am really honored to be a Pittsburgher, especially today.

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

I will simply reiterate my congratulations to both Seattle and to Pittsburgh and suggest that next year I hope to see the Chicago Bears here. But if not, then we congratulate these two outstanding teams.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding.

First I want to start off by saying thank you to the city of Detroit for hosting the Super Bowl. I attended the Super Bowl with my 14-year-old son, and I can tell you it felt like we were in Pittsburgh. Not only were there Terrible Towels everywhere, but the weather felt like Pittsburgh weather, cold blustery weather. So I thank Detroit for making us feel so welcome and so at home, and thanks for ordering up that western Pennsylvania weather for us.

But I rise today to congratulate the Pittsburgh Steelers on an incredible season, an exciting road through the playoffs and a fantastic Super Bowl victory. I want to applaud the hard work of everybody on the team. They deserve that applause and respect.

I also want to congratulate the entire Rooney family. They are a great football family, and today they carry that tradition not just as one of the founding families of the National Football League, but as one of the leading families in western Pennsylvania who continue to give back to their community.

I would also like to take this opportunity to highlight the hard work and dedication and achievement of one of the unsung heroes of the Pittsburgh Steelers, and that is Coach Dick Hoak. Dick Hoak's name is not a household name, but he is one of the keys to the success of the Steelers over the years. Dick Hoak is the longest-tenured coach in NFL history, I might add. For the last 35 years, he has been a fixture on the Steelers sidelines and on the practice fields. In 1992, Bill Cowher named him the running backs coach, and he was the only coach retained from the

previous staff. Over his 13 seasons under Cowher, Hoak's backfield has been able to compile over 28,000 rushing yards, which is the most in the NFL, and puts the Steelers alone at the top again as the only team to surpass the 28,000 rushing yard threshold.

Hoak's history with the Steelers started even earlier, though, growing up in the shadows of Pittsburgh in Jeannette, Pennsylvania. In 1961, he was the Steelers seventh-round draft pick as a Nittany Lion from Penn State. He went on to spend 10 seasons in Pittsburgh's backfield, earning a spot on the Pro-Bowl. Dick has been producing for the Steelers for over 45 years.

This Super Bowl victory is a great accomplishment for all those involved, and we are proud of our Steelers. Western Pennsylvanians can be proud of their native son Dick Hoak. And I know of three little guys who are especially proud of Dick Hoak, and they are my nephews and Dick Hoak's grandsons, Michael, Jonathan, and Daniel Shuster. Now they can all look to their grandfather, and he can literally put five rings on that one hand and get ready for the sixth one next year, because Dick Hoak literally does have five Super Bowl rings and one for the thumb.

So to the Steelers organization, congratulations. We are all very proud of everybody on that team and in the organization.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, some folks may wonder why I am up here with the distinguished delegation from the Pittsburgh area, and that deserves some explanation.

The fine young quarterback for the Steelers, who became the youngest quarterback to win a Super Bowl, Ben Roethlisberger, is from my hometown of Findlay and also a graduate of Miami University, my alma mater, the cradle of coaches. And we are very proud of Ben's accomplishments, not only what he has meant to Findlay and our community and to the State of Ohio, Miami University, and the great record that he had at Miami, but, of course, now with Pittsburgh. There are a lot of Cleveland Browns fans who are very frustrated about the fact that the Browns chose one before Pittsburgh, the Browns chose somebody else besides the native son of Ohio, and the winner of that, of course, was Pittsburgh and the Steelers, and they stand to gain by winning a fantastic Super Bowl.

So I want to thank my good friend Congressman MURPHY for adding me as a cosponsor to this legislation, making me part of this great celebration, and truly honor this fine young man who is such a great role model for the kids in

Findlay and Pittsburgh and really all over the country to show that a classy young guy at 23 can lead a distinguished team to a Super Bowl victory. It is an honor to be here and to bask in the glory, really, of the team, the coaching staff, the Rooney family, and, of course, the great contribution that this 23-year-old young man from Findlay, Ohio and Miami University made, Ben Roethlisberger. Congratulations to all.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, allowing me to wrap up here.

As we congratulate this new generation of Steelers who we are excited about, it is a good time to also remember those who got us so many memories in the past: Terry Bradshaw; Lynn Swann; Joe Greene; Franco Harris; Blount; Lambert; Wagner; and, of course, the great coach Chuck Noll. They built a team, along with the Rooneys, in which the dynasty was set. And it is an exciting time for Pittsburgh to celebrate, Pittsburghers and everywhere around the world in the Steelers Nation to celebrate the new generation of Steelers. As a Congress we take our hats off to all of the NFL players who work so hard and maintain that tenacity and dignity on and off the field and show what America is about.

As I talked to soldiers overseas and saw Steelers banners hanging there as well as many other NFL banners, it was always fascinating for me to see how people from overseas still clung to the hopes that their hometown teams gave them. Indeed, it is a message that goes to people all throughout the world for the Steelers Nation of what it means to be a team that was counted down and out but ended up on top. It is something of a lesson we can all remember as Americans of what this great team, the Super Steelers, have taught us.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H. Res. 670, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 670.

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. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

HATTIE CARAWAY STATION

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4456) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2404 Race Street in Jonesboro, Arkansas, as the "Hattie Caraway Station," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4456

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

SECTION 1. HATTIE W. CARAWAY STATION.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2404 Race Street in Jonesboro, Arkansas, shall be known and designated as the "Hattie W. Caraway Station".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Hattie W. Caraway Station".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4456, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), would designate the post office building in Jonesboro, Arkansas, as the "Hattie Caraway Station." All members of the Arkansas delegation have cosponsored this legislation.

Hattie Wyatt Caraway was born on February 1, 1878, near Bakerville, Tennessee. After marrying her husband Thaddeus Caraway, the couple moved on to Jonesboro, Arkansas, where Thaddeus started his political career by being elected into the U.S. House of Representatives. He served as a Democrat in the House from 1912 until 1921, when he successfully ran for the Senate. He served in that capacity until he passed away in 1931.

In the same year, Arkansas Governor Harvey Parnell appointed Hattie Caraway to serve out the rest of her late husband's term. She was confirmed by a special election on January 12, 1932, becoming the first woman elected to the United States Senate.

□ 1500

While serving as a Senator in 1933, Caraway became the first woman to

chair a Senate committee; and in 1943, she became the first woman to take up the gavel on the Senate floor as the Senate's presiding officer.

When Caraway was defeated in her reelection efforts in 1944 by William Fulbright, her fellow Senators honored her with a standing ovation on the Senate floor. Her service to our country did not go unnoticed, and her groundbreaking accomplishments paved the way for women everywhere. At this time in our history, women had won the right to vote only 25 years earlier.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring this courageous woman who helped shape our Nation's history by passing H.R. 4456.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting and proper that we are here today to proceed with naming a post office in Jonesboro, Arkansas, for Senator Hattie Caraway. She obviously was the first to do a lot of things.

She was the first woman ever elected to the United States Senate in her own right. She was the first woman to chair a Senate committee, the first woman to take up the gavel on the Senate floor.

She was said to be called "Silent Hattie" by her colleagues in the Senate; and when asked why she avoided making speeches, and those of us that serve in this distinguished body I am sure can identify with this, she said, "The men have left nothing unsaid."

She might have gotten very tired sometimes of hearing it said over and over again, but she served with great distinction, not only the State of Arkansas but this wonderful Nation that we all represent, and broke the way for many people to do some good things.

She also was said to drink a beer occasionally, but she would never fill the glass higher than what her hand reached. I guess to be sure that she did not have too much. I think that is an interesting fact that has been included in the information about Senator Caraway.

She was a resident of Jonesboro, Arkansas, for nearly 50 years. She reared her family there, attended church, and actively participated in the Jonesboro community and civic organizations. Her husband, of course, was a United States Senator and was responsible for getting the post office set up on the Arkansas State University campus. The Caraways were great friends with V.C. Kays, the founding president of Arkansas State University. One year at Christmas, when Thad was dressed as Santa, Hattie supposedly jokingly locked him out of the party.

She made history again recently by becoming the first Arkansasan to ever appear on a stamp. On February 21,

2001, in Little Rock, the 76 cent Hattie Caraway definitive stamp was unveiled, which was the third in the Distinguished Americans series.

The new Hattie Caraway station will be an expansion of delivery services for the postal service in Jonesboro, Arkansas. It will be presided over by the postmaster, Hillrey Adams, who will do a wonderful job of expanding these services; and, again, it is fitting and proper that we name this station after Senator Hattie Caraway and congratulate her and those that have come after her for the wonderful job that she did.

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the history of Senator Caraway is a wonderful history, and I keep learning more things about her.

There is a wonderful book that was written by former State Senator David Malone from Arkansas called "Hattie and Huey," and it tells this remarkable story when Senator Huey Long came up to Arkansas to campaign for Senator Caraway. They basically barnstormed all around the small towns of Arkansas, the two of them together: Ms. Caraway, Silent Hattie; and Senator Long. It is just a remarkable and colorful story.

One of the things I just recently learned in the last couple of days about Senator Caraway is that her maiden name was Wyatt, W-Y-A-T-T. Well, I have one of my favorite relatives, my uncle Dick Wyatt, who lives in Medford, Oregon, who had a stroke over the weekend and is doing well but has got a lot of recovery and rehabilitation ahead of him; but I have now got to figure out, well, is my Uncle Dick somehow related to Hattie Wyatt Caraway.

One of my favorite stories about Senator Caraway was she was appointed to the seat after her husband passed away and then they had this election which essentially ratified the appointment, but it was not expected that she would run for reelection for a full regular term herself. She was trying to make up her mind what to do. I think she was with her son in her own home, and they were trying to decide what to do with a group of her advisers. Somebody said, well, let us flip a coin; and so they flipped a coin, and it came up that she should not run. It got real quiet, no one said anything, and then she said, let us go two out of three. That is when they knew she had the fire in her belly and that she wanted to run. They actually flipped the coin. It came up twice that she should run.

I think this is a very fitting tribute to Senator Caraway. She has been a tremendous role model for women in America, and I appreciate the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) for sponsoring this legislation.

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

I suspect that we have exhausted our requests for time, but let me just say that I am pleased to join with both these gentlemen from the State of Arkansas in supporting this legislation.

As a former resident of the State of Arkansas, I thought I knew about its history, but this is one that had actually escaped me. I did not know that Hattie Wyatt Caraway was the first woman elected to the United States Senate. I did not know that Arkansas had been the recipient of that act and of that action, and I certainly want to join with my colleagues in suggesting that it is indeed fitting and proper that we name the post office at Jonesboro, Arkansas, after Senator Hattie Caraway.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleague, find that one of the great benefits of serving in the House is learning a lot of history, and I, too, have learned a lot today. I want to urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4456, as amended.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4456, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2404 Race Street in Jonesboro, Arkansas, as the 'Hattie W. Caraway Station'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE YEAR OF THE MUSEUM

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 389) supporting the goals and ideals of The Year of the Museum.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 389

Whereas museums are institutions of public service and education that foster exploration, study, observation, critical thinking, contemplation and dialogue to advance a greater public knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of history, science, the arts, and the natural world;

Whereas Americans, according to survey data, view museums as one of the most important resources for educating our children; and museums have a long-standing tradition of inspiring curiosity in our Nation's schoolchildren by devoting more than \$1 billion and more than 18 million instructional hours annually for elementary and secondary education programs in communities across America through creative partnerships with schools; and by involving professional development for teachers, bringing traveling exhibits to local schools, digitizing materials

for access nationwide, creating electronic and printed educational materials that use local and State curriculum standards; and by and hosting interactive school field trips;

Whereas museums serve as community landmarks that contribute to the livability and economic vitality of communities through expanding tourism; and that museums rank in the top three family vacation destinations; revitalize downtowns, often with signature buildings; attract relocating businesses, by enhancing quality of life; provide shared community experiences and meeting places; and serve as a repository and resource for each community's unique history, culture, achievements, and values;

Whereas the Nation's more than 16,000 museums found in 9 out of every 10 counties in the United States receive approximately 865,000,000 visits annually from people of all ages and backgrounds, with attendance being free at more than half of these museums;

Whereas research indicates Americans view museums as one of the most trustworthy sources of objective information and believe that authentic artifacts in history museums and historic sites are second only to their family in significance to creating a strong connection to the past;

Whereas museums enhance the public's ability to engage as citizens, through developing a deeper sense of identity and a broader judgment about the world, and by holding more than 750 million objects and living specimens in the public trust to preserve and protect our cultural and natural heritage for our current and future generations;

Whereas museums are increasingly entering into new partnerships with community educational institutions that include schools, universities, libraries, public broadcasting, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers, which then, as partners, reach across community boundaries to provide broader impact and synergy for their educational programming;

Whereas supporting the goals and ideals of The Year of the Museum would give Americans the opportunity to celebrate the contributions museums have made to American culture and life over the past 100 years; and

Whereas in 2006, American museums are celebrating 100 years of cooperation as a profession and their collective contribution to our communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of The Year of the Museum; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a year with appropriate programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. 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. 389, the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 389 offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) would support the goals and ideals of The Year of the Museum in 2006.

America's museums, some of the Nation's premier cultural learning centers, have for decades educated both young and old on the history of our being. From artistic displays to archaeological artifacts, to science and the natural earth, museums help preserve the past and help us to understand our roles in the modern world.

Museums play a very important supplemental educational role, which is central to their service to the public. People of all ages and backgrounds have traditionally gathered to learn from their exhibits and programs. A recent national survey shows that Americans view museums as one of the most important resources for education and one of the most trusted sources for objective information.

Along with the educational benefits, museums continue to influence travel and tourism. They provide a common experience that families can share and experience across generations. In fact, museums rank in the top three family vacation destinations. American families from all income and education ranges visit museums each year. According to the American Association of Museums, there are 2.3 million museum visits a day, adding up to 865 million visits per year in the United States.

In conclusion, I urge all Members to come together in support of this important and timely resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 389 and join with my fellow colleagues in celebrating the more than 11,000 museums located in communities across this country.

Museums inspire us to dream, to examine the world around us and beyond, and to discover new and exciting things. Museums enable us, and especially our children, to explore everything from the smallest form to the infinite, from microscopic plants to the vast expanses of the universe.

Museums foster our most basic desire to understand what, where, when, why, and how. They also are a great educational resource that enrich our children's learning by complementing what they experience in school. Children learn best when inspired to think abstractly and creatively, and there is no better place outside of our schools for that to occur.

Museum staffs go to great lengths to consult State educational curricula and guidelines when designing exhibits, thereby further enhancing the quality and relevance of the museum experience. Each year, museums spend over \$1 billion to create and stage educational exhibits and special programs.

Those of us here in Washington, D.C., are lucky enough to be close to the

Smithsonian Institution, which is comprised of some of the best museums in the world. In the blocks between the Capitol and the Washington Monument, anybody with a desire to learn or explore can visit a tropical rain forest, step back to the time of the Civil War, see art from different cultures and periods, examine spacecraft that have been launched into space, touch a Moon rock, and learn about prehistoric animals.

So I rise in support of this bill because museums are an indispensable part of our education system and nurture our desire to discover what we do not yet know.

I live in a museum-rich environment. My congressional district has the Alder Planetarium and Astronomy Museum, the Chicago Center for Black Music Research Library, Chicago Children's Museum, the Chicago Historical Society, the Ernest Hemingway Museum, the Field Museum of Natural History, the Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio, the Garfield Park Conservatory, the Hellenic Museum and Cultural Center, the Hull House Jane Addams Museum, the Illinois Labor History Society, the Museum of Broadcast Communications, Museum of Contemporary Art, Museum of Contemporary Photography, National Vietnam Veterans Art Museum, the Peace Museum, the John G. Shedd Aquarium, the Spertus Museum, the Terra Museum of American Art, and the Ukrainian National Museum of Chicago.

So my colleagues can see, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that I could not be supportive of museums.

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

□ 1515

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague and cochairman of the bipartisan Congressional Arts Caucus, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) in cosponsoring House Resolution 389 to recognize 2006 as The Year of the Museum.

Today on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the American Association of Museums, we recognize the importance of museums, which have been serving the American public since 1773, encouraging curiosity and providing a source of enjoyment and education for every generation.

Our resolution recognizes The Year of the Museum as a celebration of great American culture, history and traditions. Having grown up in an arts family, my mom and dad met in the theater and had a lifelong commitment to the arts. I was fortunate to have the opportunity to experience the value of the arts and humanities throughout my childhood.

Today, families in southwest Connecticut enjoy a wide range of institu-

tions like the Barnum Museum, the Discovery Museum and Museum of Art in Bridgeport, the Bruce Museum of Arts and Science in Greenwich, and the Aldrich Museum of Contemporary Art in Ridgefield, to name some.

Nearly all of us in the House of Representatives are fortunate enough to have at least one museum, obviously many more in our district. Think of the impact museums have across our country, providing environments for learning and sharing where children, their parents and their grandparents can work together to connect ideas and experiences in direct, vivid and meaningful ways.

Museums teach the stories of the struggles and accomplishments of different cultures and unfamiliar people and achieve a deeper understanding of their own families, neighborhoods, the country in which they live, and the world at large.

I obviously urge my colleagues to join us in recognizing the vast public service provided by the museums in their own communities by supporting The Year of the Museum Resolution.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the adoption of H. Res. 389.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 389, supporting the goals and ideals of the Year of the Museum.

Museums are one of the most important educational tools that our society has to offer. Museums can teach us about history, art, science, literature, and any number of other subjects. From the great Smithsonian museums of Washington, DC, to the Houston Children's Museum or the Houston Fire Museum, these institutions enrich our society by enhancing our knowledge about the world in a way that is more personal and more affecting than one can find in a book.

The Year of the Museum will help to reinforce to all Americans how important museums are to our culture. It will introduce people to museums they did not even know existed, and hopefully, it will encourage people to go back to a museum they have not visited in many years.

Education can be the silver bullet in our society. Study after study has proven that the more education a person has, the less likely that person is to lead a life of crime, or do drugs, or go on welfare.

Museums will help to improve the educational system in this country by increasing our knowledge of our world and of our culture. There are more than 30 museums in the city of Houston, and I would encourage my fellow Houstonians to go and visit all of them.

Mr. Speaker, the Year of the Museum is long overdue, and I appreciate the Distinguished Lady from New York for introducing this excellent piece of legislation.

I strongly support H. Res. 389, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 389, a resolution celebrating the Year of the Museum. This resolution recognizes the importance of museums which have served the American public since this country was founded and include every type of institution from A, art to Z, zoo. From arboretums, botanical gardens, zoos, historic

presidential homes and libraries to science centers and art and children's museums, they encourage curiosity, they provide a source of enjoyment as well as education, and they preserve our country's great history for every generation.

I'm sure there is not a person among us who does not have a cherished memory of a visit to a museum. Museums are unique places in our communities. They come in every variety and size. Their collections and the ideas they share cover the broad spectrum of human endeavors—science, history, nature and art. There is a museum to satisfy and peak the interests of everyone of us.

Museums are public forums. They provide an environment rich with opportunity for intergenerational learning and sharing among children, parents, and grandparents. Museum visitors can come to know the struggles and accomplishments of different cultures and achieve a deeper understanding of their own family's, community's and country's history. But most importantly, museums are fun places to visit.

I have always loved museums and have been fortunate to have a number of world-renowned museums in my own district: the Buffalo Museum of Science, the Martin House Restoration Corporation, the Italian Heritage Museum & Cultural Center of Western NY, the Baker-Cederberg Museum and Archives, the George Eastman House, Landmark Society of Western New York, the Memorial Art Gallery at the University of Rochester, Rochester Historical Society, Rochester Museum & Science Center, the Strong Museum and the Susan B. Anthony House. These museums are so diverse; clearly any person could find the perfect museum in which to explore a unique interest.

But it is not just my constituents that have benefited from the presence of museums. All Americans do, because there are museums in nearly every Congressional District across this country. And they help our economy. Museums play an important role in promoting travel and tourism and driving economic development. They bring heightened local and national visibility to communities and their artists, scientists, and educators, and they spend \$5.2 billion a year serving the American public. Most museums operate as small or mid-sized community institutions, offer free or reduced admissions at least one day a week, work with local schools to enhance curriculum and education of students and families, and employ paid staff and dedicated volunteers.

In addition to educating and entertaining, museums undertake the immense task of preserving and protecting the more than 750 million objects in their collections, ensuring that they are publicly available to our citizens for this and future generations.

H. Res. 389 recognizes "The Year of the Museum" as a celebration of great American cultural, history and traditions. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the vast public service provided by the museums in their own communities by supporting this resolution.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 389, supporting the goals and ideals of the Year of the Museum. This year marks the centennial of the American Association of Museums, and in turn we celebrate the museums throughout our nation that educate, entertain, and enrich local communities. I am

proud to say I am a cosponsor of this resolution.

There are more than 16,000 museums in the United States that protect and share our cultural heritage. Museums help us understand who we are and where we came from. They preserve our history, our artifacts, and our art, and they display it in ways that increase our understanding of familiar and foreign cultures and of the universe itself.

History comes to life for the millions of children who visit museums every year. 11,000 American museums have educational programs for schoolchildren of all ages. Museums annually spend more than \$1 billion and 18 million hours to educate children through school programs such as guided field trips, traveling exhibits, and professional development for teachers.

The 12th District of New Jersey is home many diverse museums, including the New Jersey State Museum in Trenton. In addition to exhibits on local history, the State Museum offers a wide array of educational opportunities to children, including family oriented educational workshops and a planetarium. From the vast fine arts collection of the Princeton University Art Museum, to the learning opportunities available at the Vietnam Era Educational Center, I am proud of the benefits that all of the 12th District's museums provide to our community.

I support the goals of the Year of the Museum and I am proud to join my colleagues in supporting this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 389.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 660) supporting the goals and ideals of National Mentoring Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 660

Whereas youth mentoring is a centuries-old concept, through which a dependable adult provides guidance, support, and encouragement to help a young person become a responsible, productive adult;

Whereas mentoring, when done well, helps young people stay in school and improve academically, boosts self-esteem and communication skills, and improves the chances of going on to higher education;

Whereas there are thousands of mentoring programs in communities of all sizes across the United States, focused on building strong, effective relationships between caring and responsible adults and young people who need positive adult role models;

Whereas in spite of the great benefits mentoring provides, America has a serious men-

toring gap, with more than 15 million young people currently in need of caring adult role models;

Whereas the demand for mentoring far exceeds the current capacity of local mentoring programs and the number of adults who currently volunteer as mentors;

Whereas on December 22, 2005, the President designated January 2006 as National Mentoring Month to focus the Nation's attention on the essential role mentoring plays in the lives of young people;

Whereas the month-long celebration of mentoring will encourage more individuals and organizations, including schools, businesses, nonprofit organizations, faith institutions, and foundations, to become engaged in mentoring; and

Whereas National Mentoring Month will, most importantly, build awareness of mentoring and recruit more individuals to become mentors, helping close our Nation's mentoring gap: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

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

(2) acknowledges the hard work of individuals and groups who promote mentoring and who are observing the month with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of and volunteer involvement with youth mentoring; and

(3) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring adults who are already serving as mentors and encourages more adults to volunteer as mentors.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OSBORNE. 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. 660.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in honor of National Mentoring Month, which actually was celebrated in January, but we were not here in January, so we are doing it a month late. I would like to honor the contributions of the thousands of mentors and mentoring programs across the country that work so hard to provide young people with support and assistance.

And I would like to make a personal reference here, Mr. Speaker, in that I spent most of my previous career, 36 years, working with young people, and I saw many changes during that period of time, certainly great changes in the family. The out-of-wedlock birth rate was 5 percent in 1960; today it is about 35 percent. So a huge increase.

And at the time that I first started my coaching career, the number of children living with both biological parents was 90 percent. Today it is roughly 50 percent. And we currently

have 22 million fatherless children in the United States today. And I worked with many young people who were without fathers, and I saw the devastation that this lack of a father caused in their lives.

I also witnessed many cultural changes during that 36-year period. We have become the most violent Nation in the developed countries for young people, currently lead the world among developed nations in suicide and homicide rates. Certainly drug and alcohol abuse has increased dramatically. And, of course, gang activity, many people are aware of the increase there.

And also some of the influences of the media have not all been that positive. Some of the television, some of the movies, some of the Internet activities, some video games certainly have been somewhat pernicious and not been helpful to our young people.

So if we look at history, we realize that most great civilizations decline and fall due to internal factors, not external consequences. And so if we look at Rome, to some degree the British Empire, Soviet Union, we see some of those things occurring. And I think it is important that we not be caught off guard here in the United States.

It is difficult to legislate or mandate solutions to some of the problems that I have outlined briefly here, but I would like to remind the fact that mentoring does work. An adult who has no vested interest in a young person, who is not a parent, not a grandparent not a teacher, no one who is paid to come and spend time with that child, makes a tremendous impact on that child's life if they simply care enough to show up and spend time, because it indicates to that young person that they are worth something, that they are worthwhile. And so we see some dramatic changes.

My wife and I have been involved with a mentoring program which currently mentors 2,900 young people, mostly in the State of Nebraska. We have done some research through Gallup, the polling company, and they have found that absenteeism, in a good mentoring program, is reduced by 80 percent, absenteeism from school. We find that discipline referrals go down by about 70 percent, grades improve by 40 percent, and also pregnancy rates go down significantly. Substance abuse is decreased by 40 to 50 percent. Gang activity is reduced substantially.

And some things improve and increase. Graduation rates go up. And personal hygiene and personal relationships with parents and peers also tends to improve.

So a mentor is someone who cares. And we have so many young people in our country today who simply do not have an adult in their life that they can count on, somebody that cares about them unequivocally and will always be there for them.

A mentor is also someone who affirms, who says, I believe in you, I see some talent, I see some possibility. A

mentor is someone who provides a vision of what might be possible. So mentoring is critical. Mentoring does work.

And Congress has responded. We had an amendment to No Child Left Behind called Mentoring For Success, which I was able to introduce. In the last 5 years we have provided \$184 million of support for mentoring programs around the country. This is supported, of course, by Chairman BOEHNER.

Another mentoring program was funded to the tune of \$168 million, and this is for children of prisoners. It was through HHS and supported by the President. And currently it costs about \$500 per mentoring match, and so we reach undoubtedly 600,000, 700,000 children through these programs.

Mentoring is cost-effective. It costs \$500 to mentor a child. It costs \$25,000 to \$30,000 to lock someone up in prison. And the average meth addict will cost the State that it resides in roughly \$47,500 if they are addicted to meth because of crimes committed and other abuses.

So at the present time, Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that we need roughly 18 million mentors in the United States, children who badly need somebody in their life. We currently are able to supply roughly 3 million, so we are 15 million short. And what we have done in Congress is helped; certainly been a step in the right direction.

So I am pleased that we can at least acknowledge what has been done, and National Mentoring Month has certainly increased awareness and shown the importance of mentoring and the need for more mentors across the country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Nebraska for his leadership in bringing this resolution recognizing National Mentoring Month to the floor today. Since he arrived in Congress, the coach, as he is so often called, has worked to make youth issues a priority both on and off the field, and this resolution is another example of his dedication to this effort.

As we celebrate mentoring today, I am reminded of the words of Coretta Scott King when she said: I am fulfilled in what I do. I never thought that a lot of money, nor fine clothes, the finer things in life would make you happy.

Mentoring is not a material good. It does not involve lots of heavy spending or working long hours to achieve monetary greatness, but mentoring truly is one of the finer things in life. It is a valuable activity that gives all involved a sense of happiness and connection that material things cannot.

A mentor, of course, is often an adult, who, along with parents, provides young people support, counsel, friendship, and a constructive example. The average mentor spends 8 to 10 hours a month with his or her mentee

on activities such as reading a good book aloud, visiting museums or going to the playground.

When a young person is matched with a caring, responsible individual, this relationship often makes a positive difference in the quality of life for that young person.

For much too long we have focused on providing remedies to problems that only address negative behavior, rather than looking at ways to promote the positive and healthy development of our young people. This resolution directs us to focus on what children need in order to grow into healthy, safe and well-educated adults, making sure that children have access to a caring and responsible adult relationship.

Mentoring opens young people's eyes to a brighter future, and every young person deserves that opportunity. Unfortunately at this time there are simply not enough mentors to go around. Only about 1,000 of the more than 1 million school-aged children in the Chicago area are fortunate enough to have a mentor. Nationally more than 15 million young people currently are in need of a caring adult role model.

In Chicago and across the country, it is clear that the mentoring framework is in place. Now we just need more people to volunteer their time to help change the life of a child. Research shows that young people who are mentored have a stronger attachment to school, higher graduation rates, and decreased involvement with drugs, gangs and violence.

This bill recognizes these positive outcomes and acknowledges the hard work of individuals and groups who promote mentoring. Mentoring is a strong investment in our children and in the future of our country. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to join with Representative OSBORNE and my colleagues in celebrating the essential role that mentoring plays in the lives of our young people.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Nebraska for his outstanding leadership in bringing these kinds of issues to the forefront and to the attention of the Members of this body.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

□ 1530

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 660. I want to thank my colleague from Nebraska for his work stressing the need for mentoring in our Nation. It has been a pleasure to work with Congressman OSBORNE over the years to emphasize this great need for mentors.

Just yesterday a young woman from my San Diego community dropped by my office to share her story of how a

mentoring program changed her life. She came from a difficult family situation as a teenager and sought help from the Turning Point program at the YMCA Youth and Family Services in San Diego. There she found the help and the guidance of mentors who helped her in turning her life around for the best and eventually enrolling in college and setting some very ambitious personal goals. With the help of mentors, she learned the skills and confidence needed to make it in life, including how to communicate and how to build self-esteem. And she also learned practical skills in the 18-month program such as how to budget finances and how to approach job interviews.

Mr. Speaker, her story is a perfect example of the power and impact of mentoring. Those who receive the help and the support of a mentor are likely to help others and to do good. As an adult she now works as a staff member of the Turning Point program, returning the gift of mentoring to young at-risk youth who face similar circumstances. Her experience also shows that mentoring is not only about helping people facing difficulties, but giving them the strength and the drive to chart their own course and to discover their own strength and talents. Her talent now is helping others change their lives for the better.

We are hearing a lot right now about the need to make our young people competitive and to push academic standards, but let us also guide our children and give them the self-esteem and the courage to face the world and all its obstacles, particularly those young people who face substantial obstacles. Our children need the wisdom and strength of someone who cares. And I know as a school board member I would often run into teachers and principals who came from what we would call tough neighborhoods, and I would ask them what made the difference, because they would share with me that a lot of children they grew up with were in jail, and some had died, young people, and they shared that the one person, that one teacher that showed an interest, that one community member who always looked out for them, that one member who really would not let them get away with things growing up. It is always important to have that special someone there who cares.

As a proud sponsor to H.R. 660, I want to urge my colleagues to support the resolution before us today and to recognize the need to promote mentoring.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the proposed bill, H. Res. 660, "Supporting the goals and ideals of National Mentoring Month."

In 2002, January was deemed National Mentoring Month to recognize the importance that mentoring has on our Nation's youth. The demand for mentors stems from the growing need of our Nation's youth to have positive role models in their life that can provide them with the critical support and guidance necessary for them to succeed.

Without external support they are less likely to graduate from high school, and more likely to engage in criminal behavior. In contrast, youth matched in mentoring programs are 46 percent less likely to use illegal drugs and 37 percent less likely to skip a day of class. Additionally, youth in mentoring programs show increased self-esteem, self-confidence and self-worth.

The benefits of mentoring do not stop with the youth. Research by the Commonwealth Fund shows that 83 percent of adult mentors "learned or gained something personally from their mentoring experience," suggesting that mentoring is a positive experience for the both the mentor and the youth.

Further, by involving individuals and organizations, such as non-profits, faith-based institutions and businesses, we strengthen our communities—something that each of us works diligently to accomplish on a daily basis.

In my district in Houston, we have worked to foster this relationship through several mentoring programs. Two key institutions are the Volunteer Houston Mentoring Institute and the National Big Brothers, Big Sisters Program, both of which are working with area schools to administer successful programs. Volunteer Houston and the Houston Independent School District entered into a partnership to ensure that at-risk high school students have mentors to help them achieve academic success. Last year, the national Big Brothers, Big Sisters Program matched 225,000 youth with mentors, 1,500 of which are in the Houston program.

Both of these programs illustrate that significant progress has been made, but there is still much to be done. Nationally, there are as many as 15 million young people that make up what is known as the mentoring gap, or youth in need of mentors. In my district this is of particularly grave concern, as 5,300 youth displaced by hurricane Katrina are enrolled in the Houston Independent School District. They have sustained both psychological and emotional burdens, and could immediately benefit from a mentoring program.

In order to extend the great benefits of mentoring to all of those in need of services it is important to recruit new volunteers and expand the scope of operations.

With that said, I join my colleagues in supporting the goals and ideals of National Mentoring Month, recognize the need for increased awareness, and stand to recognize those selfless individuals and organizations that make mentoring a priority, often without the praise they deserve.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am so glad to be here with my colleagues Supporting Goals and Ideals of National Mentoring Month.

As House Resolution 660 so accurately states, "mentoring is a centuries-old concept, through which a dependable adult provides guidance, support, and encouragement to help a young become a responsible, productive adult." It goes on to conclude that when properly carried out mentoring "helps young people stay in school and improve academically, boosts self-esteem and communication skills, and improves the chances of going on to higher education." I could not agree more.

In Michigan, we proudly recognize the contributions made by Mentor Michigan, led by Governor Jennifer Granholm, and the First Gentleman Dan Mulhern. Two individuals who lead by example and serve as mentors them-

selves. I was recently privileged to join the First Gentleman at a presentation on mentoring at the First Presbyterian Church in Mt. Clemens, Michigan where he spoke passionately and effectively not only about the meaning of mentoring in his own life but the broader impact it has for our Michigan community.

This program exemplifies what happens when government and community actively work to make certain all of our youth develop lasting relationships with individuals who are stable and caring. By developing a state-wide network of mentoring programs, Mentor Michigan has fostered support and unity among programs that accomplish what so often gets overlooked, encouragement and guidance of youth. Mentoring programs throughout the state are work in conjunction with Mentor Michigan to promote three simple values.

First, that every child has the right to a stable, caring adult in his or her life. It is so easy to take this for granted. In Michigan, over 237 programs connect youth with high quality mentors that are dedicated to helping children reach their aspirations and guiding them through fulfilling their needs. Mentor Michigan recruits and connects dedicated mentors with effective programs.

Second, everyone is responsible for the well being of our children including individuals, businesses, nonprofit and faith-based organizations, education institutions, and government. "It takes a village to raise a child," says an old African proverb, and Mentor Michigan knows that a safe, well developed network of resources is a vital way to show that community involvement matters in shaping the way young people see the world. Mentors satisfy needs and programs that value mentors such as Mentor Michigan should be commended.

Third, volunteering is a significant way for people to enrich their lives by giving of themselves to children in their community. Youth energize the world around them and working with youth energizes the individuals who take up the challenge. Over 99 percent of Michigan's mentors have recommended mentoring to others. Mentor Michigan programs provide Americans the opportunity to develop young leaders of tomorrow.

Michigan is the only state with such a focus on tracking and assessing its mentoring programs. It is estimated that over 30,000 Michigan youth benefitted from having a mentor in 2005. I feel privileged to know such outstanding devotion to the generation of tomorrow and very proud to honor it today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the great contributions mentoring programs make every day to a better America of tomorrow.

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H. Res. 660. I want to thank Mr. DAVIS of Illinois for his support.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 660.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 657) honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 657

Whereas America's Catholic schools are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence, but provide students more than a superior scholastic education;

Whereas Catholic schools ensure a broad, values-added education emphasizing the lifelong development of moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in America's young people;

Whereas the total Catholic school student enrollment for the 2005–2006 academic year is about 2.5 million and the student-teacher ratio is 15 to 1;

Whereas Catholic schools teach a diverse group of students;

Whereas more than 27 percent of school children enrolled in Catholic schools are from minority backgrounds, and nearly 14 percent are non-Catholics;

Whereas Catholic schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities by providing an intellectually stimulating environment rich in spiritual, character, and moral development;

Whereas in the 1972 pastoral message concerning Catholic education, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops stated: "Education is one of the most important ways by which the Church fulfills its commitment to the dignity of the person and building of community. Community is central to education ministry, both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal. The educational efforts of the Church, therefore, must be directed to forming persons-in-community; for the education of the individual Christian is important not only to his solitary destiny, but also the destinies of the many communities in which he lives."; and

Whereas January 29 to February 4, 2006, has been designated as Catholic Schools Week by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of Catholic Schools Week, an event co-sponsored by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and established to recognize the vital contributions of America's thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools; and

(2) congratulates Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education, and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 657.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 657 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. This resolution increases the awareness of Catholic education while honoring the contributions of America's Catholic schools.

January 29 through February 4, 2006, has been designated Catholic Schools Week, an annual tradition in its 32nd year and jointly sponsored by the National Catholic Education Association, as well as the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

With this resolution we recognize the vital role Catholic elementary and secondary schools play in providing a values-added education with high standards of quality and excellence to the over 2.4 million students enrolled in Catholic schools across the country. In just my home State of Delaware, there are over 30 Catholic schools.

According to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, Catholic schools have a graduation rate of over 98 percent, and about 97 percent of Catholic high school graduates go to postsecondary training at 4-year colleges, community colleges or technical schools. This success could be also attributed to the importance Catholic educators place on character and morals. By making the development of moral and social values an integral part of the curriculum, Catholic schools are ensuring that their students are not only good academically, but also good citizens.

The theme for Catholic Schools Week 2006 is "Character, Compassion, Values." This theme resonates with the Catholic schools this academic year in particular. Catholic schools demonstrated an enormous amount of character and compassion in their response to the devastating hurricanes that hit the gulf coast last year. In the wake of this national disaster, more than 300,000 students were displaced from their homes, schools and communities. Catholic schools opened their doors and hearts and welcomed these students into their classrooms. They provided these children with the opportunity to continue their studies without stopping to consider how to cover the costs of that education. Instead, the Catholic schools knew their first priority was to educate these children, and, second, figure out how to cover the greater costs they incurred.

In addition, the Catholic schools in New Orleans proved to be the most resilient by becoming some of the first schools in the hurricane-damaged area to reopen their doors to students.

I appreciate the great work being done by Catholic schools, their administrators, and teachers, as well as their parents and volunteers. Catholic schools carry out their servant mission by building the academic achievement, character, and values of their students.

I again commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution recognizing the contributions Catholic schools make to our society.

Both public and Catholic schools provide a strong foundation for our Nation's children. While our public schools educate the vast majority of our children, our Catholic schools provide an excellent and enriching alternative.

I have attended Catholic schools myself. I received a high-quality education from these schools and have benefited greatly. Sister Jean and Sister Jerome taught me to read and master phonics. Sister Hilary taught me Latin, which I in turn taught also. They were the greatest influence outside of my family. They not only challenged me intellectually, but forced me to examine my own personal formation.

At St. Mary's I learned the greatness of God and the dignity of humanity. In Congress, my basic principle is that government's role is to promote, protect, defend and enhance human dignity. I examine every bill on these principles of human dignity that I learned at St. Mary's. Children across America have benefited from the same positive influence a Catholic education had on me. H. Res. 657 recognizes and celebrates our Catholic schools for this contribution.

I believe that one of the greatest aspects of the American education system is its diversity. The goal of American education is to provide anyone with the opportunity to succeed. Catholic schools are a critical part of that equation, teaching critical values and providing their students with beneficial and life-enriching experiences.

The contributions which Catholic schools make to our Nation and our children strengthen our society and our place in the world. Our children have more opportunities because both Catholic and public schools can provide them with a high-quality education. Together these two sectors of our education system will work to ensure our excellence in the world.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), the sponsor who has undertaken to pursue this resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from

Delaware and the others who are speaking on behalf of this resolution. I am pleased to be here to honor the contributions of Catholic schools.

My first real encounter with Catholic elementary and secondary students was my interaction with graduates from Catholic schools that I met at St. John's University. These students impressed me. They were not only well prepared for college, but they were courteous, kind, respectful, caring and friendly to me. They say you can tell a tree by its fruit. By this measure I assume Catholic schools must be great.

I remember a conversation I had while in college with a few graduates of Catholic high schools reminiscing on their high school experience. One of these students was so cynical about his Catholic education that I resolved never to send my children to Catholic schools. Well, it turns out the cynical student became a priest, so I changed my mind. Catholic schools really do nurture one's faith.

My wife Debbie and I have four wonderful children. They have been able to experience the best of both worlds. They all graduated from Watertown Mayer Public Middle School, and they all chose to attend Catholic high schools, not just to get a great education, but to be able to talk about how God influences history and the world around us.

We are pleased to see that they have been nurtured in the Catholic spirit of helping others. They participate in many programs to help those in need. For example, my daughter Emily organized a food drive for Mary's Place, an outreach center for the needy, while she was at Holy Family Catholic High School. She collected enough food from her fellow students to fill up a van and feed many in need.

I have so much faith in Catholic schools because they consistently provide a great education for 2.5 million students across America and have a student-teacher ratio that averages 15-1.

I can attest to the quality education with two of our children now attending the University of Notre Dame. Catholic schools have done an extraordinary job of reaching out to the disadvantaged youth throughout our country. More than 27 percent of students enrolled in Catholic schools are from minority backgrounds, and nearly 14 percent of them are non-Catholics.

Mr. Speaker, Catholic schools make fantastic contributions to education in this country, but every school must recognize that there is more that can be done. Well, at St. John's Prep my son's physics teacher was a former engineer at 3M. My son, his classmates, and likely hundreds or thousands of other students were not only able to benefit from his invaluable real-world experience, but they also gained an understanding of the success that can be achieved by those who study math and science.

That is why I introduced the Teachers for Tomorrow's Career Act, H.R.

4622, with my Democrat colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT). This legislation will bring down barriers so that math and science professionals can make the transition into teaching and offer real-world experience to the critical task of teaching math and science to our children.

The Kennedy-Holt legislation goes a long way toward fulfilling President Bush's new proposal of bringing 30,000 math and science professionals to teach in our classrooms, and make sure our children are competitive in the 21st century no matter what kind of school they attend.

Mr. Speaker, last week was Catholic Schools Week. The theme was "Catholic Schools: Character, Compassion, Values."

I urge my colleagues to join Mr. LIPINSKI and I in supporting this resolution to commend our Catholic schools and their teachers, the parents, and religious communities that support them in their service to our Nation's youth.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 657, honoring National Catholic Schools Week and the tremendous contributions that Catholic schools have made to our country.

Since 1974, Catholic Schools Week has celebrated the important role that Catholic schools play in American education, and their excellent reputation for providing a strong academic and moral education, as well as teaching social responsibility.

□ 1545

This year's theme of Catholic Schools Week is: "Catholic Schools: Character. Compassion. Values." These words embody the mission of Catholic education beyond providing top-notch academic training. Compassion is at the heart of the Catholic faith. It teaches so many young men and women the strength of character and the strong convictions that they need to be successful adults and to contribute to our society.

My wife and I are each products of 12 years of Catholic elementary and secondary school: my wife in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, at Saint Patrick's grade school and Bishop McCourt High School; myself in Chicago at Saint Symphorosa Grammar School and Saint Ignatius College Prep. Like so many others, I understand how important Catholic schools are in providing a spiritual, moral, and intellectual foundation. My 12 years of Catholic education provided me with the knowledge, discipline, and the love of learning that enabled me to go on and earn my Ph.D. and become a teacher before I came to Congress.

As we recognize Catholic Schools Week, we must pay special tribute to the dedicated teachers and administrators who sacrifice so much, usually

getting paid less than they could elsewhere, to dedicate their lives to teaching at Catholic schools. I have fond memories of my teachers, who taught me not only the value of a good education but also the values of faith and service. Although it was almost 35 years ago, I can still remember Sister Mildred, my first grade teacher; Miss Ivers, my second grade teacher. And the memories go on.

I will never forget Sister Diane, who was my student congress coach when I was in high school. To this day, when I speak in front of crowds, I still envision Sister Diane sitting there, nodding, giving me confidence when I was a nervous young kid trying to make my first public speeches. I related these memories while attending a celebration at Saint Richard's School last week. After the celebration, many people came up to me with similar memories, memories of teachers who gave their heart and soul and made such a big difference in the lives of their students.

To thank these men and women and their tireless contributions and service, I held a breakfast last week at Saint Lawrence High School during Catholic Schools Week. We talked about the successes of Catholic schools and also the challenges that they face. Nationally, more than 2.4 million young people are enrolled in nearly 8,000 Catholic schools. These schools have more than 160,000 full-time professional staff, boasting a student-teacher ratio of 15-1.

The Chicago archdiocese has had one of the most successful school systems. Today, more than 106,000 students attend 276 schools. In my district alone, there are 34 grammar schools and five high schools. The success of students in the Chicago archdiocese is phenomenal. The high schools have an amazing graduation rate of 99 percent, and about 95 percent of those graduates go on to college. This is clearly a record to be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, as an important complement to our public schools and other private institutions, Catholic schools contribute a great deal to America. They have made a big difference in my life and a big difference in the lives of countless others. They deserve our praise and our support; and I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution, the Kennedy resolution, honoring Catholic schools during this Catholic Schools Week.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, who turns out to be a Pittsburgh Steelers fan, which is a real insult to Philadelphia Eagles fans like myself.

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of this resolution recognizing Catholic schools throughout the country. In particular, I would like to recognize those in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, with several of whom I celebrated National Catholic Schools Week.

National Catholic Schools Week is an annual celebration, as mentioned by my colleagues; and I am very pleased to have been a part of it in the communities I represent. It is inspiring to see the students focus, students who are very lively, normal students, but who also focus on service and on faith and on commitment.

The young people that I encountered last week were just like any other student, but in one way very different. They were able to express for me their moral commitment to service, their commitment to their fellow man in a way that obviously is a further expression of their faith. These are the students who I expect will grow up to be public servants in the future, to be the teachers of the future, to be those who become missionaries in the future, and those who will make our world a better place.

I know firsthand the benefits of a Catholic education that emphasizes that intellectual, spiritual, moral, physical and social values in students, having attended Saint Richard's School in North Olmstead, Ohio; St. Mary's in Glenshaw, Pennsylvania; and finally graduating from the sixth grade at Saint Alexis in Wexford, Pennsylvania, which is currently my parish.

I have also had the opportunity, as I mentioned earlier, of visiting many schools throughout the six counties I represent in Pennsylvania District Four. One thing I learned when I was a State senator was that these schools not only provide all of these advantages for students but they provide a significant advantage to the taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. For every student who attends a Catholic school, the taxpayers of the commonwealth save a significant amount of money that would have been spent in the public school system. So financially, a benefit; socially, a benefit.

I congratulate the Catholic schools, the teachers, and the parents for sending their kids to these schools and making the United States's future much brighter.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time, and I rise to recognize the contributions of Catholic schools to Chicago and to the Nation.

Children all across America have benefited from Catholic education. I applaud these schools for their long commitment to education, to a value system and character development, and to developing the kind of lifestyles that students as well as adults need to seek.

There are almost 8,000 Catholic schools nationwide. Illinois is one of the 10 States with the highest enrollment of Catholic students, with over 181,000 students in 538 schools in the State. In Chicago, as in other urban

areas, Catholic schools play an important role in providing quality academic training for children and youth.

Indeed, the archdiocese of Chicago is the second largest Catholic school system in the Nation. There are 34 outstanding Catholic schools in my congressional district, and I recognize all of them as being outstanding, as a matter of fact, some of the very best schools in the Nation, such as Saint Ignatius Prep, known nationally as an outstanding school. But all of them are outstanding schools. They do an exceptional job.

Catholic schools, however, like all other components of education, Mr. Speaker, are facing difficult times. And almost every time I meet with residents and students and staff, we are all trying to figure out how do we keep the resources available to keep these educational institutions intact. So I would hope that as the year goes on and as we discuss and debate education, that we will find ways to put as much resources into education as we possibly can, knowing that the investment will pay off in the end.

Again, I salute the Catholic schools for their outstanding contributions, and I would like to recite for the RECORD those in my district, which are as follows:

Chicago Jesuit Academy, Divine Infant Jesus School, Divine Providence School, St. Bernardine School, St. Edmund School, St. Jerome School, St. Stanislaus Kostka, St. Elizabeth School, St. Helen School, Children of Peace School, Santa Lucia School, St. Pius V School, St. Therese School, Visitation School, St. Domitilla School, Ascension School, St. Giles School, St. Luke School.

St. Vincent Ferrer School, Old St. Mary's, St. Angela School, St. Malachy School, St. Nicholas Cathedral, San Miguel-Comer Campus, Frances Xavier Warde, Our Lady of the Westside, St. Catherine/St. Lucy, Immaculate Conception School, Archbishop Quigley Preparatory, Fenwick High School, Holy Trinity High School, St. Ignatius College Prep., St. Joseph High School, Trinity High School.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), alas another Steelers fan.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I am pleased to join my colleagues in support of this resolution to recognize the students, teachers, faculty, and graduates of Catholic schools. At Catholic schools across my State of Pennsylvania and the Nation, students will receive the highest-quality teaching in all academic subjects. But perhaps more important, beyond reading, writing, and arithmetic, students will be exposed to well-rounded, values-based curricula that teach the mind, the heart, the body, and the soul. Indeed, Catholic schools don't shy a way from matters of right and wrong.

The late Pope John Paul II, himself a great advocate for education, chal-

lenged Catholic schools to "foster in your students a social consciousness which will move them to meet the needs of their neighbors and to discern and to seek to remove the sources of injustice in society." I believe Catholic schools do promote social awareness and help make the world a better place to live.

Last week, as we know, was Catholic Schools Week, and the theme was "Catholic Schools: Character, Compassion, and Values." As a young student at St. Barnabas Elementary School myself and Walsh Jesuit High School, I was taught these traits at early ages. I greatly value my Catholic school education, as I do my public school education.

The 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania has this diversity of many Catholic schools, 67 in Allegheny County alone, five in Washington County, 19 in Westmoreland County. With over 183,000 students educated in Catholic schools across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the impact is huge. Eighty percent of Catholic school students go on to college, and Catholic schools saved more than \$1 billion last year in taxpayer funds in Pennsylvania alone by a reduction of the dropout rate to less than 3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a co-sponsor of this legislation. I commend the authors and all those who teach and are students of Catholic schools.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as the National Conference of Catholic Bishops once stated, "Education fosters the dignity of a person and the building of a community." Today, I am honored to thank my friend, Congressman MARK KENNEDY, for his leadership in recognizing America's Catholic schools for their continued commitment to education, and I appreciate Congressman MIKE CASTLE for his managing of the resolution.

I know firsthand of the effectiveness of Catholic schools from my school visits in the Second District of South Carolina to the elementary schools of St. Mary Help of Christians in Aiken; St. Peter in Beaufort; St. John Newmann of Columbia; and St. Joseph of Columbia, where I have two godsons, Jackson Gossett and Joseph Fisera; St. Martin DePorres of Columbia; St. Peter of Columbia; and additionally, St. Francis by the Sea of Hilton Head Island, along with Cardinal Newman High School in Forest Acres, South Carolina.

□ 1600

For generations these schools have served as an origin of opportunity for millions of Americans by teaching a broad, values-added education. Catholic schools play a pivotal role in helping American children develop into responsible and productive members of

society. Today, almost 8,000 Catholic schools are educating nearly 2.5 million students. Because of their excellent curriculum and strong emphasis upon values, these schools consistently outperform other public and private schools. Ninety-nine percent of Catholic high school students graduate, and 97 percent attend some form of postsecondary schooling.

Catholic schools also serve willingly in our communities. After Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita, Catholic schools in almost every State graciously welcomed displaced children from devastated areas without charging them for tuition, uniforms, books and supplies. Their recent generosity is simply another example of Catholic schools faithfully following the Gospel message. As we celebrate Catholic Schools Week, I join my colleagues in supporting the resolution expressing our sincere appreciation for America's Catholic schools.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for offering this resolution recognizing the contributions of Catholic schools to our communities and to our Nation, and join in the remarks of those who have spoken before me on this measure.

Clearly, as we travel our congressional districts and we recount our own life experiences with Catholics schools, both in attending them and in interacting with them in our congressional roles, the magnificent and incredible contribution they make to our communities and to building the lives of young people in the fullest sense of the word, not just the academic performance of these young people, but the efforts that they make to integrate them into the community in terms of community service and building their character and building their moral values and building their recognition of the community in which young people live, and the diversity of that community and understanding the need to be accepting of that community, these are characteristics, these are values, these are principles that we hold dear as a Nation, and Catholic schools have been fundamental to building those within the young people that attend these schools.

I had the honor of attending Catholic high school, but only for 1 year, Bellerme High School in San Jose, and I just wanted to express my support of this resolution and the continuation of the contribution of Catholic

schools to our Nation's education system and the character-building of our young people.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my support to House Resolution 657, which honors the contributions of Catholic schools on America's youth, and more than this, their contribution in enhancing the social framework of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago President Reagan's Secretary of Education, Secretary Bennett, remarked that during the first 150 years in the history of this Nation, that education was not just about the development of the mind, it was also considered to be the architect of the soul, and Catholic schools have never forgotten that second, most important, part of the mission of education.

As someone who has benefited greatly from Catholic education, I can say unequivocally that the values taught to me by the Catholic school system prepared me for the challenges and the opportunities I have met during my lifetime. My Catholic education prepared me to stand up and make the hard decisions in life with the comfort of having complete confidence in who I am as a person, and the deep understanding of human dignity that is so easily forgotten in today's overly commercialized, media-driven society.

My education taught me the value of developing not only my mind, but my commitment to my family, my community and my faith. The sisters, priests and teachers of Bishop Egan High School in Fairless Hills, Pennsylvania, and my professors at St. Thomas University in Florida helped me develop those core values, and for that I will be forever in their debt. Therefore, I call on my colleagues to join with me in strong support of this resolution, to show their support for Catholic school systems, educators, students, and contributors.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit these comments for extension of remarks.

I would like to speak in strong support of H. Res. 657, a resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic Schools and thank Mr. KENNEDY for his good work.

As a proud graduate of St. George's Elementary School, St. John the Baptist High School, and Fordham University, I know firsthand the great value of a Catholic School education.

Catholic school has been a longstanding tradition in my family. My three sons graduated from Catholic schools prepared for the challenges they have faced in their professional and personal lives.

As we celebrate the 32nd Annual Catholic Schools Week, I am proud to report that Catholic schools continue to play a vibrant and integral role in the educational and cultural life of our Nation.

Today, nearly 2.5 million children attend Catholic elementary, middle and high schools.

Minority enrollment is nearly 30 percent and non-Catholic enrollment is over 13 percent of the total.

There are nearly 400 Catholic schools in my home State of New Jersey alone, serving nearly 130,000 students, and many of these schools serve our urban districts.

Impressively, the student/teacher ratio in Catholic schools is 15:1, a ratio which provides teachers the opportunity to truly get to know the individual needs and strengths of the student body.

Catholic schools provide a disciplined, multi-faceted educational experience for children.

A Catholic education merges critical thinking and knowledge-based learning with a spirit of tolerance, empathy and service to others. This unique approach is exemplified in the theme of this year's Catholic Schools Week: Character. Compassion. Values.

Teaching students to serve their communities and to develop fundamental human values enhances self-esteem and enthusiasm, brings abstract subjects to life, and empowers students to think about worlds beyond their own.

It may also have a significant salutary effect on academic performance. Recent studies have demonstrated that Catholic students consistently perform up to a very high standard on tests assessing reading, writing, math and science abilities.

What transpires during the education of each and every child has repercussions beyond the classroom: It will shape the character of the country that we will become.

That is why I would like to thank the Catholic Schools of America for the tremendous success they have had in producing a student body well educated and well prepared to take an active role in strengthening our society.

This is perfectly illustrated in the generous response that Catholic schools students have had toward students devastated by the recent hurricane in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

Catholic students delivered more than \$1 million to Katrina students and opened their hearts and schools to thousands of victims. After the hurricane, New Orleans, with its deep Catholic roots, had 52,000 displaced students enroll in Catholic schools around the Nation, and Biloxi and Mobile had thousands more.

This is only one example of the contributions that Catholic Schools are making to our society. I am pleased to add my voice to the chorus of those who celebrate and honor the achievements of these valuable institutions.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the importance of America's Catholic schools and share my support for House Resolution 657.

As a product of Sacred Heart School in Lake Worth, Catholic parochial education was a major part of my life and that of my family. My father first attended Sacred Heart himself as a teacher and then moved on to Cardinal Newman High School to work as coach and science teacher.

At Sacred Heart, I was taught how to be a better citizen because of their focus on discipline and moral values. I often fall back on lessons learned during my formative years—especially in the case of November 22, 1963. I was in 4th grade and our teachers asked us to pray for our Nation and for our assassinated President. Though the shock of the

tragedy could have easily given way to anger among the faculty at Sacred Heart, it instead encouraged us to focus on a compassionate tone by praying for our country and the Kennedy family.

I am and have always been a strong proponent of public education. But by the virtue of its very nature—publicly funded schools cannot offer the type of spiritual education that Catholic schools have long provided. In search of a complete education with the ideals of trust, faith, understanding and compassion, many families are turning to the structure, discipline and academic standards of Catholic schools. Parochial schools in the United States are also responsible for educating students from a wide range of ethnic backgrounds, including many who are non-Catholic.

I think one of the unique aspects of Catholic school education is the opportunity to care for the material and intellectual needs of the child in a community atmosphere. By offering an education centered on values, the faculty in Catholic schools can create an interactive setting between parents and students that is geared toward long-term healthy character and scholastic development for all enrolled children.

Please join me and my colleagues as we celebrate the contributions of Catholic schools following National Catholic Schools Week.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 657, a resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools across America, including those in my congressional district of El Paso, Texas.

On September 21, 2005, with representatives of the school watching from the House gallery, I proudly rose to recognize the 80th anniversary of Cathedral High School in my district. Cathedral and other Catholic schools in El Paso and throughout our country offer a quality education and produce men and women committed to a broader idea of learning—one that extends beyond just textbooks.

Catholic schools offer—in more than one sense—a value-added approach to education. They instill in their students a moral compass, a sense of purpose, and a commitment to service. Indeed, many of the men and women who inspired me to spend my life in public service were themselves encouraged to enter that field by the virtues conveyed through Catholic education. I count among that group Ambassador Raymond Telles, the first Hispanic mayor of El Paso, an American ambassador, an advisor to presidents, and a man whose success in life was built in large part upon the ideals he learned at Cathedral High School.

Today, Catholic schools teach 2.5 million young Americans, almost 15 percent of whom are not Catholics. This resolution reaffirms the House of Representatives' support for the countless Catholic school teachers and administrators who dedicate their lives to a particular vision of education, and for the values of love, charity, and hope that are tenets of a Catholic education.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support H. Res. 657 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this important resolution.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 657. This resolution honors the contributions that Catholic schools make to our communities and, in par-

ticular, recognizes the annual Catholic Schools Week, celebrated from January 29–February 4 this year. I thank Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota for introducing H. Res. 657, for recognizing Catholic Schools Week, and for his ongoing support for Catholic schools nationwide.

Catholic Schools Week is an event co-sponsored by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Honored during the Week are Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education. The Catholic schools community has a significant role in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for our communities, our country and, most of all, for our children.

Guam's association with the Roman Catholic Church dates back to Ferdinand Magellan's arrival on our island in 1521. Guam became an important port-of-call along trade routes through the Pacific sailed by Spanish Galleons. Padre Diego Luis de San Vitores, a Spanish Jesuit missionary, arrived in Guam in 1662 during his journey from Mexico to the Philippines. Padre San Vitores vowed to return to Guam upon leaving the island.

Three years later, through his close ties to the royal court, he persuaded King Philip IV of Spain and Queen Maria Ana of Austria to order the establishment of a Catholic mission in Guam. Padre San Vitores established a mission in the village of Agaña which later became the site of the island's first Catholic Church. It is now the seat of the Metropolitan Archdiocese of Agaña, canonically erected in 1911, elevated to a Diocese in 1965—300 years after Padre Diego Luis de San Vitores kept his promise to return to the island. The Diocese was further elevated in 1984 to a Metropolitan Diocese. Today it enjoys a congregation of 101,000 strong throughout Oceania.

The Roman Catholic faith grew strong on Guam over the years. This strength is represented in the quality of Catholic school education on the island. Our island has four nursery schools, six elementary and middle schools, and three high schools that teach the Catholic faith in addition to academic curriculum.

The Catholic school tradition on Guam began with Bishop Appollinaris Baumgartner. He recognized our island's need for quality education inspired by the Catholic faith. In 1946, he invited the Three Sisters of Mercy from North Carolina to Guam. They established The Academy of Our Lady, the first all girls' Catholic high school on Guam. This school remains in operation today. Also, Bishop Baumgartner invited the School Sisters of Notre Dame of La Crosse, Wisconsin to come to Guam in 1949. Soon after arriving on the island the Sisters founded Notre Dame High School, a Catholic co-educational high school. Notre Dame High School also remains operational today. Father Duenas Memorial High School is the third Catholic high school on Guam. Its namesake, Father Jesus Baza Dueñas, was executed on July 11, 1944, by the Japanese forces occupying Guam. Father Dueñas, a resistance figure on the island, was executed along with his nephew because he would not betray the location of an American sailor hiding on the island. Father Dueñas Memorial High School continues his legacy of courage and integrity. All three schools offer rigorous curricula to prepare students for col-

lege while instilling strong moral values and an understanding of the Catholic faith.

Bishop Baumgartner initiated a strong tradition of Catholic elementary and middle school education on Guam, as well as providing advanced theological study opportunities for the island's faithful in minor seminary.

Bishop Baumgartner's legacy of shaping the character of Guam's faithful by promoting Catholic education opportunities on the island was continued by Archbishop Felixberto Camacho Flores, Guam's first Chamorro Bishop, when he became Titular Bishop of Stonj in 1970. The number of Catholic schools on Guam increased under his leadership. He expanded their programs and improved school facilities.

Today, the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Agaña remains committed to serving the people of Guam. Under the direction of the Most Reverend Anthony Sablan Apuron, OFM Cap, DD, Metropolitan Archbishop of Agaña, Catholic educational institutions on Guam provide quality academic instruction to students. The contributions of the Catholic school system to the people of Guam are reflected in our local leaders in the clergy, government, and private-sector who are alumni of the Catholic schools. The dedication shown by the Archdiocese of Agaña to the quality of Catholic school education on our island strongly reflects the theme for Catholic Schools Week: Character. Compassion. Values.

Guam has a long history of Catholicism and enjoys a strong tradition of educational institutions grounded in the teachings of the Catholic Church. I recognize and commend the Catholic schools in Guam for their commitment to instilling the principles of academic rigor, sound moral values, and respect and understanding for the Catholic faith in our children's daily lives. In honor of Catholic Schools Week, I want to recognize dedication and achievements made by the students, parents, teachers and administrators of Catholic schools in Guam and across the Nation. Their contributions to our society, both inside and outside of the classroom are significant. It is my hope that the tradition of Catholic schools education on Guam and around the United States will remain strong for generations to come.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring the important role that Catholic schools play in educating the children of America, including in my hometown of St. Louis. Catholic schools not only teach our kids how to think, but also teach them how to live.

Catholic schools have always been known for their high academic standards and excellent teachers, but I would like to draw your attention to their ability to provide more than just an excellent academic education. The Catholic schools in my district are a perfect example of this—providing children from a young age with a moral foundation which leads them to serve their community through out their lives.

It was strong religious and moral beliefs that drove our Nation's Founders to develop a country where individual freedom is coupled with individual responsibility. Catholic schools across our great Nation continue to produce students who understand their responsibility and act accordingly. The values imparted and the strong faith that Catholic schools develop in their students produces citizens who understand the importance of service and diligently work for the good of our country.

I am honored to represent a district where numerous Catholic schools provide a rigorous academic education and a moral compass to guide students through their lives. Catholic schools in Missouri's Second Congressional District and throughout the St. Louis region produce well-rounded and morally grounded members of our community. The teachers, administrators, parents, and students of Catholic schools deserve this recognition for the tremendously positive impact they have on our Nation. These schools will continue to play a significant role in developing responsible American citizens for our future generations.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 657, a resolution honoring the contributions made by Catholic schools nationwide. These schools provide students with an education that instills a lifelong development of moral, intellectual, and social values in America's young people.

Our Nation's Catholic schools provide excellent opportunities for learning. Today, nearly 50 percent of students enrolled in U.S. private schools attend Catholic schools. In Connecticut, over 39,000 students are enrolled at 148 Catholic schools throughout the State. Catholic schools provide educational opportunities to a broad cross-section of our society. With over 7,000 schools and current matriculating classes of greater than 2.5 million students, it is estimated that about 27 percent of students enrolled are minorities. Catholic schools also encourage greater levels of student-teacher interaction through their small class-size ratio. The 160,000 faculty that teach at these schools provide students with both an intellectually stimulating and values-based education.

As a former student of St. Rose's School in East Hartford, Connecticut, I would like to praise the outstanding efforts of the Sisters of Notre Dame for providing students with strong academic and moral values. The Catholic education I received at St. Rose's School has guided me throughout my career in public service. At St. Rose, I was taught the valuable lessons of good works toward others and society's special obligation to consider first the needs of the poor. The Catholic teachings have given me a valuable framework for life, and have enabled me to achieve personal and professional goals.

Again, I am proud to support H. Res. 657. As we celebrate Catholic Schools Week, we must honor the role these schools play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for this Nation. I am proud that these schools continue to nurture students dedicated to their faith, to their values, to their communities and to their families. These schools develop the leaders of tomorrow with effective leadership and character.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of H. Res. 657, a resolution to honor the contributions of Catholic schools and recognize Catholic Schools Week. I want to thank my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee as well as the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. KENNEDY, for their work.

Like many of my colleagues, I too am a product of Catholic schools. My upbringing is a testament to the quality education and dedicated efforts of Catholic educators to produce students, whether they are Catholic or not, dedicated to improving themselves, their community, and our Nation.

At Cathedral Carmel School in Lafayette, Louisiana, I developed a lifelong love of learning and reading. Through college and medical school, the lessons I learned in high school helped me to work through classes and assignments. Even throughout my professional career as a heart surgeon and now in Congress, I find myself relying on the personal development and classroom lessons from high school.

The Seventh District of Louisiana contains a strong Catholic school system; and I have met with many students, parents, and educators who believe these schools are helping to create students and young adults who will stay in Louisiana and become productive members of our community.

As we recover from the devastating effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, Louisiana Catholic schools have played an integral role in our relief and recovery, taking in thousands of displaced students. Keeping our students in Louisiana is a big part of restoring our state's economy. These young adults provide entrepreneurship, creativity, workforce, and ingenuity to build businesses and create jobs.

Again, I congratulate the Catholic schools of our great Nation and look forward to continuing to support them in my community and in Congress.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy said in his Inaugural Address: "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth, God's work must truly be our own." I rise today to thank our Catholic schools for doing God's work here on earth for generation after generation.

More than 163,000 educators teach in nearly 8,000 Catholic schools in America, and they educate nearly 2.5 million students every year. My husband and I and our five children have attended over 100 years of Catholic school education. Needless to say, we support our Nation's Catholic educational system.

I can tell you firsthand that Catholic schools provide exceptional education. They contribute to a student's intellectual, ethical and spiritual development. As a devout Roman Catholic and the product of Catholic schools, I rely every day on the values and the sense of responsibility that were deepened for me by my Catholic education.

The theme of this year's Catholic Schools Week is "Character. Compassion. Values." Education is about more than reading, writing, and arithmetic, although it's certainly about that. But it is also about teaching each child to live and work with integrity and in a way that serves others.

My Catholic education helped me appreciate that we all contain a spark of divinity, to recognize that spark of divinity in every person, and to respond to that spark with humility and awe, even when it's found in "the least of these."

Catholic schools teach their students that our personal faith means public obligation. Simply put, faith means we have work to do. My Catholic education taught me that to minister to the needs of God's creation is an act of worship. To ignore those needs is to dishonor the God who made us. That lesson should inform every debate we have here in Congress, whether it is education, health care, job creation, or the budget, which should be a statement of our national values.

Our Catholic schools truly do God's work here on earth, and they deserve our Nation's gratitude. I join my colleagues in thanking all of the teachers, parents, and students of Catholic schools who bring our Nation closer to the "beloved community" it was meant to be.

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the Catholic schools of Pittsburgh. Catholic schools around the country will celebrate National Catholic School's Week from January 29 until February 4, 2006.

National Catholic School's Week is a week to promote Catholic schools. Every year there is a theme for the week, and schools hold special events for the students and their families. This year about 8,200 schools nationally will be participating in and celebrating the theme, "Catholic Schools: Character, Compassion, Values."

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in honoring National Catholic School's Week. It is an honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and a pleasure to salute the Catholic schools of Pittsburgh.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for H. Res. 657, a resolution recognizing the valuable contribution of Catholic Schools.

Last week marked the 32nd annual Catholic Schools Week, a week dedicated to honor the achievements and successes of Catholic Schools throughout the U.S. More than 2.4 million children are enrolled in the 7,799 Catholic schools in our country. In addition, 720,000 students are enrolled in the 212 Catholic Colleges and Universities nationwide.

In my home State of New Jersey, 129,232 students are enrolled in Catholic Schools. In fact, New Jersey has the sixth largest enrollment of students in Catholic Schools out of all 50 States.

Of course, children do not form their core values on the sole basis of what schools teach them. Learning a respect for life and respect for the rights of others is not the purview of schools alone; it begins and is nurtured in the home. Accordingly, the Catholic school curriculum recognizes parents and family as primary educators and seeks to foster a shared vision between the school and family. As the father of four children who have attended Catholic schools, I know that Catholic school educators strive to work hand-in-hand reinforcing family values, ethical behavior, social responsibility, and academic achievement.

Placing a premium on both academic standards and moral responsibility has proven to be a successful formula for Catholic Schools. Catholic Secondary Schools have a 99 percent graduation rate and moreover, 97 percent of graduates continue their education.

Learning in a religious setting is not for everyone and America's public school system is critical to providing educational opportunities for all. We must continue to vigorously support our public schools at both the federal and local levels. At the same time, however, we should support those who seek the benefits of Catholic school and choose a religious setting as the best educational environment for their children. The contribution of Catholic schools to our Nation extends beyond the classroom. Catholic elementary and secondary schools save the government and taxpayers of the U.S. up to \$20 billion a year.

In effect, parents of Catholic school children pay twice—they pay their fair share of taxes necessary to support the public school system and they pay tuition at the school their children attend. In order to address this issue, I have introduced H.R. 441, the Education, Achievement and Opportunity Act. This bill provides refundable tax credits for the educational expenses incurred by parents for elementary and secondary school. Most significantly, the tax credit is used for private school tuition, however, it can also be used for other educational needs such as computers, tutoring or transportation fees. Thus, parents sending their children to public school can also benefit from this legislation.

A Catholic education challenges students through a combination of high standards, strong motivation, effective discipline and an emphasis on personal responsibility. It is an education that goes beyond preparation for a secular life; it is an education that prepares students for a Christian life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members lend their support to H. Res. 657, and pass it unanimously.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 657, legislation that supports the goals of Catholic Schools Week, and acknowledges the crucial role that Catholic schools play in serving and strengthening our communities.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution. Catholic schools have an impact far beyond the confines of the classroom. Values such as devotion to faith, family, community, and character development, are the foundations of Catholic education. These values promote a respect for the dignity of individuals, and encourage outstanding civic participation.

Catholic schools are also scholastic standard bearers. With a student-to-teacher ratio of 15 to 1, they are committed to smaller class sizes. Smaller classes correlate with more accomplished students which in turn leads to the global competitiveness of American students in the 21st century.

In the 12th District of New Jersey, Catholic schools continue to work to serve communities. Corpus Christi School, a Catholic elementary school in the town of South River, at one time struggled to keep its doors open. However, through the efforts of concerned parents, alumni, and prodigious fundraising, the school was able to remain open. Corpus Christi now provides assistance to the whole community, offering a pre-kindergarten program for 3- and 4-year-old children. During Catholic Schools Week, Corpus Christi will be offering reduced tuition rates. Other schools in the 12th district will be celebrating Catholic Schools Week, including the Immaculate Conception in Spotswood, which will be using its activities to raise money for St. Jude's Hospital for Children.

These schools, and Catholic schools in general, advance ideals that we all hold dear. They enrich our communities, and I am proud to join with my colleagues in supporting this resolution.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 657 to honor the contributions of Catholic schools. Catholic schools provide students with a wonderful education and, in many cases, a quality alternative to overburdened public schools.

I am grateful for the work of the 39 Catholic schools which serve 10,395 students from di-

verse backgrounds, run by the Diocese of Bridgeport. These schools offer elementary and secondary education, as well as after-school programs. They provide a wonderful environment for learning and a strong sense of faith and discipline.

I commend the teachers, administrators, students and parents for their role in Catholic education, and the key role they play in creating a brighter, better-educated nation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 657.

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. CASTLE. 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 question will be postponed.

HONORING SACRIFICE AND COURAGE OF WEST VIRGINIA COAL MINERS

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 331) honoring the sacrifice and courage of the 12 coal miners killed and the stamina and courage of the one who survived the mine disaster in Sago, West Virginia, and the sacrifice and courage of the two coal miners killed in the Aracoma Alma mine disaster, and recognizing the rescue crews for their outstanding efforts in the aftermath of the tragedies, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 331

Whereas coal generates more than half of domestic electricity, providing millions of Americans with energy for their homes and businesses;

Whereas West Virginia is the Nation's second largest coal producing State;

Whereas an average of 7,600 pounds of coal per person per year is used in the United States;

Whereas the United States has an estimated 275,000,000,000 tons of recoverable coal reserves representing about 95 percent of all fossil fuel reserves in the Nation;

Whereas coal continues to be the economic engine for many communities;

Whereas coal miners are among the most productive of all American workers, producing 7 tons of coal per miner per day, which results in coal consistently being the most cost-effective choice for generating electricity in the United States;

Whereas during the last century over 100,000 coal miners have been killed in mining accidents in the Nation's coal mines;

Whereas the Nation is greatly indebted to coal miners for the difficult and dangerous work they perform to provide the fuel needed

to operate the Nation's industries and to provide energy to homes and businesses;

Whereas 13 West Virginia miners were trapped 260 feet below the surface in the Sago mine for over 40 hours following an explosion on January 2, 2006;

Whereas Federal, State, and local rescue crews worked relentlessly in an attempt to save the miners;

Whereas many residents of Upshur County, West Virginia, and the surrounding areas came together at the Sago Baptist Church to support the miners' families;

Whereas 12 miners, Thomas Anderson, Alva Martin Bennett, Jim Bennett, Jerry Groves, George Hamner Jr., Terry Helms, David Lewis, Martin Toler, Fred Ware Jr., Jack Weaver, Jesse Jones, and Marshall Winans, lost their lives on January 3, 2006;

Whereas only one miner, Randal McCloy, was safely rescued;

Whereas 2 West Virginia miners were trapped by a fire in the Aracoma Alma Mine on January 19, 2006;

Whereas Don Israel Bragg and Ellery "Elvis" Hatfield lost their lives in the Aracoma Alma Mine;

Whereas 2 West Virginia miners lost their lives in separate incidents in Boone County on February 1, 2006; and

Whereas Edmund Vance perished in the Long Branch No. 18 Mine and Paul Moss perished at the Elk Run Black Castle mine: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes Thomas Anderson, Alva Martin Bennett, Jim Bennett, Jerry Groves, George Hamner Jr., Terry Helms, David Lewis, Martin Toler, Fred Ware Jr., Jack Weaver, Jesse Jones, and Marshall Winans for their sacrifice in the Sago, West Virginia, coal mine;

(2) recognizes Don Israel Bragg and Ellery "Elvis" Hatfield for their sacrifice in the Aracoma Alma, West Virginia coal mine;

(3) recognizes Edmund Vance and Paul Moss for their sacrifice in the Boone County, West Virginia, coal mines;

(4) extends the deepest condolences of the Nation to the families of these men;

(5) recognizes Randal McCloy for his stamina and courage that enabled him to survive in severe conditions for over 40 hours;

(6) recognizes the rescue crews for their outstanding effort resulting in the safe rescue of Randal McCloy; and

(7) recognizes the many volunteers who provided support for the miners' families during the rescue operations.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 331.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 331 to honor the now 16

West Virginia miners who have lost their lives in coal-mining accidents this year.

I want to thank the Nation, I want to thank the Nation for their outpouring of concerns, prayers, and sympathy. You have fortified us as West Virginians.

On the morning of January 2, an explosion rocked the Sago Mine in Upshur County, West Virginia. Thirteen men were trapped 260 feet below the surface. One, Randal McCloy, suffered serious injuries resulting from a lack of oxygen, yet he miraculously survived. Twelve other miners, Tom Anderson, Alva M. Bennett, James Bennett, Jerry Groves, Junior Hamner, Terry Helms, Jesse Jones, Dave Lewis, Martin Toler, Fred Ware, Jackie Weaver, and Marshall Winans were killed in that tragedy.

Only 2 weeks later, another accident struck at the Aracoma Alma Mine in Logan County, West Virginia, taking the lives of Don Israel Bragg and Elvis Hatfield. Sadly, just last week, Edmund Vance and Paul Moss were killed in separate mining accidents in Boone County, West Virginia.

These men made the ultimate sacrifice doing a job that is vital to our Nation. Over 50 percent of America's electricity comes from coal, and our West Virginia veins run with an abundance of coal. Mining is the profession most closely identified with West Virginia, not only because of our State's abundant supply of the resource, but because of the character of our people. Coal is in our blood; whether we work in the mines or not, our heritage and our souls are coal-fired. West Virginians are proud and hard-working people with a deep devotion to our country.

Martin Toler, one of the Sago miners wrote to his family while he lay dying in the mine, and I quote, "It wasn't bad. I just went to sleep. Tell all I see them on the other side. I love you." Simple, powerful words with great meaning. The valor of these miners is, in fact was, with them until the end.

The 16 miners who died over the past 5 weeks in our State mines knew the dangers of their work. They knew that over the past century over 100,000 men have lost their lives in coal mining, but they performed their jobs with reliability and a sense of duty to their families, indeed our country. Miners know just how important their jobs are. They know how important it is to our economy across the Nation, and they sacrifice for us.

Author Homer Hickam of Rocket Boys fame, who himself grew up the son of a West Virginia coal miner, wrote and delivered what I thought was an incredible eulogy to the Sago miners. He listed a philosophy of life that exemplifies coal miners and, I think, all West Virginians:

We are proud of who we are.
We stand up for what we believe.
We keep our families together.
We trust in God.

We do what needs to be done.
We are not afraid.

Most of the time we are not thinking of coal miners when we turn on the lights or sit down to watch television. It is easy to take for granted the constant supply of relatively inexpensive electricity we have in this country. It is easy to forget that somebody gave of themselves and risked injury or death to mine the coal that powers the Nation's economy.

Today in the wake of the terrible tragedy at Sago and the death of the miners at the Aracoma Alma and Boone County mines, we as a Congress pause to remember the coal miners. We remember their hard work and sacrifice. We remember that each one of these men was a husband, a grandfather, a father, a brother and a son, and we pray for each of their families as they cope with the loss of a loved one. And we pray for Randal McCloy, who, despite improvements, faces a long road to recovery from his injuries.

This resolution also stands to honor the mine rescue teams who were willing to sacrifice themselves to save others. Rescuers of Sago were eager to enter even before it was safe to do so. Once in the mine, these rescuers demonstrated tremendous courage. And without their work, it is doubtful that Randal McCloy would be with us today.

West Virginia's communities came together during these tragedies, as they always do, to support their friends and neighbors. You see, in West Virginia, we are all family with a special closeness and respect for one another.

During this time I sat and talked with the families at the Sago Baptist Church as we awaited news from their rescuers. The prayers and support of people from across the Upshur County area and the Nation was overwhelming at the church, and this resolution honors the commitment and friendship shown by these folks.

I know that this commitment of community and family not only occurred in Sago, about also in Logan and Boone Counties because, as I said, in West Virginia, we are family.

Through our sorrow, we recognize our duty to do our part to improve safety for our miners. Sixteen West Virginians have been lost this year. While this resolution honors their loss, their legacy must be safe mines. It is important that Congress, State governments, MSHA, mine operators, and miners themselves work in a concerted effort to improve mine health and safety.

The West Virginia delegation has introduced on a bipartisan basis the Federal Mine Safety Act of 2006. I hope my colleagues will support this effort to bring enhanced technology to the mines, improve rescue teams, and ultimately save lives.

We all recognize the dangers of the mining profession, but we must do everything in our power to make underground mining safe. I have seen the pain and suffering in West Virginia at Sago, Logan, and at Boone County, and

I do not want to see that suffering again. We must act to prevent similar accidents.

May God bless the lost West Virginia coal miners and their families and friends.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time, and thank him for his leadership and expertise in helping us on mine safety legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise and associate myself totally with the comments just made by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), and I commend her for the very eloquent manner and touching manner in which those comments were made.

It is with sorrow that we rise today to express the heaviness in West Virginians' hearts. Grief hangs a misty veil across our mountains. Since just the beginning of this year, West Virginia has lost 16 brave coal miners in a nightmarish series of mine tragedies. Sixteen sons gone in the span of a month, 16 souls that too soon slipped the bonds of Earth. These were good and decent men, God-fearing men, brave citizens, caring fathers, loving husbands, loyal friends, and generous neighbors who worked hard to earn an honest wage. They walked in the wake of risk to provide for their families.

□ 1615

These were tough men, made strong not merely by the labor of digging coal, but also by the work of building a Nation.

Coal has long been the lifeblood of America's industrial engine. It has fueled our economic growth. It has reinforced our military might.

But none of this would be possible without the labor of coal miners, who have served our Nation quietly and faithfully for generations, but with precious little thanks. To these men, we owe so much.

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of gratitude, I join with my West Virginia colleagues in offering this resolution and, again, commend the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for bringing it to the floor. Today we celebrate the courage and stamina of Randal McCloy whose miraculous survival in the Sago mines was a glorious gift. We thank the teams of rescuers who in recent weeks have risked their own lives to save the lives of others in our coal fields. And we honor the memories of these 16 men: Thomas Anderson, Alva Martin Bennett, Jim Bennett, Jerry Groves, George Hamner, Jr., Terry Helms, David Lewis, Martin Toler, Fred Ware, Jr., Jack Weaver, Jesse Jones, Marshall Winans, the two from my congressional district, Don Israel Bragg, Ellery "Elvis" Hatfield, whose families I sat with for close to 40 hours in the Melville Freewill Baptist Church as we sang, as we prayed together for a miracle that never happened.

And to the latest two, also from my congressional district, Edmund Vance and Paul Moss. We honor their memories. These brave men have now joined the ranks of so many miners before them who went to their daily shift anticipating the warm and loving hugs of family at day's end, but who emerged instead into the outstretched arms of heaven. May God bless them, their families and their brothers and sisters, still in the mines, who continue to walk in the wake of risk in service to our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I rise today to express the heaviness of West Virginia's heart.

Grief hangs a misty veil across our mountains.

Since just the beginning of this year, West Virginia has lost 16 coal miners in a nightmarish series of mine tragedies; 16 sons gone in the span of a month; 16 souls that too soon slipped the bonds of Earth.

These were good and decent men—God-fearing men, brave citizens, caring fathers, loving husbands, loyal friends, generous neighbors—who worked hard to earn an honest wage.

They walked in the wake of risk to provide for their families. These were tough men made strong not merely by the labor of digging coal, but also by the work of building a nation.

Coal has long been the lifeblood of America's industrial engine. It has fueled our economic growth. It has reinforced our military might.

But none of this would be possible without the labor of coal miners who have served our Nation quietly and faithfully for generations, but with precious little thanks. To these men we owe so much.

Mr. Speaker, in that spirit of gratitude, I join with my West Virginia colleagues in offering this resolution.

Together we celebrate the courage and stamina of Randal McCloy, whose miraculous survival in the Sago mines was a glorious gift. We thank the teams of rescuers who, in recent weeks, have risked their own lives to save the lives of others in our coalfields.

And we honor the memories of these 16 men: Thomas Anderson, Alva Martin Bennett, Jim Bennett, Jerry Groves, George Hamner, Jr., Terry Helms, David Lewis, Martin Toler, Fred Ware, Jr., Jack Weaver, Jesse Jones, Marshall Winans, Don Israel Bragg, Ellery "Elvis" Hatfield, Edmund Vance, and Paul Moss.

These brave men have now joined the ranks of so many miners before them, who went to their daily shift, anticipating the warm and loving hugs of family at day's end, but who emerged, instead, into the outstretched arms of Heaven.

May God bless them, their families, and their brothers and sisters still in the mines who continue to walk in the wake of risk in service to our Nation.

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

This year, 21 miners have lost their lives in mining accidents. Our thoughts and prayers are with their families. Today, we honor the 16 men who have died in West Virginia's coal mines and the lone survivor of the Sago mine accident. We also recognize members of

the mine rescue teams who put their own lives on the line to try to save their fellow miners.

On January 2, 2006, the Nation watched, waited, hoped and prayed that 13 men trapped in the Sago mine would return to the surface alive. Then the Nation was stunned when we learned that 12 men had died. Only one survivor, Randal McCloy, returned to the surface alive. Two more miners were lost at the Alma mine, despite the courageous efforts of the mine rescue teams. And just last week, two more miners died in Boone County.

The first 6 weeks of 2006 have seen an unprecedented loss of life in West Virginia's recent mining history. Working with the State of West Virginia, the Mine Safety and Health Administration has begun investigations into these accidents. The agency also has announced an internal review to ensure that all the regulations and procedures under the Mine Safety and Health Act were followed.

In response to concern about MSHA's Freedom of Information Act policy, Chairmen BOEHNER and NORWOOD and Representative CAPITO wrote to Secretary of Labor Chao to secure changes that would provide for greater disclosure of important information. Prior to this action, inspectors' notes and other information related to MSHA citations would not have been disclosed until a case exhausted all appeals. This important change will allow miners and their families better and quicker access to information regarding citations and inspectors' notes.

Only a thorough investigation will pinpoint the cause of these tragic events. Congress must ensure the investigation proceeds as efficiently as possible, and then consider any proposed changes to our Federal mine safety laws and regulations that will help ensure that tragedies of this kind do not happen again in the future.

Mr. Speaker, along with the rest of the Nation, we extend our condolences to the impacted families in West Virginia.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is one that demands our attention, and I hope it is attention in more than just a ceremonial memorial way. It demands our attention for future action.

This resolution pays tribute to 17 courageous and hardworking West Virginia miners and their families, as well as the many rescue team members mobilized to save them in the face of last month's lethal accident at Sago mine, a subsequent fire at the Aracoma Alma mine, and 2 other mine incidents. Despite intense rescue efforts, 12 brave

miners were killed at Sago, as we all know. We honor them with this resolution, and we grieve with their families, friends, and neighbors who will miss them terribly. We also honor the sole survivor of those miners trapped by the Sago explosion, commending his courage and perseverance. We wish him and his extended family all the best throughout the long and arduous recovery process that he faces.

We also honor the 2 miners killed in the Aracoma Alma fire and 2 other killed in separate incidents in WV coal mines. All of the miners I just spoke of, and you heard their names read earlier, are referenced by name in this resolution. It is our hope that the family members and descendants of these hardworking men will find this resolution and our statements in their honor a source of solace as well as inspiration for many years to come. For we intend that their names and personal histories will be immortalized, so to speak, inscribed within a public law that Americans may read and refer to from this year forward.

But Members of Congress are not poets by nature, nor should we be. In addition to enacting this commemorative resolution, we must do far more to honor these West Virginia mine workers. We must take critical and immediate steps to ensure that all of the other mine workers from West Virginia and throughout the Nation get the safe workplace environments they need and deserve.

One speaker has already pointed out that a large percentage, about half of the electricity produced in America, is produced by coal. Throughout the world, coal is a major fuel producing electricity. Huge mines in Russia and China, and elsewhere, in many of these places their mines are perhaps often not as safe as ours. But there are some places obviously with mines that are safe, safer than ours. There are obviously technologies available which will avoid the kind of catastrophe we experienced here or at least minimize that kind of catastrophe.

I hope that all of us have read about the accident in the Pot Ash mine in Canada where a number of workers were trapped in an explosion and they all got out safely. It was pointed out that while they were waiting to be rescued, there were some cubicles or little cubby holes that they were able to go into and there they found extra oxygen, they found sandwiches and food and a number of things were stored there. And it had all been prepared ahead of time in case an accident should happen.

I doubt if the bottom lines of the profits for the coal mines were greatly affected by preparing those kinds of emergency arrangements. I think that we ought to take a hard look at the fact that there is technology available, there are techniques available to save miners' lives. There are places in the world where mine safety is made a priority. But nobody should be ahead of

America. No worker should be treated better than our workers in the effort to provide safety.

Congressional committees must conduct the requisite oversight hearings to determine whether Federal funding shortfalls or staffing shortfalls or rule-making snafus at the Mine Safety and Health Administration, MSHA, played any role in the two WV mine tragedies. And if that is the case, then we must fix any such problems without delay. For such subsequent congressional action will serve equally as a fitting and altogether appropriate tribute to the West Virginia men and their families, as well as rescue team members we honor today.

Thus, I urge my colleagues both to pass this resolution and to undertake all other congressional actions, from oversight to authorizing and appropriations legislation, essential to protecting America's hardworking miners and their families.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is one that demands our attention. It pays tribute to 17 courageous and hard-working West Virginia miners and their families, as well as to the many rescue team members mobilized to save them in the face of last month's lethal explosion at Sago Mine, the subsequent fire at the Aracoma Alma Mine and two incidents at other WV mines. Despite intense rescue efforts, twelve brave miners were killed in the Sago disaster, Thomas Anderson, Alva Martin Bennett, Jim Bennett, Jerry Groves, George Hamner Jr., Terry Helms, David Lewis, Martin Toler, Fred Ware, Jr., Jack Weaver, Jesse Jones, and Marshall Winans, and two brave miners at Aracoma Alma, Don Israel Bragg and Ellery "Elvis" Hatfield. Also, two other miners, Edmund Vance and Paul Moss, were killed at other WV mines. We honor them with this resolution and grieve with their families, friends and neighbors who will miss them terribly. We also honor the sole survivor of those miners trapped by the Sago explosion—Randal McCloy—commending his courage and perseverance. We wish Mr. McCloy and his extended family all the best throughout the long and arduous recovery process he faces.

All the miners I just spoke of are referenced by name in this resolution, which I am very pleased to cosponsor. It is our hope that family members and descendants of these hardworking men will find this resolution and our statements in their honor a source of solace as well as inspiration for many years to come. For we intend that their names and personal histories will be immortalized so to speak, inscribed within a public law that Americans may read and refer to, from this year forward.

But Members of Congress are not poets by nature, nor should we be. In addition to enacting this commemorative resolution, we must do far more to honor these West Virginian mineworkers. We must take critical and immediate steps to ensure that all the other mineworkers, from West Virginia and throughout the nation, get the safe workplace environments they need and deserve. We must ensure that the appropriate Congressional committees conduct the requisite oversight hearings to determine whether federal funding shortfalls, staffing shortages, or rulemaking snafus at the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) played any role in the Sago,

Aracoma Alma, and other mine tragedies. And if that is the case, then we must fix any such problems without delay. For such subsequent Congressional action will serve equally as a fitting and altogether appropriate tribute to the West Virginia men and their families, as well as rescue team members we honor today. Thus, I urge my colleagues both to pass this resolution and to undertake all other Congressional actions—from oversight to authorizing and appropriations legislation—essential to protecting America's hardworking miners and their families.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to solemnly support House Concurrent Resolution 331 that mourns the loss of so many coal miners from the Sago and Alma mine disasters and, quite frankly, it is a time for us to remember so many other coal mining disasters. The victims as well as the rescue crews who fought bravely to get them to safety ought to be recognized in the aftermath of this tragedy. But now our deepest sympathies are with the families and friends whose lives have passed.

I feel a special affinity to these miners, my own great-grandfather having been a coal miner in Pennsylvania, and while I was a student at Wheeling Jesuit University in Wheeling, I spent so much time working in towns and volunteer work in mining towns in West Virginia, among them being Mann, West Virginia where the great Buffalo Creek flood disaster hit when a dam from a coal mine collapsed and wiped out so many people in that town.

It is a rough life for coal miners and coal mining towns, for the families, the wives and loved ones who sit and wait each time the elevator goes down into the shaft. The struggles and the hard scrabble life is so often immortalized in songs and folk songs over the years. And they are true, indeed, for the life is difficult for men and women who work in the mines and recognize the dangers and the constant safety that the mine operators must attend to.

It is also time to recognize that there are teams of people out there who did so much and responded so quickly, in particular Consol Energy, which had all five of their West Virginia teams and three Pennsylvania teams first on the site to try and help. We wished and we prayed so much that this would not have ended as it did. Instead, we had hoped that perhaps it would have been what happened at Cue Creek mine disaster of a couple of years ago in Pennsylvania when we all waited and watched with our eyes glued to our televisions as nine miners emerged from the mine late at night.

We wished for that. We prayed for that. Sadly that did not happen. And sadly, there may be other disasters of this type, but we must work hard to set the goal that it never happens again. We know that coal is a vital part of American energy. We know that coal

and all the things that come out of manufacturing related to coal are a vital part of our country's economy. And the men and women who continue to work in the mines down below or on the surface are all part of that dedication and their willingness through their courage to give so much every day.

And then finally, perhaps, what we have to make sure we do, as the gentleman from West Virginia was saying, is work very hard with rescue teams and strong safety regulations for mines and enforcement of those regulations to prevent these tragedies from happening again. It is only through such actions that we would fittingly remember those who have come before us and died, and those who may come in the future and be suffering as well. That is the very least we owe their families. And as we honor those who have lost, we need to work towards that safety for those miners and their families for the future.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I am honored to join in support of this resolution offered by our colleagues from West Virginia and to join our colleagues in paying tribute to these 16 brave miners who lost their lives last month in West Virginia, and also to the miner who lost his life in Pike County, Kentucky, who died during the mine roof collapse, and to express the condolences to their families and to their friends who have lost loved ones.

We continue to hope and pray for the full recovery of Randal McCloy who lived through this ordeal at the Sago mine disaster, and wish him well. I join, I am sure, our entire Nation in recognizing the sacrifice of these individuals. And I want to salute the efforts of dozens of brave rescue workers who volunteered to risk their own lives to save others and the efforts of citizens of the affected communities who continue to help and to support the families of victims and to deal with their loss.

□ 1630

Despite a half century of improvements in mine safety, the truth still remains that underground mining continues to be one of our country's most dangerous occupations. It is also an occupation that we recognize many people would have a very difficult decision to make to join this occupation. It is one of the reasons we talk about the bravery, the courage, and the sacrifice of these workers and those who entered the mines after the disaster to join them, because we recognize that many of us would not want to do this.

But we also understand that just a week ago the President was here telling us the importance that coal would make if we really want to achieve energy independence for this Nation for a whole host of reasons that are very

good for this Nation. Then we continue to need to have the sacrifice and the courage and the bravery of the mining community and of these communities to send their young men and women into the mines. But if it is about their bravery and their courage and their sacrifice, then our obligation is to meet their bravery with the duty of care.

There is no question that our progress in making mining a safer and healthier occupation than it has been in the past has been remarkable, but the Sago tragedy shows us that our job is not done. Death, injuries, and serious illnesses remain a very real part of those who go down into the mines and to their families and their communities and the brave men and women who help when the safeguards fail.

The men and women who need the solid incomes provided by mining jobs face difficult choices every morning before they go to work and see their loved ones at the door. I think the way that we truly honor their courage, their sacrifice, and their bravery, and these miners who have lost their lives and the volunteers who helped out and the grieving families and the communities, is to make the promise, as the gentlewoman from West Virginia said, that part of their legacy is safer mines and a safer occupation and a safer future for their children and their grandchildren and others who will go down into the mines. That means that we must meet our duty of care to these miners to make sure that we fully understand where the failures took place, where the improvements can be made, and where the risk is unacceptable.

Mr. RAHALL and his West Virginia colleagues have already introduced legislation that deserves immediate consideration to make certain improvements in standards and operations of the Mine Health and Safety Administration. I am delighted that they already received a partial response to that with the Agency engaging in emergency temporary standards to require coal operators to maintain additional self-contained, self-rescue devices in storage areas within underground coal mines, and to require coal operators to notify the Agency within 15 minutes of an accident. This is quite properly done on an urgent and emergency basis. I have urged the Education and the Workforce Committee to immediately commence oversight hearings to help us to determine the actions that would help strengthen the agency so that it can carry out the important responsibilities we have vested in it and what they owe the workers in the mines.

Next week, Monday, February 13, my colleagues and I are sponsoring a mine safety forum. We have invited the miners and their families and mine safety experts to share their views on how Congress and the Department of Labor can make mine safety enforcement more vigorous and effective.

It seems clear to me that there are serious questions regarding this admin-

istration's track record on mine safety that the employees and families of the Sago and Aracoma Alma mines have a right to know. I think we have to know the impact of the changes in the regulations and the regulations that were withdrawn in 2001 and the regulations that were implemented in their place. What was the margin of safety? Was there a change in that margin of safety, and did they have impact on the overall mine safety in the mine? We know that some of those regulations that were withdrawn at that time are now seen as urgently needed, as I just recited, from the response to the West Virginia delegation by the mining agency, safety standards for oxygen and breathing devices, standards for flame-resistant conveyor belts that Mr. RAHALL has raised, and that their withdrawal may have undermined the safety at Sago and Aracoma Alma mines.

We want to know what is the relationship between the drop in maximum fines and the usage of fines. Are fines helpful? Do they deter bad behavior? Do they, in fact, make for improvements to take place?

What is the relationship between the mines and those who are repeat offenders of serious violations of the current mine safety regulations and the protections that are put in place for those miners? Should they be dealt with in a different fashion? Do we fully understand the voluntary compliance assistance program that is currently in place? Should that continue to be extended to those mine owners that, again, repeatedly violate the law?

What is the relationship between the voluntary nature of the program and the compliance and the margins of safety that we expect for these miners?

Does the administration have the right people in the right place for the running of this Agency? Are their qualifications commensurate with the duties that they have to the miners in the field, and are we sure that we have the best people to continue the downward trend of mine fatalities in the mine, but also the general safety environment within the mines?

And we want to make sure that, in fact, the Department of Labor has kept pace with existing mine safety technologies, such as electronic tracking and communications devices and reserve oxygen chambers, technologies used in other countries, in some cases in other mines in this country, but clearly are not mandated. But we now see, as we start to do the forensics of what took place here, that maybe these things, had they been in place, these miners would have had the opportunity to walk out of that mine. These miners may have had a chance to shelter in place until rescuers could have gotten to them if they did not understand their ability to work their way around the danger that presented itself.

So these are the questions that the miners and their families will address in the forum. These are the questions that must be addressed by the adminis-

tration, and these are the questions that must be addressed by this Congress, and must be addressed by this Congress in an independent fashion.

I am not sure I entirely agree with my colleagues on the other side that we must await the administration's doing its own investigation and hearings prior to our embarking upon that effort. I think that we ought to ask these people to come before the Congress and to explain the situation that we see.

Again, this is about the legacy of these miners' lives. It is about the future of mining in this country. It is about our responsibility to these individuals, to their families, to these communities. Again, it has been made clear that coal is going to play an evermore important role in our energy future, so we must understand that these individuals were patriots in that effort to achieve energy independence in this country. And I would hope that we would understand that as we pay tribute to their courage, to their sacrifice, and to their bravery to go down in these mines, that we inherit on their behalf and on behalf of their families a duty of care to these individuals and a responsibility to make sure that we have done all that we can do, as the government, in assuring their safety and making sure that they are working under the best safe environment that is possible for them and their colleagues.

Again, I thank the members of the West Virginia delegation for bringing this resolution to the floor and urge the support of it by all of our colleagues in the House.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 331, "Honoring the sacrifice and courage of 12 coal miners killed and stamina and courage of one who survived the mine disaster in Sago, West Virginia and the sacrifice and courage of the two coal miners killed in the Aracoma Alma mine disaster and recognizing the rescue crews for their outstanding effort in the aftermath of tragedies."

I would first like to commend the West Virginia delegation including my good friend Mr. RAHALL, for introducing this resolution honoring those who lost their lives and the dedicated rescue crews who worked tirelessly during the crises. This resolution proposes recognition of our brave citizens who gave their lives for their work. West Virginia is the Nation's second largest coal producing State that generates more than half of domestic electricity and provide millions of Americans with energy for their homes and businesses. The United States has an estimated 275 billion tons of recoverable coal reserves representing about 95 percent of all fossil fuel reserves in the Nation, meaning that the average of 7,600 pounds of coal per person per year is used in the United States.

Moreover the coal miners are extremely productive American workers in the face of grueling conditions, producing 7 tons of coal per miner per day.

During the last century over 100,000 coal miners have been killed in mining accidents in the Nation's coal mines. The Nation is greatly indebted to coal miners for the difficult and

dangerous work they perform to provide one of the sources of fuel needed to operate the country's industries and to provide energy to homes and businesses.

There were 12 miners, Thomas Anderson, Alva Martin Bennett, Jim Bennett, Jerry Groves, George Hammer, Jr., Terry Helms, David Lewis, Martin Toler, Fred Ware, Jr., Jack Weaver, Jesse Jones, and Marshall Winans, that lost their lives on January 3, 2006, but fortunately one miner was rescued, Randal McCloy. I also recognize the 2 miners that lost their lives early this year in a fire in Aracoma Alma Mine on January 19, 2006. These men were Don Israel Bragg and Ellery "Elvis" Hatfield.

It is a burden on all of our hearts when hard working citizens of this country perish, especially while on the job. My prayers go out to the friends and families of those who have lost their lives.

I support H. Con. Res 331 and I urge my colleagues to follow suit. I thank you for your consideration and yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last month, America witnessed the tragedy of the Sago and Aracoma Alma mine deaths. We saw terrible things happen to good people, and the Nation was saddened by the events that unfolded.

I join with my colleagues in honoring these hard-working Americans who died or were injured while laboring to support their families. We also recognize the individuals who worked so hard to save them.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the friends, family, and neighbors of each of the miners affected.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 331, a resolution honoring the 16 extraordinary miners who lost their lives in the recent West Virginia coal mine accidents and recognizing the courage of Randal McCloy who survived. Further, I join my colleagues in extending our condolences to the families of these miners, and recognize the brave efforts of the rescue crews and volunteers during this time.

I represent southwestern and southern Illinois, a region with a rich coal mining history. Coal mining has played a significant role in transforming and developing the region since the mid-1800s when substantial coal mining in Illinois began. In 2006, the coal industry continues to be a vital component of our economy, and one we are working to strengthen for the future. Improving mine safety standards is an important part of this process in Illinois, West Virginia, and other coal producing States.

These unfortunate coal mining fatalities in West Virginia have highlighted the pressing need to revise the national coal mine health and safety standards to ensure miners are equipped with state of the art technologies and tracking devices, and sufficient emergency supplies of oxygen. I am pleased West Virginia legislators acted quickly to enact a state law requiring coal companies to give employees electronic tracking devices and to store oxygen supplies underground. Precautionary measures are needed to protect the health and safety of our coal miners and penalties for flagrant violations of the law and regulations must be enforced. To this end, I have joined my colleagues in the House as a cosponsor of H.R. 4695, the Federal Coal Mine Safety and Health Act of 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in honoring the West Virginia coal miners for their courage and sacrifice and expressing our deepest condolences to their families.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 331, as amended.

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

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution honoring the sacrifice and courage of the 16 coal miners killed in various mine disasters in West Virginia, and recognizing the rescue crews for their outstanding efforts in the aftermath of the tragedies."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mrs. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1712

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG) at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4297) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(b) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. NEAL OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal of Massachusetts moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4297 be instructed as follows:

(1) The House conferees shall agree to the provisions of section 106 of the Senate amendment (relating to extension and increase in minimum tax relief to individuals).

(2) The House conferees shall recede from the provisions of the House bill that extend the lower tax rate on dividends and capital gains that would otherwise terminate at the close of 2008.

(3) To the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall insist on a conference report that would not increase the Federal deficit for any year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and the gentlemen from California (Mr. THOMAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we all know that perhaps more important than anything else we do here, we set and we establish priorities. Our motion to instruct sets forth the priorities that I believe should be followed in the conference on this legislation.

The priorities of the Republican majority are clear: Large tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the wealthiest in our society, while slashing initiatives that protect the most vulnerable in our society. Even in normal times, these priorities would be wrong, but these are not normal times.

America is currently involved in two wars, one in Iraq and one in Afghanistan. These are the first wars in our country's history where only those in the military and the poor are being asked to sacrifice.

Hurricane Katrina forced America to see poverty and its consequences. And let me compliment former President Jimmy Carter for his remarks yesterday at Mrs. King's funeral when he spoke of that very issue.

□ 1715

The administration has converted surpluses into an enormous budget deficit, but has done nothing to prepare programs like Social Security and Medicare for the future other than to threaten privatization. The most significant fiscal turnaround in the history of America has occurred on the watch of the Republican majority here in the Congress.

What I think is interesting, and I say this with great confidence, during these past few years we have almost doubled defense spending, we are fighting two wars, we have created a Department of Homeland Security, we have witnessed the national principle

play out during Hurricane Katrina, and we have done all of this with six tax cuts. There is not anybody who is watching at home tonight in America who could run their personal lives on that basis. They could never hope to balance the ledger of trying to raise a family if they attempted to copy the model utilized by this Congress.

Our motion to instruct sets forth different priorities. First, it instructs the House conferees to follow the Senate bill and extend alternative minimum tax relief. Now, I must say that during my time as being one of the leaders here, it even was acknowledged by one of my friends on the other side, in the area of alternative minimum tax, that seldom have I had any issue in my time where I spoke of an issue more earnestly, received more congratulations from Members of both parties, and seen less extensive action than in the area of alternative minimum tax. This should be one of our first priorities. Without an extension of this relief, over 17 million Americans will face a tax increase in 2006, and the size of that tax increase could be as large as \$3,640. Many middle-income families, largely married couples with children, simply are going to face higher taxes. That should be the priorities that we entertain.

Second, our motion to instruct would require the House conferees to drop any extension of the tax benefits for dividend and capital gains. Those benefits do not terminate until the end of 2008, so there is time to extend these benefits in the future if it is to be determined that they are appropriate as we seek balance in the ledger. Almost half of those benefits would be enjoyed by the wealthiest one-fifth of one percent of individuals, or better understood as individuals with annual incomes over \$1 million.

Third, our motion requires the House conferees to develop a conference report with the view to not further increasing the Federal deficit. The administration projects a Federal deficit of over \$400 billion for this fiscal year.

By the way, we have been told for the last 5 years that those numbers were going to come down substantially. The administration is proposing large deductions in education and health programs using the large deficit as an excuse, the very deficit they have created by their actions. Many of us on both sides of the aisle will oppose those misguided spending reductions. And once we get to the real battle here in the coming year over Medicare and Medicaid, my suspicion is that they will see all the action that Social Security saw in the past year. Further tax cuts for the superwealthy would jeopardize the remaining safety net for our children, for the disabled, and for other vulnerable individuals in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would have an open conference where the views of all parties might be expressed. After all, that ought to be one of the cornerstones of our democracy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do have to say this is one of the oddest motions to instruct that I have seen in my multiple decades in the House for basically one reason: just a few short days ago the House passed by a vote of 234 to 197, a tax reconciliation package which extended the dividend reductions and the capital gains reductions. On the same day, the House passed, outside of reconciliation, the alternative minimum tax assistance that the gentleman has pleaded for by a vote of 414 Members of the House of Representatives, I believe, to 9 in opposition. That was the substantive action of the House on the floor.

This motion to instruct, which is nonbinding, requests that the House completely reverse itself from the vote we had just a few days ago, and that is, we do not include dividends in capital gains in tax reconciliation, but we include the alternative minimum tax which was voted outside of reconciliation. And I guess I would just ask my Members whether or not it is more important to hang on to the substantive action of the House or the symbolic gesture on the part of the Democrats. That is not the only strange thing about this motion to instruct.

You heard my colleague from Massachusetts and you will soon hear from other Members of very large urban States asking for tax relief for the very richest Americans. After all, by definition, the alternative minimum tax is not applied to the lowest. It is not applied to the 10 percent bracket. It is not applied to the 15 percent bracket. It is applied to the richest among us. And although it is refreshing, it is just ironic that we are going to have Democrats going to the floor pleading to relieve the wealthiest among us from an alternative tax burden. And to do that, they want to deny, the number 17 million was mentioned, as those who were affected by this. That is everyone who has even a dollar affected, as opposed to 14 million who would get total relief on the basis of this if it were substantive, which it is not.

But what my colleague fails to recognize, or chooses not to mention, is that with the reduction for dividends and capital gains, we also provide for significant tax relief in the investment aspect of dividend in capital gains for those in the 10 and 15 percent bracket going to zero before it expires. On capital gains that benefits 14 million alone; on the dividends, that benefits 27 million Americans.

They want to take those people who want to invest, who are in the 10 and 15 percent bracket, and deny them the opportunity to bootstrap themselves so they can give the richest among us a little bit of relief because large States that have high State income taxes and high State sales tax want to live off the rest of the Federal taxpayers in

getting relief from alternative minimum tax.

And let me say about the gentleman's example about how we do not seem to be able to figure out how individuals can live if they followed the Federal example of tax cuts, it is very simple. The alternative minimum tax that they ask for in terms of relief are dollars to the richest among us who will spend, who will spend it on consumption. You get a one-time benefit on consumption. In that example, there is no question that American families could never survive tax cut after tax cut if all you did with the money was feed consumption. But what the history of the investment of dividends and capital gains meant is that people were able to invest money going to jobs and to productivity which has given us a bonus back.

And if the individual family took that money and invested it, that is the smartest thing, deferring current gratification for future reward. That is exactly what we are doing with the dividends and capital gains. So I am a little startled that my colleagues are bewildered, the difference between a consumption-insisting tax or an investment insisting tax. One consumes, the other one grows. That is why we are able to continue to see the economy improve as we continue to cut taxes. It depends on which taxes you cut, where you cut them, and how you cut them.

What my colleagues are asking for in this motion to instruct is to give more money to rich people to spend and deny those people even in the 10 and 15 percent tax bracket a chance to invest and grow wealth. One is the American way. I do not know what the other one is.

So all I would tell my colleagues is, please, we acted substantively. We passed tax reconciliation. I know this motion is not binding, but please make sure you understand what you are doing. You would be reversing investment in favor of consumption. If you come from a rich urban State, it probably makes sense to you. If you are from the rest of America, it certainly does not.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the chairman said that this is one of the oddest motions to instruct that he has come across, but let me say I think that everybody would agree the most peculiar moment we have had in the last few years was the prescription drug bill. If you want to talk about a peculiarity that will be with all of us forever and how that was done at 4 o'clock in the morning, now that is peculiar. That is odd. What we are offering here is a sensible solution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Mr. THOMAS, the chairman of the awesome and powerful Ways and

Means Committee, has normally presented brilliant arguments, many of those I have opposed; but I have really never seen such creative thinking as he has done on the alternative minimum tax. I would hope the whole world, and that is at least those in New York and around the country, will hear who he is describing as the richest people in the world. I mean, coming from California there may be some distorted thinking about incomes, but from all of the statistics, they say that over half of the people are between the incomes of 100 and \$200,000, they would be getting the relief.

And then if we were talking about, I do not want to start a class war because I do not want to offend any on the other side, but over 50 percent of the relief under the interest in the capital gains would go to people above a million dollars.

And so I do not think we would call the 100 to \$200,000, certainly as it relates to the Nation, that is high income, but it certainly does not compare to the recipients of those in the categories that will receive capital gains and corporate dividends.

But more importantly, I beseech Mr. THOMAS to deal with the question of equity. When we are trying to help somebody in terms of taxes or to take away some benefits from somebody, it may be done in the back room, but ultimately the public will know which group are the beneficiaries.

Now, there is no way that you can contradict that nobody in this Congress or the Ways and Means Committee or the Finance Committee ever thought that the people that we were going after to make certain that they paid a minimum tax would find themselves being pushed in the category where they would be paying out thousands of dollars in taxes which we never intended for them to have, they just got pushed into this by inflation. We owe them more than new people that would benefit, some kind of relief.

Now, this whole idea that we did it outside of reconciliation means that you did not do it at all. We know that when the House and the Senate conferees go to conference, that is when Democrats are invited to go but whether we are there or not, that we try to find out what is the best in both of the bills.

□ 1730

So it would seem to me that the only thing that we truly have that was passed by both the House and the Senate was relief for the alternative minimum tax. True, the Republican-controlled House did not put in any reconciliation, but those who were invited to go to conference would at least know that the Senate had it in their reconciliation bill and the House overwhelmingly passed it.

So it would seem to me, in equity and fairness, if you are talking about the intent of the House and the Senate, since they never included in their rec-

onciliation bill the concept of the tax relief being given to capital gains and to corporate dividends, that in good conscience you could come back to the House and report that you followed the instructions.

It just seems to me, Mr. Chairman of the full committee, that you already knew that you were not going to give relief to the AMT; and now, instead of saying that we are sorry that we never responded to an equitable need, we never intended to throw these people into this category, instead of that, you have made them the richest people in the world.

Well, it is getting close to the election; and since the economy is doing so well, we will stick by that. If Republicans say they are the richest people in the world, Democrats would support that you said it.

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

We actually could solve a lot of our problems if we would tax all the people in the world. Clearly, what I said was the people in the United States. Those of us among us.

I cannot speak for the gentleman in terms of how he casts votes. I know he was on the losing side when we voted to extend the dividends and capital gains relief in the tax reconciliation package that just a few days ago passed the House with 239 votes. My vote in insisting for alternative minimum tax outside of reconciliation was an honest vote, and I intend to help those people.

Reconciliation is a process that is used by the Senate, not by the House. In terms of the number of votes necessary to pass legislation, the House always passes legislation by a majority vote, and it is always permanent. What we did with the minimum alternative tax vote, which with the help of the gentleman from New York passed by 414 votes, is exactly the same thing as far as the House is concerned that we did with the dividends and cap gains under tax reconciliation.

It is the Senate that utilizes reconciliation to pass measures by only 51 votes, albeit not permanently, for only a decade; and it is the Senate that needs 60 votes to make things permanent. So far as the institution of the House and the rules of the House and the votes that were cast, both on tax reconciliation and on the alternative minimum tax vote, the effective result of the House vote is absolutely the same.

All I am pointing out about the strangeness of this motion to instruct is that it is a request for the House to reverse itself, albeit nonbinding, from the very vote that we took, and that is that the gentleman from New York and others who were on the losing side on the vote for tax reconciliation want to be on the winning side by offering a motion to instruct. I guess it is okay. I will trade substance for appearance any day of the week. But Members need to know what they are voting on,

and what they are voting on is to reverse themselves from the substantive decision they made earlier. I have never seen a motion to instruct that completely flips the legislation that had been presented. That is what I meant by strangeness.

And the argument that the gentleman from New York has just made in terms of the comparisons kind of equals that level as well. It is pretty simple. The economy is moving because we are investing in the economy through the reduction of tax on dividends and capital gains. If you were to give money to people, although the consumer helps, you simply do not get the benefit. And the people who make the most money, who are subject to the alternative minimum tax, deserve help. They do not deserve help in reconciliation, which the Senate needs to be able to make law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a valuable member of the committee.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time; and I will say one thing, Mr. Speaker, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts had it right when he said this is about priorities. This motion is definitely about priorities, and it is about maintaining or not maintaining the current economic policies that make it a priority to encourage economic growth and encourage job creation.

In 2005, we created 2 million jobs in our country, and since 2003 our GDP has seen its fastest growth rate in 20 years, averaging a robust 4.4 percent per quarter. That growth is attributable at least in part to the competitive rates that we have set on capital gains and dividends, the seed corn of our economy. And it is precisely here that their instruction proposes to impose a tax increase, a tax increase on the most dynamic sector of the economy and on the most sensitive part of our Tax Code.

They do not say tax increase. They couch it in terms of withholding or withdrawing a tax cut. But in fact the markets for years have now taken into account a tax rate on capital gains and a tax treatment of dividends which encourages economic growth. They want to raise taxes.

At a time when our economy is facing pressure from globalization and facing pressure from high energy costs, now is not the time to be raising taxes on dividends. Now is not the time to be raising taxes on capital gains. I realize they desperately want to spend more money and they desperately want to raise taxes, but we cannot permit that to happen.

If we are serious about maintaining America's economic growth rate, if we are serious about maintaining a competitive position in the world, it is essential that we send the right message and that we look to make permanent the current rates on capital gains and

the current tax treatment of dividends that are so important a part of our competitive position.

I am surprised to see the other side coming forward with such a naked and clear attempt to raise taxes. But be that as it may, I think the time has come for us to reaffirm our message and to send a clear message to the markets that we are prepared to maintain current policies to encourage economic growth and to maintain the strong points of our current economic policy.

I call on my colleagues to turn down this instruction and do so decisively.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there were 22 million jobs created during the Clinton years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, at the end of last year we came to the floor, as was pointed out, to vote on the tax reconciliation bill. That bill extended tax cuts that did not expire for years, and it ignored tax relief that was expiring within days, relief from the alternative minimum tax, or the AMT.

Now, just this past Monday, the President released his annual budget; and it was, with apologies to Yogi Berra, *deja vu* all over again. He called on Congress to make permanent \$1.4 trillion in tax cuts. Some of those do not expire for years to come. And he called on Congress to make permanent relief from the AMT only through fundamental reforms of the Tax Code. Unfortunately, his budget did not call for fundamental tax reform.

So that is the naked tax increase that was alluded to. If it is not fixed, this creates 17 million new taxpayers, a tax on 17 million new people.

If our friends on the other side of the aisle tell us, as they do often enough, that the budget is a document outlining the priorities of the President, then we can only deduct that paying down the debt is not a priority of this administration; that managing our money so that we no longer have to mortgage our future to countries like Japan and China is not a priority of this administration; and permanent AMT relief for working and middle-class families is just not a priority of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, these are priorities for everyday Americans and for those of us on the Democratic side of the aisle. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct which reflects the priorities of Americans and calls upon the conferees to provide immediate and fiscally responsible relief from the alternative minimum tax, which is going to tax 17 million new people.

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

If it is going to tax 17 million new people, why do they call it the alternative minimum tax? These people are already being taxed. It is an alternative way to tax them and was actually put in place when my colleagues

on the other side of the aisle were in the majority.

The gentleman from Napa Valley, in pleading for some of the richest Americans to get some relief from an alternative system of taxation they put in place when they were a majority and could have dealt with it, literally wants to take money from the 10 and 15 percent bracket, people who are trying to invest and grow a nest egg so that they can have a piece of America like the people in Napa Valley.

The people in the 10 and 15 percent bracket for the first time actually can figure out a way to invest in America, to grow a nest egg, and to see the ability to have a better tomorrow. But they want to take the money from these people and ease taxes on those people in the upper tax brackets who have now triggered the alternative minimum tax.

I said I am in favor of helping relieve the alternative minimum tax, but the plan we have proposed is not trading one for the other. It is not denying the 10 and 15 percent bracket a piece of America. We passed assistance to the alternative minimum tax. It was outside of tax reconciliation. What they want to do is shove that nest egg-building approach out of tax reconciliation and move the alternative minimum tax in its place. That is what we are opposed to.

We are not opposed to assisting the alternative minimum tax. We are opposed to denying the 10 and 15 percent bracket a chance to invest in America at the lowest possible cost. That is what this is about.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding to me; and I just want to point out that I represent seven counties, and I have people that are going to get caught in this AMT tax just like you do and just like every one of our colleagues across the country.

This was a tax, as you point out, to make sure people did not get out of their tax liability. But it was never indexed; and now it has crept up to catch all those good, hardworking people in the middle. And, Mr. Chairman, you know that our State pays 25 percent of the AMT that comes to the Federal Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and his party had every opportunity when they were in the majority to index that. And in fact they had every opportunity to remove the credits and deductions which allowed those people not to pay any taxes. Instead, they took the easy way out of offering an alternative minimum, and you have gotten bitten.

I find it is ironic that the people in New York, New York City, and other areas are now asking relief for very wealthy people. I do not have a problem with that. We passed 414-4 relief

for that on the floor. At the same time, within tax reconciliation, a structure which assists the Senate, we placed our highest priority, investment to creating nest eggs for the 10 and 15 percent brackets. That is where we decided to place our priorities. Your attempt here is to reverse that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the chairman of the Select Revenue Committee of the Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1745

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct. This motion is really based on a flawed rationale and flawed thinking. They are saying that we drop the 2-year extension on reduced rates for capital gains and dividends, somehow thinking that is going to help the deficit. First of all, that would be a tax increase on all those investors. As we have seen with employee stock ownership and employee-owned companies on the rise, stock ownership on the rise, more Americans participating in the stock market and investments than ever before, more than half, this would be a huge problem and tax increase for them.

Not only that, as we have seen when President Clinton was President in 1997 and signed a reduction in capital gains rates from 28 to 20 percent, we saw that then increased revenue to the government because of the economic growth that came out of that increased investment. We have seen the same with our recent capital gains and dividend reductions.

For example, the Congressional Budget Office says that receipts to the government have not declined, but have increased significantly by 45 percent, and that is by reducing the capital gain rates from 20 to 15 percent because not only did that double the realization of gains, and one reason was there was a higher return on investment as that tax declined, but also there was this unlocking effect where investors could sell their assets and move into other investments that then grew more rapidly. So we had this growth and dynamic aspect of the economy that took over that is so critical.

The CBO also found that tax collections from what they call nonwithheld tax receipts also jumped dramatically by 32 percent. We have seen dividend payouts from American companies virtually triple as a result of this reduction. So we have seen that this is tremendous benefit for the American people as their investments grow and they become more well off, and this is all income levels. Anybody who is part of an employee-owned company can participate, anybody can participate in the market, it is not just the high-income people, and we have seen lower and lower income levels participating in

the stock market over times because of these changes.

So I think it is critical that we not approve this motion to instruct, that we reject it for the reasons that to create economic growth, increase prosperity and give every American a shot at the American dream, we must extend the reduction in capital gains and dividends.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan control the remainder of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we stand out here and argue this sort of arcane piece of tax policy here today, the chairman tells us we are better off than we ever were before. Anybody who has looked at where the national debt is knows that is not true. Whatever this tax policy they are pushing is about, it is driving us deeper and deeper into debt.

In addition, today the President presents a budget to us that says nothing about the war and what it is costing. It is probably going to cost us a trillion dollars by the time it is all done, if we ever get out of it, stagnant wages in this country, and 500,000 more people in poverty.

Now the chairman says we want to have everybody have a shot at the American dream. Well, let me tell you something, this is a shot like a shot at the moon for most of them with a shotgun. It is not going to come anywhere near it. We do not want any more tax holidays for the rich.

The fact that you are trying to get rid of the AMT by letting it drift down further and further and further into the tax-paying people in this country is very obvious. You want there to be an uprising that says let us get rid of the AMT. You know why it was put there. You said yourself. They put the AMT because there were rich people in this country paying nothing. We could have kept it at that level, but in 2001 you decided we have got to balance the budget. Let us not do anything about the AMT. We told you over and over and over again in the Ways and Means Committee that is what you were doing. And yet you now say, oh, well, it is somebody else's problem.

You are driving this country over the edge. You think you are sending a market message. You are sending a message to the market with the kind of debt this country is in. If you take the credit card debt and the amount people have borrowed against their homes to

keep up their level of income, you have a country seriously in debt. Now you say we do not care who has to figure their taxes twice, we will let it go down to \$50,000, \$60,000, whatever the number is going to be. That is of no consequence to you at all because you are dedicated to only one group in this society, and that is the people on the top.

This whole construction that you put together over the last 4 years, and I welcome you back to the well, I think you might have a couple of things to say to me, but bringing this tax bill to where we are today was a deliberate attack on the middle class. That reconciliation bill that the President signed took away the money that people would use to educate their children. You gave the banks big breaks so they could take more out of the hides of the kids. This is a good motion, and it ought to be adopted.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I note that the House voted 414-4 to move the alternative minimum tax outside of reconciliation to pass alternative minimum tax relief. I was sincere in my vote. I would just inquire whether those on the other side of the aisle who voted for this bill were sincere in their votes.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

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

A budget is indeed about choices about picking winners and losers. And there is a certain consistency in the approach that we have seen in this Republican Congress.

Each year this administration targets the same losers and rewards the same winners. Each year it offers more tax breaks for those at the top, the wealthiest few, and it insists that the deficits that are thereby created be paid for in part by cutting aid to working families, to students and to our seniors. Each year it sacrifices long-term fiscal responsibility at the altar of short-term political gratification, escalating the national debt to subsidize private fortunes.

The administration's budget does not just crunch numbers, however, it crunches people.

Only last week the same folks that are here today demanding more and more tax breaks for those at the very top were here saying they had billions in what they called "savings" to help finance these tax cuts. But if you were a family caring for an abused and neglected child, that savings meant no support.

If you were a single mom relying on Federal child support enforcement to get a deadbeat dad to pay their monthly child support payments, it meant no child support.

For many a student relying on Federal student financial assistance, it meant an inability to get aid to go to

school. And the health cuts, the same burdens imposed on the most vulnerable.

This Republican-controlled Congress continues to make these cuts to the vulnerable while offering high tax cuts for million-dollar-a-year-income folks. Extending these tax breaks today will put over \$32,000 in the hands of people who earn a million dollars or more every year. While true that some of the 64 percent of families who earn less than \$50,000 a year will get a tax cut, too, it will amount to only about \$11 a year. So it is the difference between giving a new car to some of the privileged few and a car wash to the 64 percent.

The difference that they propose today is the difference between tuition at some fancy private school to the few, but only a pack of pencils to the many. It is the difference between a down payment on another vacation villa for the wealthy and some Lincoln logs or Legos for most everyone else.

At the very moment we are now debating this, the Office of Management and Budget is over here at the Capitol whacking away again at what they claim are unnecessary programs. But there are more programs that they propose to eliminate or significantly reduce in the Education Department than in any other department in the Federal government. Such unfortunate actions by the Republicans create another kind of deficit, an "opportunity deficit," where young people and some not so young are not able to obtain the resources needed to achieve their full, God-given potential.

I think it is wrong to add to that opportunity deficit in our communities, just as it is wrong to build a national deficit that those future generations will be asked to pay. There is no balance in the budget these folks are offering to us today, and there is no equity either. It ought to be rejected.

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to correct, if I may, the chairman's assertions. He has suggested that the Senate's relief is more focused at the rich, and that is not true. It is true that both the House and the Senate would give about 90 percent of their benefits to the top 20 percent, but at the very high end, the difference is amazing. More than half of the House's capital gain and dividend tax cut goes to the best 1 percent of taxpayers, and that 1 percent, those people earning more than \$1.2 million a year would receive an average reduction of \$26,500 apiece. That is where half of the Republican House bill goes.

The Senate's bill, on the other hand, would give the AMT relief, would give that same 1 percent merely 2.5 percent of their AMT relief, or an average of \$600 apiece.

The other thing that is missing, and I do not suppose it is untrue to say

things are missing, you cannot find weapons of mass destruction, did we lie about the war, I do not know, but to look at the fact that the Senate has paid for a good bit of their relief, and if we look at the subsequent 5 years, it is true in the first 5 years the House bill loses \$56 billion, and the Senate loses \$57 billion, but that is only the tip of the iceberg because in the second 5 years the Senate bill picks up \$20 billion because it has not recklessly given away revenue through reduction of capital gains and dividend income. The House, on the other hand, in the second 5 years loses another \$30 billion. So while the grand total in 10 years for the Senate is only \$37 billion, less than it is in 5 years, it is \$80 billion for the House bill over 10 years, a difference of \$43 billion.

Come on, folks, that \$43 billion would pay for the education and health care and housing and rebuilding from Hurricane Katrina, and a whole host of things that the Republicans tend to ignore because the rich people that the Republicans represent already have that. They are turning their backs on the children and the middle class by capriciously and recklessly giving away our Federal revenues to the very richest in this country, and that is obscene.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank Leader PELOSI for appointing me to this conference committee, and I rise in support of this motion to instruct.

I strongly believe tax cuts are unnecessary, irresponsible, and morally reprehensible at the present time. If allowed in the room, as Democrats rarely are these days, I will work hard on the conference committee to make sure that any tax cuts adopted be targeted to the middle-class rather than to millionaires.

I will argue for fiscal responsibility. I will insist with my colleagues in the Senate that the tax reconciliation bill protect middle-class families from the Alternative Minimum Tax. I will work to strike the extension of capital gains and dividend tax cuts that benefit the wealthy few at the expense of the hard working many.

In short, I will fight for Americans the President in his budget left behind.

The President in the document released Monday clearly illustrates the course he prefers for tax reconciliation—more tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of vital domestic programs on which many Americans depend.

The President wants to cut Medicare by more than \$100 billion, eliminate Social Security benefits for many older children whose parents have died, and severely cut state funding for child care. His proposal to expand Health Savings Accounts takes direct aim at the more than 160 million workers and their families who have job-based health coverage.

These cuts aren't necessary. Neither are the \$21 billion in extensions of capital gains and dividend tax breaks for the top 1 percent of Americans put forth by Republicans in the House in their ill-conceived tax reconciliation bill.

A vote against this motion to instruct is a vote against working families and in favor of millionaires. Voters won't forget that in November.

I urge all my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say for the RECORD, the will of the House by a vast majority extended both kinds of AMT relief we have been discussing today without raising taxes as the Senate did.

I just want to say that one in five taxpayers, or 20 percent with capital gains, and one in four taxpayers, 25 percent of the taxpayers with dividends, have incomes below \$50,000, so this clearly is an opportunity for Americans to begin to become part of the American dream by investing and growing that income. To not extend the tax relief would be to raise taxes, which would be the wrong thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1800

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is actually bipartisan support for reducing taxes in the AMT on American families. If I could go back in time and stop that Congress from ever creating it, I would have because the principle of it has always been so wrong. The principle was our Tax Code is so complex, it is so full of loopholes that it really is not fair anymore. So rather than fix the problem, let us just create a second type of tax, make people create second books, second type of accounts and then try to catch them another way.

It was a terrible principle to begin with; and because it was not put in place, it was put in place for the wrong reasons, in the wrong way and now affecting more and more of our American taxpayers who should never have to fool with this.

The question today is, how do we do it? Do we do it as proposed in this issue, to raise taxes to pay for it? Or as Chairman CAMP has said, this House has voted overwhelmingly to provide tax relief to these families the right way, by just exempting them and not raising their taxes to pay for it. That is exactly the right way to do it.

And another, I think, bad side effect of this proposal that we are debating today is that we take away the tax savings on capital gains and dividends. That is very important to America's seniors, very important to seniors in Texas. And what I especially appreciate is that since this Republican Congress lowered taxes on dividends and capital gains, more and more people, especially seniors, are investing for their retirement, and more companies are not just promoting their stock value. They are actually returning money to dividends to our investors, to our neighbors. And so they are not just saying we have got a great company. They are actually showing it, showing us the money through dividend relief.

That is very important in a time where you just saw last week that

America has a negative savings rate, a negative. We are going in the hole more and more each year, American families are. We ought to encourage savings. We ought to encourage dividends. We ought to encourage investment, and we ought not raise their taxes in order to provide relief from AMT. And I respectfully oppose this and urge us to work in a bipartisan measure to do this the right way.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. One thing I agree with the previous speaker on, that the American people are going more in the hole; and when they feel what is happening to student aid and cutbacks in scholarship money because of the Republican majority, they are going to know what being in the hole is really about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this issue was put so squarely, and I think clearly, in the answer of Secretary Snow when he testified in the Senate. He was asked why the White House had put a higher priority on the investment tax breaks than relief from an alternative minimum tax. His answer, and I quote, "because lower taxes on dividends and capital gains more broadly benefit taxpayers than AMT relief." That is the position of the administration. So what they are saying is that tax relief dividends and capital gains, we are talking now about 2009 and 2010, not this year, next year or the year thereafter, that that is more important when over 50 percent of the benefit goes to people making a million dollars a year, that is more important than the impact of the AMT not in 2009, 2010, but this year, on 19 million taxpayers. That is really the issue.

Now, we hear all kinds of arguments. Mr. THOMAS kind of says, well, those AMT people are kind of wealthy people. A lot of them are not, nowhere near the million bucks made by the people who are the 53 percent who gain in 2009 and 2010.

And then, well, it said, okay. More taxpayers receive capital gains in dividend reduction, that is true, most of them are in lower middle income brackets, but most of the money goes to people making a million bucks a year. That has never been challenged.

Well, then the answer is, Mr. CAMP, we are going to do both. Tell us how you are going to do both. Tell us. Stand up now and tell us. How are you going to pay for both?

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Well, because your whole assumption is based on the flawed principle that if we reduce investment taxes, revenues to the government decline.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I take back my time.

How are you going to pay for both? The Senate said they could not pay for both and that is why they put the AMT in. We voted for AMT relief, the 400-some, because we wanted the issue to stay alive and for the conference committee to act responsibly, civilly and to have the AMT in there. How are you going to pay for both? Tell me how you are going to pay for both.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Well, we are certainly not going to raise taxes like the Senate did.

Mr. LEVIN. No, no. Do not tell me what you will not do. Tell me what you will do.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Well, because the investment taxes actually increase.

Mr. LEVIN. Tell me. I think the answer is, Mr. CAMP, that you do not intend to pay for both. What you hope to do is to have some AMT relief, later on, unpaid for, in addition to 2009 and 2010 provisions on capital gains and the like. You do not have any intention to pay for both because you cannot do it. This is a further example of the fiscal irresponsibility of the majority in this Congress.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, first let me say, we are certainly not going to pay for it by raising taxes as our friends in the Senate did by including AMT in reconciliation. And let me just say that we have seen since we reduced investment taxes in 2003, we have seen a doubling of capital gains realizations, meaning, a huge increase in the amount of revenue generated by capital gains sales and a huge 45 percent increase in tax receipts as a result. This is part of the revenue that I hear from the other side.

And so what happens when investment taxes are reduced is revenues to the government increase. That occurred in 1997 when President Clinton signed a bill that reduced investment taxes, that occurred in 2003 when President Bush signed a bill reducing investment taxes. And so one of the things that you have seen from the investment community is that even though we have seen dramatic, positive revenues to the government as a result of decreasing these taxes, a lot of people in the investment community say that if we do not enact an extension, that would be a very negative signal for Wall Street.

Others have said you really will not even see the full potential of realization from the effects of lower rates on investment taxes until they are perceived to be permanent. And that is from the Congressional Budget Office. So the threat of these taxes expiring will affect business decisions well before they do expire and personal investment decisions. So that is why it is important we act now. So, again, I urge Members to reject this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman arguing the other side has voted to raise the debt limit three times. You know, all of this new revenue is coming in. You have got to wonder how come we have to keep borrowing more because of our deficit and national debt getting deeper and deeper and deeper.

With this motion we say we ought to address first things first. What is the threat that American taxpayers will pay higher taxes in 2006 and 2007?

Well, millions will pay higher income taxes through application of the alternative minimum tax in 2006 and 2007. Under existing law, no one, not one American will pay a higher capital gains rate or higher corporate dividends rate than they do now. That is established in present law. So if we have got a problem with the alternative minimum tax and we do not have a problem with the capital gains and corporate dividends tax, it seems to me you ought to address the 2006 and 2007 problem. And it is a big problem. In 2005, 1.1 percent of taxpayers in the 75,000 to \$100,000 income range paid alternative minimum tax. In 2006 it will be 30 percent. 30 percent will pay a higher income tax in that bracket. Only 7 percent in the 100,000 and up bracket got hit with the AMT last year. It will be two-thirds in 2006. Do not increase income taxes through AMT. Fix it.

And so this resolution that they are supporting, the motion to recommit that they are opposing, it makes no sense. It places all the emphasis on 2008 and 2009. Guess what, Chairman CAMP? We can do that later. Let us deal with the problem that is right before us, the alternative minimum tax income tax increase that faces millions of our households.

I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would just say briefly that the threat of these expiring will have an effect on business and individuals from investment decisions well before midnight on December 31, 2008. So it is important that we act now while we can, because that will send a very strong signal that these reductions in investment taxes are here to stay, which will continue to encourage the kind of investment and growth that has created the job relief that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), or job creation that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), mentioned, over 2 million jobs. And it is so important that we continue to do that.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me urge my colleagues to support this motion and point out that this motion makes it clear that if we work together, Democrats and Republicans, that we can get through a reconcili-

ation bill that deals with expiring tax provisions that need to be dealt with, including the R&D tax credit and other provisions, but we need to do this in a financially responsible way. You cannot extend all of these tax provisions and fix the alternative minimum tax and not worry about the impact it is going to have on the Federal deficit. And I think that is a point Mr. NEAL and others on this side of the aisle have been making. We are talking about trying to reduce the Federal deficit. The first thing you do is stop getting greater and deeper in debt.

So last week we cut programs for our students. We cut programs in health care. We cut programs for those who are the most vulnerable, and we said we were doing it to help reduce the deficit. But, no, we are using every dollar of those dollars for tax cuts. That is not what we should be doing.

We have lots of unmet needs, including rebuilding from Katrina and dealing with the financing of No Child Left Behind. So we have unmet needs. You cannot have these large tax cuts and try to deal with the unmet needs without further increasing the Federal deficit, and that is what this motion is about. This motion is about, yes, there are areas we need to move forward in the Tax Code, and, yes, there are additional investments that need to be made; but if we do it in a reasonable manner, we can reduce the Federal deficit.

Without us paying attention to what is in this motion, we are going to be digging a deeper hole and making it more difficult for us to get out. So I just urge my colleagues to support this motion, but more importantly, support action in this body that will bring us together and not have extensions of tax cuts that are going to make it more difficult for us to balance the budget. Support the motion.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. First let me just say that lowering tax rates on capital gains and dividends helps contribute to the long-run economic growth and expansion of this country. Sixty percent of the people who realize capital gains have incomes below \$100,000. Twenty-five percent of the people who have dividend income have incomes below \$50,000. Capital gains tax receipts have been increasing since the 2003 tax cut. More companies have been offering dividends since the 2003 tax cut. These pro-growth policies are getting America moving again. In the past 12 months, 2 million jobs were created, and the unemployment rate is at its lowest level since July 2001. Do not derail or reverse that growth.

Second, I would say the House voted 414 to 4 to move the alternative minimum tax outside of reconciliation. The House voted in a majority vote just a few days ago to include capital gains relief inside of reconciliation.

□ 1815

This motion to instruct is a clear attempt not to instruct the conferees, but to reverse what the will of the House has voted just a short time ago.

I urge Members to vote "no" on this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is okay every once in a while if the Sheriff of Nottingham does not win. Addressing the issue of alternative minimum tax ought to be the priority here. Speaking to those 19 million Americans who are going to get caught in this again is where we ought to be.

Once again, Katrina; two wars; doubling defense spending; the creation of Homeland Security; and although the President did not mention it the other night, he has planned a trip to Mars for NASA.

The point is very simple. We cannot continue going down this road of shaving revenue all the time for the strongest among us. It always has to be more for the powerful, more for the strongest. And on the point that was raised by the gentleman from Michigan about job growth, this has been, by the 5-year standard, anemic job growth. It is the weakest performance in 70 years. Twenty-two million jobs were created during the Clinton years.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a very important piece of legislation, H.R. 4297, the "Tax Relief Extension Reconciliation Act." It is very important to understand this piece of legislation within the big picture the Republicans are painting here. Just last week, the Republicans passed a bill called "The Deficit Reduction Act." This was a spending cut bill that slashed funding to many vital programs my constituents depend on, including Medicaid, Medicare, student loans, food stamps, and child support programs. The Republicans lectured us on the need to make sacrifices to control the national debt. By passing the spending cut bill, the Republicans actually asked the poor, the downtrodden, the disabled and the young to sacrifice on behalf of the rest of the country.

Now we are faced with the Tax Reconciliation Act, which will add billions, if not trillions, to the deficit over the next 10 years. One source estimates that if all of President Bush's expiring tax cuts are extended, including the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) relief, it will cost this country \$3.3 Trillion over the next 10 years.

Last year, both the House and the Senate passed our respective versions of the Tax Reconciliation Bill. The major difference between the two bills involves AMT and the low rate on dividends and capital gains. The Senate version extends the temporary AMT relief for one year, while the House bill extends the 15 percent tax rate for dividends and capital gains for 2 years.

CAPITAL GAINS AND DIVIDENDS

The House bill contains language that will further extend the contentious capital gains and dividends tax cuts. We shouldn't even

have to debate this right now, because these tax cuts don't expire until 2008. If passed, the capital gains and dividends tax cuts will cost almost \$51 billion over the next 10 years. These tax cuts will be enjoyed by the ultra wealthy, with those earning more than \$1 million a year saving an average of \$32,000 in taxes. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities:

Over half—54 percent—of all capital gains and dividend income flows to the 0.2 percent of households with annual incomes over \$1 million. More than three-quarters—78 percent—of this income goes to those households with income over \$200,000, which account for about 3 percent of all households.

In contrast, only 11 percent of capital gains and dividend income goes to the 86 percent of households with incomes of less than \$100,000. Only 4 percent of this income flows to the 64 percent of households that have income of less than \$50,000.

ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX (AMT) RELIEF

If the Senate AMT provision is not adopted, over 17 million middle class Americans will face a tax increase next year from the Alternative Minimum Tax, the AMT. The AMT was enacted over 35 years ago to ensure that the richest Americans would pay their fair share of income tax. Unfortunately, when the AMT was enacted, Congress neglected to index the tax rates to inflation. The AMT has now begun to add an extra burden to middle class taxpayers at an alarming rate. I urge the conferees to recognize the need for continued AMT relief and include that language in the conference report.

KATRINA TAX RELIEF

In the House bill, unbelievably, there are no tax benefits for areas affected by last year's devastating hurricanes; Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. The Senate version of this bill contains language similar to language Congress already passed, providing a few billion dollars over the next 2 years. The economy of the gulf coast has been set back decades, and it is going to take years to rebuild. Congress should provide even more supportive tax laws for the region so that both businesses and individuals can get themselves back on their feet. I again urge the conferees to include language further providing tax relief to the areas affected by last year's hurricanes.

MISGUIDED PRIORITIES

Last month, Republicans in Congress couldn't find the money to spare the elderly from Medicaid cuts, to spare the students from loan increases, or to spare our children from child care cuts. They can't seem to find the money to properly rebuild the gulf coast or get New Orleans back on its feet. They are having trouble finding this money because they are choosing to extend the dividend and capital gains tax cuts for the richest in our country. As such, they are making the choice to pass the burden of paying for these tax cuts on to our children in the form of a huge deficit.

This is NOT how we take care of our own in Texas, and this is not how we do things in the United States. The Republicans are launching an unabashed attack on the American way by ignoring the neediest in our country to give tax cuts to the richest.

DEMOCRATIC SUBSTITUTE

At the time of the last vote, the Democrats offered an amendment in the form of the substitute that is much more fiscally responsible

and equitable. The Democratic Substitute extended for one year all temporary tax provisions that expire at the end of this year, similar to the Majority's bill. The major difference, however, is that the Democratic substitute addresses the problem of the AMT by eliminating all liabilities for middle class individuals. Further, this \$45 billion provision would be fully offset by rolling back a portion of the tax cuts that would otherwise go to those with annual incomes of over \$1 million for joint returns and \$500,000 for other returns. I again urge the conferees to seek fiscally responsible options and point out that there are other options to alleviate tax burden on the middle and lower class without lining the pockets of the ultra-wealthy.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the priorities in the Republican bill are misguided. Congress should not be providing additional tax breaks for the rich less than a month after enacting huge spending cuts aimed at the most vulnerable. In the end, this tax bill will either exacerbate our already large Federal deficits, or will force even deeper cuts in critically important domestic programs. I am strongly opposed to this legislation in its current form, and I implore the conferees to seek more fiscally responsible options.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. 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 question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4297.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES

The Chair laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Financial Services:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 8, 2006.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: I hereby respectfully resign my seat on the Committee on Financial Services, effective immediately. Thank you for the opportunity to serve on this important committee.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING,
Member of Congress

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE CONFLICT IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-88)

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 International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with subsection 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b) (IEEPA), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1631 (NEA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire. In that order, I declared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by that conflict, as described below.

The United Nations Security Council, in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, expressed deep concern over the resumption of hostilities in Côte d'Ivoire, the public incitement of hatred and violence, and the repeated violations of the ceasefire agreement of May 3, 2003. United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1572 determined that the situation in Côte d'Ivoire poses a threat to international peace and security in the region and called on member States to take certain measures against persons responsible for the continuing conflict. The United Nations Security Council has continued to express serious concern at the persistence of the crisis in Côte d'Ivoire and of obstacles to the peace and national reconciliation process from all sides in UNSCRs 1643 of December 15, 2005, and 1652 of January 24, 2006.

Despite the intervention and efforts of the international community, there have been massacres of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and attacks against international peacekeeping forces in Côte d'Ivoire. Such activity includes the

killing of large numbers of civilians in Korhogo in June 2004, and in Abidjan in March 2004; significant violence and unrest, including public incitements to violence, in Abidjan in November 2004; human rights violations, including extrajudicial killings, in western Côte d'Ivoire in April and June 2005; attacks on a police station and prison in July 2005 in Anyama and Agboville, and violent protests in Abidjan and attacks on U.N. and international nongovernmental organization facilities in western Côte d'Ivoire in January 2006. Also, notwithstanding the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement signed by the Ivorian political forces on January 24, 2003, the related ceasefire agreement of May 3, 2003, the Accra III Agreement of July 30, 2004, the Pretoria Agreement of April 6, 2005, and the Declaration on the Implementation of the Pretoria Agreement of June 29, 2005, consolidating the implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis peace and national reconciliation process, Ivorian parties have continued to engage in military operations and attacks against peacekeeping forces in Côte d'Ivoire leading to fatalities.

Pursuant to the IEEPA and the NEA, I have determined that these actions and circumstances constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States and declared a national emergency to deal with that threat and have issued an Executive Order to deal with the threat to U.S. national security and foreign policy posed by the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire.

The order blocks the property and interests in property in the United States, or in the possession or control of United States persons, of the persons listed in the Annex to the order, as well as of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to constitute a threat to the peace and national reconciliation process in Côte d'Ivoire, such as by blocking the implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis, Accra III, and Pretoria Agreements; to be responsible for serious violations of international law in Côte d'Ivoire; to have directly or indirectly supplied, sold or transferred to Côte d'Ivoire arms or any related material or any assistance, advice, or training related to military activities; or to have publicly incited violence and hatred contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

The designation criteria will be applied in accordance with applicable domestic law, including where appropriate, the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The order also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to designate for blocking any person determined to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the ac-

tivities listed above or any person listed in or designated pursuant to the order. I further authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to designate for blocking any person determined to be owned or controlled by, or acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person listed in or designated pursuant to the order. The Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, is also authorized to remove any persons from the Annex to the order as circumstances warrant.

I delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, the authority to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by the IEEPA and the United Nations Participation Act, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All executive agencies are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

The order, a copy of which is enclosed, became effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern standard time on February 8, 2006.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 8, 2006.

2006 NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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 Education and the Workforce, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Committee on Government Reform, Committee on Homeland Security, Committee on International Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 2006 National Drug Control Strategy prepared by my Administration, consistent with the Office of National Drug Control Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1705).

Four years ago, my Administration issued its first National Drug Control Strategy. That Strategy set out an ambitious, balanced plan to reduce drug use in our Nation. Since 2001, drug use by 8th, 10th, and 12th graders has dropped by 19 percent, translating to nearly 700,000 fewer young people using drugs.

I appreciate the support the Congress has given for previous Strategies. I look forward to your continued support as we work together on this critical endeavor.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 8, 2006.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 670, de novo;

H. Res. 657, by the yeas and nays;

Motion to instruct on H.R. 4297, by the yeas and nays.

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

CONGRATULATING THE PITTSBURGH STEELERS FOR WINNING SUPER BOWL XL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 670.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 670.

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. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 0, answered “present” 10, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]
YEAS—384

Abercrombie	Bonner	Chandler
Aderholt	Boozman	Chocola
Akin	Boren	Clay
Alexander	Boswell	Cleaver
Allen	Boucher	Clyburn
Andrews	Boustany	Coble
Baca	Bradley (NH)	Cole (OK)
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Conaway
Baird	Brady (TX)	Conyers
Baker	Brown (OH)	Cooper
Baldwin	Brown (SC)	Cramer
Barrett (SC)	Brown, Corrine	Crenshaw
Barrow	Brown-Waite,	Crowley
Bartlett (MD)	Ginny	Cubin
Barton (TX)	Burgess	Cuellar
Bass	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Bean	Butterfield	Cummings
Beauprez	Calvert	Davis (AL)
Becerra	Camp (MI)	Davis (CA)
Berkley	Campbell (CA)	Davis (FL)
Berry	Cantor	Davis (IL)
Biggert	Capito	Davis (KY)
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Davis (TN)
Bishop (NY)	Cardin	Davis, Jo Ann
Bishop (UT)	Cardoza	Davis, Tom
Blackburn	Carmahan	Deal (GA)
Blunt	Carson	DeFazio
Boehlert	Carter	Delahunt
Boehner	Case	DeLauro
Bonilla	Castle	DeLay

Dent	Kline	Putnam
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Radanovich
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kolbe	Rahall
Dingell	Kucinich	Ramstad
Doggett	Kuhl (NY)	Rangel
Doolittle	Langevin	Regula
Drake	Lantos	Rehberg
Dreier	Larson (CT)	Reichert
Duncan	Latham	Renzi
Edwards	LaTourette	Reyes
Ehlers	Leach	Reynolds
Emanuel	Levin	Rogers (AL)
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Engel	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)
English (PA)	Linder	Rohrabacher
Eshoo	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
Etheridge	LoBiondo	Ross
Evans	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman
Farr	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Fattah	Lucas	Royce
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger
Ferguson	E.	Ryan (OH)
Filner	Lynch	Ryan (WI)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Mack	Ryun (KS)
Flake	Maloney	Sabo
Forbes	Manzullo	Salazar
Ford	Marchant	Sánchez, Linda
Fortenberry	Markey	T.
Fossella	Marshall	Sanchez, Loretta
Fox	Matheson	T.
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Sanders
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy	Saxton
Frelinghuysen	McCaul (TX)	Schakowsky
Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Schiff
Gerlach	McCrery	Schwartz (PA)
Gibbons	McGovern	Schwarz (MI)
Gillmor	McHenry	Scott (GA)
Gingrey	McHugh	Scott (VA)
Gohmert	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McKeon	Serrano
Gordon	McKinney	Sessions
Granger	McMorris	Shadegg
Graves	McNulty	Shays
Green (WI)	Meehan	Sherman
Green, Al	MEEK (FL)	Sherwood
Green, Gene	MEEKS (NY)	Shimkus
Grijalva	Melancon	Shuster
Gutierrez	Mica	Simmons
Gutknecht	Michaud	Skelton
Hall	Millender-	Smith (NJ)
Harman	McDonald	Smith (TX)
Harris	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hart	Miller (MI)	Snyder
Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)	Sodrel
Hayes	Miller, George	Solis
Hayworth	Mollohan	Souder
Hefley	Moore (KS)	Spratt
Hensarling	Moore (WI)	Stark
Herger	Moran (VA)	Stearns
Herseth	Murphy	Strickland
Higgins	Murtha	Sweeney
Hinojosa	Musgrave	Tancredo
Hobson	Myrick	Tanner
Hoekstra	Nadler	Tauscher
Holden	Napolitano	Taylor (MS)
Holt	Neal (MA)	Taylor (NC)
Honda	Neugebauer	Terry
Hostettler	Ney	Thomas
Hoyer	Northup	Thompson (CA)
Hulshof	Norwood	Thompson (MS)
Hunter	Nunes	Thornberry
Hyde	Nussle	Tiahrt
Inglis (SC)	Oberstar	Tiberi
Israel	Obey	Tierney
Issa	Oliver	Towns
Jackson (IL)	Ortiz	Turner
Jackson-Lee	Osborne	Udall (CO)
(TX)	Owens	Udall (NM)
Jefferson	Oxley	Upton
Jindal	Pallone	Van Hollen
Johnson (CT)	Pascrell	Velázquez
Johnson (IL)	Pastor	Walden (OR)
Johnson, E. B.	Paul	Walsh
Johnson, Sam	Payne	Wasserman
Jones (NC)	Pearce	Schultz
Jones (OH)	Pelosi	Waters
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Watson
Kaptur	Peterson (PA)	Watt
Keller	Petri	Weiner
Kelly	Pickering	Weldon (FL)
Kennedy (MN)	Pitts	Weldon (PA)
Kennedy (RI)	Platts	Weller
Kildee	Poe	Westmoreland
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pomoy	Wexler
Kind	Porter	Whitfield
King (IA)	Price (GA)	Wicker
King (NY)	Price (NC)	Wilson (NM)
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	
Kirk		

Wilson (SC)	Wu	Young (AK)
Wolf	Wynn	Young (FL)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—10

Chabot	Larsen (WA)	Schmidt
Dicks	McDermott	Simpson
Hastings (WA)	Otter	
Inslee	Pence	

NOT VOTING—38

Ackerman	Everett	McCollum (MN)
Berman	Foley	Miller, Gary
Bilirakis	Gallegly	Moran (KS)
Blumenauer	Gilchrest	Rush
Bono	Gonzalez	Shaw
Boyd	Goode	Slaughter
Buyer	Hinchee	Stupak
Cannon	Hookey	Sullivan
Capps	Istook	Visclosky
Costa	Jenkins	Wamp
Costello	LaHood	Waxman
DeGette	Lee	Woolsey
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	

□ 1853

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

Mr. SIMPSON changed his vote from “nay” to “present.”

Mr. INSLEE changed his vote from “yea” to “present.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 5. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS
OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 657.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 657, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 0, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]
YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Biggert	Brown-Waite,
Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Akin	Bishop (NY)	Burgess
Alexander	Bishop (UT)	Burton (IN)
Allen	Blackburn	Butterfield
Andrews	Blunt	Buyer
Baca	Boehlert	Calvert
Bachus	Boehner	Camp (MI)
Baird	Bonilla	Campbell (CA)
Baker	Bonner	Cantor
Baldwin	Boozman	Capito
Barrett (SC)	Boren	Capuano
Barrow	Boswell	Cardin
Bartlett (MD)	Boucher	Cardoza
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Carnahan
Bass	Bradley (NH)	Carson
Bean	Brady (PA)	Carter
Beauprez	Brady (TX)	Case
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Castle
Berkley	Brown (SC)	Chabot
Berry	Brown, Corrine	Chandler

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

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

Moran (KS)
 Peterson (MN)
 Rush
 Shaw
 Slaughter
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Visclosky
 Wamp
 Waxman
 Wolf
 Woolsey

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. NEAL OF MASSACHUSETTS

The SPEAKER. The pending business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 4297 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will designate the motion. The Clerk designated the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 207, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—185

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Allen	Hersth	Owens
Andrews	Higgins	Pallone
Baca	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Baird	Holden	Pastor
Baldwin	Holt	Payne
Barrow	Hoyer	Pelosi
Becerra	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Israel	Pomeroy
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	(TX)	Rangel
Boehlert	Jefferson	Reyes
Boswell	Johnson, E. B.	Ross
Boucher	Jones (OH)	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Ruppberger
Brown, Corrine	Kennedy (RI)	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	Kildee	Sabo
Capuano	Kilpatrick (MI)	Salazar
Cardin	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Kucinich	T.
Carnahan	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson	Lantos	Sanders
Case	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Chandler	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Clay	Leach	Schwartz (PA)
Cleaver	Levin	Scott (GA)
Clyburn	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Cooper	Lowey	Sherman
Crowley	Lynch	Shuster
Cuellar	Maloney	Skelton
Cummings	Markey	Smith (WA)
Davis (AL)	Marshall	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Solis
Davis (FL)	Matsui	Spratt
Davis (IL)	McCarthy	Stark
Davis (TN)	McDermott	Strickland
DeFazio	McGovern	Tanner
Delahunt	McIntyre	Tauscher
DeLauro	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Emanuel	Melancon	Udall (CO)
Emerson	Michaud	Udall (NM)
Engel	Millender	Upton
Eshoo	McDonald	Van Hollen
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Evans	Miller, George	Wasserman
Farr	Mollohan	Schultz
Fattah	Moore (KS)	Waters
Filner	Moore (WI)	Watson
Ford	Moran (VA)	Watt
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Weiner
Gordon	Nadler	Weldon (PA)
Green, Al	Napolitano	Wexler
Green, Gene	Neal (MA)	Whitfield
Grijalva	Oberstar	Wilson (NM)
Gutierrez	Obey	Wu
Harman	Oliver	Wynn

NAYS—207

Aderholt	Barton (TX)	Blunt
Akin	Bass	Boehner
Alexander	Bean	Bonilla
Bachus	Beauprez	Bonner
Baker	Biggett	Boozman
Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)	Boren
Bartlett (MD)	Blackburn	Boustany

NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman	Galleghy	Moran (KS)
Berman	Gilchrest	Peterson (MN)
Bilirakis	Gonzalez	Rush
Blumenauer	Goode	Shaw
Bono	Harman	Slaughter
Boyd	Hinchey	Stupak
Cannon	Hooley	Sullivan
Capps	Istook	Visclosky
Costa	Jenkins	Wamp
Costello	LaHood	Waxman
DeGette	Lee	Wolf
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Woolsey
Everett	McCollum (MN)	
Foley	Miller, Gary	

□ 1904

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) 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.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed roll-call vote 6. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

MAJORITY LEADER

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Conference, I am directed by that conference to notify the House officially that the Republican Members have selected as Majority Leader the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER.

MAJORITY LEADER OF THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleagues for their support and for this big job, and it is a big job.

I think all of the Members who I have worked with over the years know how I operate. I am a Republican. I believe in Republican principles. But this is the people's House. It is to represent all of the people. And while I want my party to win every day, I want us to win fairly and honestly. And so I will say to all of you, I am going to do my best for the people's House. You may not agree with every decision we make every day, but I think all of you know in the marrow of my bones I believe in fairness.

As I have said before, when you have 11 brothers and sisters and your dad owned a bar, you have learned a lot of lessons along the way.

Bradley (NH)	Hayes	Pearce
Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Pence
Brown (SC)	Hefley	Peterson (PA)
Brown-Waite,	Hensarling	Petri
Ginny	Herger	Pickering
Burgess	Hobson	Pitts
Burton (IN)	Hoekstra	Platts
Buyer	Hostettler	Poe
Calvert	Hulshof	Pombo
Camp (MI)	Hunter	Porter
Campbell (CA)	Hyde	Price (GA)
Cantor	Inglis (SC)	Pryce (OH)
Capito	Issa	Putnam
Carter	Jindal	Radanovich
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Ramstad
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Regula
Chocola	Johnson, Sam	Rehberg
Coble	Jones (NC)	Reichert
Cole (OK)	Keller	Renzi
Conaway	Kelly	Reynolds
Cramer	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (AL)
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Cubin	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Culberson	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Davis (KY)	Kirk	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Jo Ann	Kline	Royce
Davis, Tom	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Deal (GA)	Kolbe	Ryun (KS)
DeLay	Kuhl (NY)	Saxton
Dent	Latham	Schmidt
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourrette	Schwarz (MI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Drake	Linder	Shadegg
Dreier	LoBiondo	Shays
Duncan	Lucas	Sherwood
Ehlers	Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus
English (PA)	E.	Simmons
Feeney	Mack	Simpson
Ferguson	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Flake	McCaul (TX)	Sodrel
Forbes	McCotter	Souder
Fortenberry	McCrery	Stearns
Fossella	McHenry	Sweeney
Fox	McHugh	Tancredo
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Terry
Garrett (NJ)	Mica	Thomas
Gerlach	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Gibbons	Miller (MI)	Tiahrt
Gillmor	Murphy	Tiberi
Gingrey	Musgrave	Turner
Gohmert	Myrick	Walden (OR)
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Walsh
Granger	Ney	Weldo (FL)
Graves	Northup	Weller
Green (WI)	Norwood	Westmoreland
Gutknecht	Nunes	Wicker
Hall	Nussle	Wilson (SC)
Harris	Otter	Young (AK)
Hart	Oxley	Young (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Paul	

NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman	Galleghy	Moran (KS)
Berman	Gilchrest	Osborne
Billirakis	Gonzalez	Rush
Blumenauer	Goode	Shaw
Bono	Hinchey	Slaughter
Boyd	Honda	Stupak
Cannon	Hooley	Sullivan
Capps	Istook	Visclosky
Costa	Jenkins	Wamp
Costello	LaHood	Waxman
DeGette	Lee	Wolf
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Woolsey
Everett	McColum (MN)	
Foley	Miller, Gary	

□ 1924

Mr. GRAVES and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed roll-call vote 7. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, McCRERY, CAMP of Michigan, RANGEL, and STARK.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 671) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 671

Resolved, That the following Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. DeLay to rank after Mr. Wolf.

Committee on the Budget: Mr. Campbell of California.

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Mr. Blunt to rank after Mr. Fossella.

Committee on Financial Services: Mr. Campbell of California.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Campbell of California.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

A CALL FOR RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE AND PEACE IN THE WORLD

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have values in this country. We believe in the First Amendment that appreciates and celebrates freedom of the press and freedom of speech and freedom of religion and freedom of association. But it is important to note that with all of the trauma that we are experiencing around the world there should be something called religious appreciation.

I do understand that the Danish Government believes that the First Amendment is prime and a priority, but I also believe there is something for the government to say to the Muslim world, and that is that we do not

condemn a religion that we do not understand and that we do have religious tolerance and religious appreciation. I call for tolerance and peace.

I ask those who have expressed themselves in violence to find other ways of expressing their opposition to the characterization of their religion through cartoons. I, too, find it to be an outrage, and I offer a sense of sympathy and appreciation for the dignity of the Muslim religion, of Islam. Because Islam is not terrorism, as the President of the United States has said.

So I hope that we will find a way and the Danish Government will find a way to not stand only on the principles of freedom of press, but that they will stand on the principle of religious tolerance, religious appreciation and respect. As we respect all faiths of this Nation, we should likewise respect the faiths of the many peoples of the world.

PROPOSAL TO CUT DEATH BENEFIT UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed a few minutes ago to have the Office of Management and Budget Director tell me in a committee hearing that the administration is eliminating the \$255 death benefit available to widows and widowers under Social Security as a part of its great budget savings; justified, he told me, because that death benefit is anachronistic, to use his term.

Well, as far as I know, death is still occurring across America. There are poor widows and widowers for whom \$255 is an important contribution toward the cost of a burial. The fault has been in not keeping that \$255 benefit with the purchasing power it had for a widow or widower in the 1950s.

A benefit that goes back to 1939 under Social Security is one of the benefits that the President and this Republican Congress in their budget propose now to eliminate. It is wrong and I hope this House will reject this unfortunate move.

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). 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.

MILITARY CHAPLAINS SHOULD BE ABLE TO PRAY ACCORDING TO THEIR FAITH

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have read reports, received letters, and seen

documentation which verifies that suppression of religious freedom throughout our Armed Forces is a pervasive problem, affecting military chaplains from all denominations and religions.

Of particular concern is an incident involving Army Captain Chaplain Jonathan Stertzbach. This chaplain who is serving our troops in harm's way in Iraq was asked by another unit, whose chaplain had to return home to start chemotherapy after cancer was discovered, to serve the spiritual needs of the unit's soldiers in weekly movement to an undisclosed FOB (Forward Operating Base). During a mission, tragically, one of the soldiers was killed in action. The unit's Commanding Officer asked this chaplain to perform the memorial ceremony because he had bravely served the soldiers and risked his own life.

Before the memorial ceremony, the chaplain submitted two prayers for review. The Brigade Chaplain attempted to remove the chaplain from praying at the memorial ceremony because he concluded his prayer in the name of Jesus Christ. The chaplain, adhering to his conscience and faith tradition, said he would not strike the words Jesus Christ.

The unit's Commanding Officer intervened, explaining that Chaplain Stertzbach volunteered to serve a different unit outside of his assigned unit and placed his life in harm's way to provide for the needs of the unit's soldiers. The Commanding Officer instructed that Chaplain Stertzbach would pray according to his faith tradition.

After the incident, Chaplain Stertzbach's story reached the media. Consequently, his answers to the media and the incident surrounding the memorial ceremony resulted in Chaplain Stertzbach's removal from his chapel. This is unacceptable!

Since the beginning of our nation's military, chaplains have played an integral role, fulfilling the spiritual and emotional needs of the brave men and women who serve—and they have always prayed according to their faith tradition. It is in the best interest of our Armed Services and this nation to guarantee the constitutional right of military chaplains to pray according to their faith.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2006.

LTG STANLEY E. GREEN,
Department of the Army, The Inspector General,
Army Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR LTG STANLEY GREEN: It has come to my attention that in all branches of the military it is increasingly difficult for chaplains to pray in adherence to their faith. I have read reports, received letters, and seen documentation which verifies that suppression of religious freedom throughout our Armed Forces is a pervasive problem, affecting military chaplains from all denominations and religions. Of particular concern is an incident involving Army Captain Chaplain Jonathan Stertzbach of the 3-6 FA HHB in Iraq. I am writing to request that the Army Inspector General investigate whether Chaplain Stertzbach was illegally removed from his chapel.

This chaplain who is serving our troops in harm's way in Iraq was asked by another unit, whose chaplain had to return home to start chemotherapy after cancer was discovered, to serve the spiritual needs of the unit's soldiers in weekly movement to an undisclosed FOB (Forward Operating Base) as well as his own battalion. During one of the missions, tragically, one of the soldiers was

killed in action. The unit's Commanding Officer asked this chaplain to perform the Memorial Ceremony because he had bravely served the soldiers, and gone to the risk of conveying to the FOB (Forward Operating Base) weekly.

Before the Memorial Ceremony, the chaplain submitted two prayers and a meditation for the Division Chaplain and his direct supervising chaplain to review and was approved. The Brigade Chaplain, having just arrived from Fort Drum, attempted to remove the chaplain from administering the prayers of the Memorial Ceremony because he concluded his prayer in the name of Jesus Christ in a public forum. The chaplain, adhering to his conscience and faith tradition, said he would not strike the words Jesus Christ.

The unit's Commanding Officer intervened, explaining that Chaplain Stertzbach volunteered to serve a different unit outside of his assigned unit and placed his life in harm's way to provide for the needs of the unit's soldiers. The Commanding Officer instructed that Chaplain Stertzbach would pray according to his faith tradition and the prayers that he had already submitted. The Brigade Chaplain told him to qualify his prayer at the beginning with "Please pray according to your faith tradition, as I pray according to mine" and then close the prayer with "in thy name we pray, and in Jesus' name I pray." Chaplain Stertzbach delivered the Memorial Meditation and prayers for the fallen hero, but still followed orders with the "qualifier" remaining in place.

After the incident, Chaplain Stertzbach's story reached the media. The chaplain was directly contacted by the Washington Times and referenced in a Washington Times January story. Chaplain Stertzbach's incident was not printed, but he was quoted as saying the following:

"You need to allow people to pray according to their faith group. Many faith groups do not pray in general and generic terms. . . . For Christian groups, the name of Jesus is from where all the power comes."

I believe Chaplain Stertzbach answered questions fairly, accurately, and within his legal rights. Consequently, his answers to the media and the incident surrounding the memorial ceremony resulted in Chaplain Stertzbach's removal from his chapel.

I am concerned that Chaplain Stertzbach was removed without justification. Again, I am requesting that you investigate this incident and provide an explanation.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,
Member of Congress.

REMEMBERING STAFF SERGEANT MICHAEL DURBIN

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, he was buried yesterday in the National Cemetery in Houston, Texas. Monday I met with his parents, Jerry and Teresa, in their home in Humble, Texas, and I am talking about Army Staff Sergeant Michael Durbin. He was born on July 6, 1979, in Houston, Texas. He grew up in Spring, Texas, and attended Nimitz High School where he earned the nickname "Iceman." He excelled in sports and was the quarterback on the football team. He also ran track and played on the baseball team. He was the oldest of five kids, and his father said, "When he

entered a room, he drew everyone's attention."

He attended Kingwood College before deciding to enlist in the Army in 2001 at the age of 21. His goal in life was to someday work for the CIA, and he enlisted in the hopes that the military would be a quick route toward that goal.

He met his wife Janelle while working together at a Houston computer store. They were married in 2001 and had a son Austin and a daughter Alyssa together. By the age of 26, Michael had already become staff sergeant in an air assault unit, and had bold aspirations of becoming a member of the elite and daring Delta Force.

Staff Sergeant Durbin had already served two tours of duty in the Middle East and was deployed for his third tour of duty in September 2005. Family members said he lived to serve his country, and 2 weeks ago during combat operations in Baghdad, Michael became the 194th Texan killed since the start of the war. He was killed when a homemade bomb exploded while he was on patrol. Michael was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team of the 101st Airborne Division, Fort Campbell, Kentucky. By the way, Mr. Speaker, 1 out of every 10 Americans wearing the uniform tonight is from the State of Texas.

I have a photograph of Staff Sergeant Michael Durbin taken shortly before he received another stripe on his left sleeve. Several days before he was killed in Iraq, he sent his wife Janelle a bouquet of flowers, and she talked with him the morning he died. He called her to tell her that he was leaving for a mission, and he loved her and would be back in a few days. He loved playing with his kids and being in love with his wife. They would have celebrated their fifth wedding anniversary next month.

Michael will be remembered by his family and friends for his passion for computers. He was a gifted artist with a special talent for original cartoon characters and superheroes. He actually designed his platoon's boot camp T-shirt when he entered the Army.

With his entire life before him, and his aspirations to serve Americans, Michael risked everything to fight for the values and freedoms we as Americans enjoy this day and every day. He was fighting so the Iraqis can enjoy these freedoms as well.

With the death of Michael Durbin, this Nation lost a freedom fighter, a loving father, and, as his dad said, a perfect son.

I would like to extend my prayers and condolences to his parents, Jerry and Teresa; to his family, relatives and friends in Spring, Texas, and Fort Campbell, Kentucky; his wife Janelle; and his children Alyssa, Austin and Hayley. Michael touched the lives of many people in his 26 years, and our hearts are filled with gratitude for brave soldiers like Staff Sergeant Michael Durbin.

In the words of country singer Randy Travis in his song "America Will Always Stand," he sings the following lyrics about the American soldier: "Walking through the fires of danger, there are those who gave their lives. They're the world's greatest heroes, and we won't forget their sacrifice. So raise the banner called Old Glory. Let us join our fellow man. History will tell this story, America will always stand."

Mr. Speaker, history will tell the story of all the brave soldiers like Staff Sergeant Michael Durbin who walked through the fires of danger for freedom for Americans.

That's just the way it is.

SRI LANKA PEACE PROCESS RESOLUTION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to ask that my colleagues join me in supporting a resolution I introduced today that urges the Government of Sri Lanka and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam to engage positively in peace talks. I am deeply concerned about the ongoing violence caused by terrorism in Sri Lanka. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil, also known as the Tamil Tigers, is a group designated by the United States State Department as a terrorist organization. I hope this body can express its disapproval of the violence and instead voice full support for the resumption of constructive peace talks between both sides.

For over two decades, there has been armed strife between the Government of Sri Lanka and the Tamil Tigers, costing an estimated 65,000 lives. In a breakthrough agreement brokered by Norway back in 2002, the Government of Sri Lanka and the Tamil Tigers signed a cease-fire. Unfortunately, the Tamil Tigers have committed a number of violations, and the peace process has broken down.

On August 12, 2005, Sri Lanka's Foreign Minister was brutally assassinated by a sniper, and it has been widely acknowledged that the LTTE members had targeted him for some time. Though LTTE has denied any involvement, past history demonstrates that the group never claims responsibility for their crimes. There is now clear evidence, for example, that the Tamil Tigers ordered assassinations of India's Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, President R. Premadasa, and others. These patterns indicate that the Tamil Tigers were likely involved in Mr. Kadirgamar's assassination.

In addition to the death of Sri Lanka's Foreign Minister, the Sri Lanka Monitoring Mission has recorded over 3,000 violations of the cease-fire agreement by the Tamil Tigers. These violations include assassinations and abductions, particularly

the forcible abduction of children for armed combat and kidnapping individuals for ransom.

This past December marked the bloodiest month since the cease-fire agreement came into effect in 2002. Nearly 70 people, about 40 of them from the Sri Lanka Army and Navy, have been killed as a result of the Tamil Tigers' guerilla actions. The Tamil Tigers continue to follow their past policy of denying any responsibility for these actions.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the U.S. continue to reject the actions and violent tactics of the Tamil Tigers and apply international pressure to request that they begin conducting themselves in a responsible and credible manner. We must insist that the Tamil Tigers demonstrate a willingness to change, abstain from violence, and establish their commitment to the peace process.

The recent pledge to continue peace talks in February in Geneva, Switzerland, is encouraging, but it must include positive engagement by both parties. It is necessary that the Government of Sri Lanka and the Tamil Tigers renegotiate a cease-fire agreement and implement the agreement in a productive and successful manner so the hostilities do not resume. Without progress at the negotiating table, there is a real threat of another armed conflict.

Mr. Speaker, Sri Lanka is Asia's oldest democracy and remains a close friend of the United States. As the founder and current cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Sri Lanka, I encourage the Bush administration to take the steps necessary to support Sri Lanka during these trying times and continue to strengthen ties between the United States and Sri Lanka.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in cosponsoring this resolution. Congress must convey the importance of a constructive peace process and urge both parties to cooperate in good faith in order to find a fair and lasting resolution to Sri Lanka's armed conflict. It is time we ensure peace in Sri Lanka as well as greater stability throughout the South Asia region.

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.)

URGING RELEASE OF DR. GONZALEZ-MEJIAS AND DR. DARIAS-MESA

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a great humanitarian injustice facing two Cuban refugee doctors and their families.

On April 10, 2002, Dr. David Gonzalez-Mejias and Dr. Marialis Darias-Mesa were notified by the U.S. Government that they had been awarded documents that would allow them to immigrate to America and begin a new life in freedom.

Unfortunately, the Cuban Government denied these doctors permission to leave Cuba with their spouses and children. They were told because they were doctors, they would have to remain in Cuba for another 3 years. However, their families were permitted to leave and now reside in Florida.

Three years later, in April 2005, the doctors again sought permission to leave Cuba. That permission was once again denied, and they were told they would have to remain in Cuba. Fearing the Castro regime would continue to block their exodus to freedom and reunification with their families, the doctors copied their original United States parole papers and made a desperate attempt to escape tyranny.

While on a boat fleeing Cuba, they were picked up by the United States Coast Guard and turned over to the Bahamian Government along with 17 other Cuban nationals at Cay Sal in the Bahamas. Unlike the other refugees, Dr. Gonzalez-Mejias and Dr. Darias-Mesa had been awarded an authorization for parole of an alien allowing them to enter the United States, and they should not have been turned over to the Bahamian Government. But they were, and since then they have been detained in the Bahamas in deplorable conditions.

Since June, the United States Government has actively sought the release of the doctors to U.S. custody and to prevent their repatriation to Cuba. However, despite numerous official requests for their release and meetings between our governments, including a meeting I had with the Bahamian Ambassador to the United States, the Bahamian Government continues to debate, deliberate and drag its feet about releasing these doctors to our custody.

Mr. Speaker, the time is past due for the Bahamian Government to release these doctors to the United States. Our two countries have always enjoyed strong relations, and we all want that friendship to continue without question or concern. But in this matter, the Bahamian Government is not acting as friends should. They are denying liberty to two refugees who were awarded freedom by the United States.

This past weekend I spent nearly 2 hours with the families of these doctors. I was moved by their incredible strength and faith that their family would one day be reunited. I was also

saddened by their long and needless separation, and outraged by the course of events that have torn their lives apart.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Bahamian Government in the strongest possible terms to release Dr. Gonzalez-Mejias and Dr. Darias-Mesa to our custody, and I hope my colleagues will join me in this important humanitarian endeavor.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET HURTS PEOPLE

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, this administration will go down as the most antilife in modern history. The President's budget is a moral document. It should promote life. Yet the President's new budget released Monday makes the wrong choices. It irresponsibly hurts future generations and saddles them with gigantic debt. It hurts them, it hurts people. It is irresponsible.

Let us start with health care. The President's budget will hurt people. It is a health care budget that is antilife. The Bush budget carves out over \$36 billion through 2011 from Medicare. Despite the fact that people cannot afford prescription drugs and costs are exploding, why is he forcing across-the-board cuts to future Medicare payments?

The chaos surrounding the new prescription drug benefit has already caused undue anxiety and lack of medication to thousands of our citizens too sick and too ill to fight back in lines at drugstores around our country. Seniors 80 years old with Parkinson's disease are being forced to go into drugstores confused without the help that they need. The President's budget is antilife.

At the same time, the President's new budget slashes our lead agencies to fight disease. They shortchange veterans' health care. Apparently, the Bush administration's idea of honoring service to our country is to make millions of veterans pay huge increases for health care costs that they have earned.

□ 1945

The President's budget proposal includes legislation that would raise veterans' premiums to over 100 percent on prescription drugs. Additionally, the Bush administration has shortchanged the Department of Veterans Affairs, leaving it short of needed funds to take care of the expected influx of tens of thousands of injured and disabled veterans returning from Afghanistan and the Iraq war. His veterans budget is anti-life.

The Bush budget offers words only and no substance to thrust our Nation into a new era of energy independence. For hard-hit consumers, he has offered

nothing. His policies, however, allow the huge oil giants to rack up even more profits. Take ExxonMobil that just racked up the largest profit of any corporation in U.S. history, \$36 billion in profits in just 1 year. Their profits in 1 year were larger than the entire budget of the U.S. Department of Energy. It is interesting to note that Exxon's windfall lifted the combined profits of the 2005 oil giants to \$63 billion, three times the size of the entire Department of Energy. His energy budget is anti-life.

There are people freezing and getting flu around this country because they have to set their thermostats down. His budget is anti-life. He refuses to see those people.

If the President was serious about helping people, he would be committed to making our Nation energy independent. He would have made new fuels a centerpiece of his State of the Union address. Instead, his budget eliminates all funding for new fuels to help expand the production of ethanol and biodiesel. His budget cuts renewable energy loans, bioenergy support value-added to help small companies get a start up. By almost \$100 million he shortchanges them.

And yet if we look at oil company profits, they have allowed CEOs in those firms to double their salaries and drive up their political contributions by a staggering \$450 million in the past 6 years. They know how to cash in. But what a great injustice to the vast majority of people. Their heating bills are going up. They are paying for gasoline. They do not have any sweetheart deals in this town to cut their taxes.

If you look at the weatherization program, the President is reducing funds there. If you look at the winter heating assistance program, the people applying have reached a 12-year high, but his budget is over \$2 billion short, \$2 billion short of what is needed just to take care of the people that we needed to take care of last year. But the oil companies have a \$63 billion profit, just the top three companies. What is wrong with this picture?

He has cut first responders. We know he has not gotten help to people affected by Katrina and Rita in the gulf.

And this says nothing about how his budget is anti-life against the youth of our country and children by causing tuition to go up at all of our schools. The Bush budget fails the moral test. It fails the ill. It fails our youth. It fails the future. It is the most anti-life budget in American history.

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

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

IN HONOR OF THE BIRTHDAY OF MRS. HELEN GINGREY

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take my time this evening to address the House regarding a very important person, someone who has meant so much to me and without whom I could not be here today. Mrs. Helen Gingrey turned 88 today, February 8, 2006. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, along with all Members of this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats, will want to join me in wishing Mom a happy birthday.

It is important in this day and age for children to grow up in a strong family environment like the one my parents provided for me. And I would hope that as I continue my time in the United States House of Representatives representing the people of Georgia's 11th Congressional District, that my colleagues and I would always keep an eye on how our actions will affect the American families who are struggling to raise their children and to make ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, my mother has had a great life and has been a blessing to both her community of Kalmia Landing and Aiken, South Carolina and her family. Helen Gannon Gingrey is the daughter of Irish and Scottish immigrants. She was born in New York. She grew up in Astoria, Queens before marrying my father and moving to Edgefield, South Carolina.

My father, James Franklin Gingrey, Jimmy, a native South Carolinian, had moved to New York as an impoverished 16-year-old with little means of support. Several years later he had the good fortune of meeting my mom while he was working his way through New York City night school, and they married 8 months later. Shortly thereafter, Mom and Dad headed south with my 3-month-old brother in tow. While neither of my parents had the opportunity to obtain a college education, they worked hard in several small family businesses to assure that each of their three sons, myself, my brothers, Bill and James, got that college education.

Mr. Speaker, my dad and my mother were married for 44 years until his death in 1980. The ideals my parents instilled in me are ones of hard work, good education, personal responsibility, respect for others, love of family and country, and love of God. These are not only good principles for rearing a child, but they are also good guidelines for the initiatives we will continue to work on here in this 109th Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to use the example and the principles of Mrs. Helen Gannon Gingrey

and all loving mothers like her to set an agenda that will work to strengthen and support the most vital components of our great Nation, the American family.

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

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

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak in the gentleman from California's place.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many of us want to join in wishing Mrs. Gingrey a happy birthday. And I guess we would say it is 8 o'clock, and she knows where her son is tonight at least.

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by the assault on freedom of expression that we are seeing in the world today. I want to be very clear. The newspaper in Denmark, the name of which I will not even try to pronounce, had every right to print the cartoon. That does not mean the cartoon was not offensive or disrespectful. Free speech, freedom of expression means nothing if it does not mean the right to be mean and disrespectful and obnoxious. It is easy to be for free speech when it is polite and civil and when you agree with it.

One of the dangers that comes to free speech are those who say, well, yes, we believe in freedom of speech, but it should be respectful. We believe in freedom of speech, but it has to be reined in. No it does not. Freedom of expression means that as long as you are speaking or writing, as long as you are not acting, you are free to exercise what you think you need to say, what you think you need to write. Now, people who are offended by that writing have every right in return to be very critical and, indeed, even to boycott the organ that printed it.

But we see something today that is terribly frightening that goes far beyond it. First of all, we see this extraordinarily disproportionate violent reaction. I am struck that in parts of the Middle East and elsewhere, people who were apparently not moved to action by death and destruction and murder and famine, are moved to violence because somebody printed a cartoon. The values of people who put a cartoon ahead of serious damage to individuals as a cause of outrage are seriously deficient.

But it is also wrong when people say they are going to put pressure on the entire nation of Denmark because it will not censor a newspaper. Again, people have a right to boycott the newspaper. People who exercise their free speech have to expect there might be a response. But what we are being told is that people are going to punish the entire nation of Denmark because that government will not censor a newspaper. That is a terrible threat to free speech. It would be a grave error for the country of Denmark to give in. When I read that people are going to boycott Danish goods, I am myself moved to try to go out and buy some Danish food. I wish some of it was not quite so fattening, from what I look at.

But we must repudiate the notion that it is legitimate to punish the government and the country of that government because it will not censor a newspaper. That is a terrible threat to free speech. It is a threat to free speech again when people defend the newspaper in such a halfhearted way or when people say, well, they should not have printed that, and we understand why people are doing this. And freedom of speech must be tempered by respect for the views of others. No, it must not.

And I speak as someone who has espoused that principle in a variety of categories. I am Jewish and I believe that the Nazis had a legal right to march in Skokie, as despicable as I thought that was, as much as I thought people ought to have expressed their disagreement. I am a patriotic American, but I would not vote to put you in prison if you burned the American flag. And I must say, let us have some consistency here. People who are for jailing those who disrespect the American flag seem to me ought to be thinking about what kind of reaction they are seeing now because people dishonored the prophet Mohammed.

There are people who put their religion ahead of their country. That is not necessarily an irrational or an immoral thing to do. Let us be very careful. And by the way, I think that newspapers in the Arab world have a legal right to print vicious anti-Semitic cartoons that deny the Holocaust, that talk about "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion."

Again, let us have some consistency here. The consistency ought to be this: people have a right to write or say whatever they wish. People who are offended by that writing or that speech are entitled to retaliate, nonviolently, but by boycotts, by criticism from the person who expresses it. But when we see this kind of violence, when it is suggested that a cartoon justifies violence, when people are halfhearted in condemning the violence, when we have people say that it is legitimate to punish a government, not for publishing a cartoon, but for failing to censor the publication of that cartoon, then free speech is in danger.

So I think it is very important for us to say that people may have whatever

view they have about the cartoon, but we must speak up against what is a growing systematic campaign of intimidation that will result in a diminution of those important freedoms.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NORTH CAROLINA SENATOR HAM HORTON

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week the State of North Carolina lost one of its finest citizens, North Carolina Senator Hamilton "Ham" Horton. I had the great privilege of serving with Ham for 10 years in the North Carolina senate. I considered him to be not only a great role model and mentor but a trusted friend.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Senator Ham Horton for leading a rich life of service to others. I rise in trepidation because Senator Horton was such a wonderful orator and my skills are so inferior to his in intellect and expression.

Hamilton Cowles Horton, Jr., was born in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, on August 6, 1931. He was the great-grandson of Calvin Josiah Cowles, who represented Wilkes County in the United States Congress and the great-grandson of William Woods Holden, who was the Governor of North Carolina following the War Between the States. Obviously, public service was in Ham's blood from the start.

Ham went on to receive his bachelor's and law degrees from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He served nine terms in the general assembly, one in the House, and the remainder in the State senate.

During his time in the general assembly, Ham gave impassioned and eloquent floor speeches on a wide range of topics. Whenever he took to the senate floor, Ham commanded the respect of everyone in his presence, Republicans and Democrats alike. I often said he was like E.F. Hutton: when he spoke, everyone listened. Ham had a strong sense of justice and doing what was right. He was an ardent supporter of the individual liberties bestowed by our Founding Fathers.

I will never forget when State inspectors tried to shut down a Winston-Salem market because it sold slices of country ham. Ham promptly introduced the Country Ham Preservation Act to exempt small markets from regulation on meat preparation. After all, he said, the only difference between tasting wine and tasting ham is that you spit out the wine and no one has been known to spit out the ham.

In all of my years in the senate, I have never seen a bill move so quickly. The senate passed the bill just 2 days after Ham filed it. Then the State House passed it the following day.

□ 2000

Ham had a gift of bringing people together, despite partisan differences, to

do what was best for our State. The North Carolina Senate Republican leader Phil Berger once said that Ham "harkened back to another age in the Senate, an age when there was debate that focused greatly on the merits of the issues rather than politics and personality." Likewise, the editorial page of the Winston Salem Journal wrote, "If only America could have more political leaders like Ham Horton. Smart, talented, intellectual, yet in touch with every man. A staunch conservative who saw liberals as his opponents, not his enemies. A man who understood that politics is the art of working with others . . . In an era of politicians who rage with anger, questioning the morality, patriotism, and goodness of those with whom they disagree, Horton never had a disagreeable thing to say to anyone. He just took their arguments apart the way a chef carves a turkey."

At Ham's funeral at Calvary Moravian Church last week, the Reverend Lane A. Sapp noted that Ham acknowledged his Lord with a life of unselfish service, whether he was "serving as someone's lawyer, representing his constituents in Raleigh, serving on a church board or agency, or helping someone in need." Ham cared about helping others more than he cared about helping himself. Despite his difficult fight with cancer, he recently asked his daughter Rosalie to drive him to Raleigh for a Senate committee meeting. When asked why he did not stay home and rest, Ham responded, "I took an oath to serve my constituents and I must fulfill it."

Reverend Sapp put it eloquently when he said, Ham Horton was a man who took to heart Jesus' parable of the talents, using the blessings given by God, not hiding or squandering them for his own use, but using his gifts in service to others, whether it was caring for his wife Evelyn and daughter Rosalie; serving his beloved Moravian Church, his Nation, or the State of North Carolina. Ham Horton was a good steward of all he had been given, and he never became too important that he forgot the call to humble service. In this he emulated his Master, who once told his quarreling disciples that "whoever would be great among you must be your servant," Matthew 20:26.

As I said, Ham was my mentor and someone for whom I had the utmost respect. Anytime I had the privilege to be with him, I went away as a better person because of him. He was a great calming influence on me, and I will miss his wise counsel more than I have words to express.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with Ham's wife Evelyn, and daughter Rosalie and his extended family. May God bless them and comfort them during this difficult time. The State of North Carolina is fortunate to have been served by Senator Hamilton Horton. He was truly a blessing to everyone whose life he touched, and there

were many. Ham Horton will be sorely missed.

FOLIC ACID AWARENESS

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, every year in the United States, thousands of babies are born with serious, preventable birth defects of the brain and spine.

Spina bifida, the most common neural tube defect, is the leading cause of childhood paralysis. Anencephaly, a neural tube defect of the brain, is always fatal.

To bring attention to this preventable tragedy, we highlighted National Folic Acid Awareness Week as part of January's National Birth Defects Prevention Month. Since we were not in session at the time, I will take this opportunity to focus on the public health significance of folic acid and the important role it plays in the prevention of these devastating neural tube birth defects.

The value of folic acid became clear in 1991 when absolute scientific evidence showed that a daily supplement of synthetic folic acid could prevent spina bifida and anencephaly in most pregnancies. In 1992, the finding led the United States Public Health Service to recommend that women, beginning at puberty and continuing through their childbearing years, take a daily dose of 400 micrograms of folic acid.

It was in response to the Public Health Service recommendation that I authored the Folic Acid Promotion and Birth Defects Prevention Act. This act authorized the CDC to develop programs to educate health professionals and the public about the importance of folic acid consumption. I am very pleased that this bill became law as part of the Children's Health Act of 2000.

The Food and Drug Administration also responded to the need to increase consumption in the general population by requiring the addition of folic acid to enriched grain products like bread and cereal. It is important to note, however, that new evidence has found that the current fortification level of grains is not adequate for full protection against birth defects. Nevertheless, over the past 10 years, our efforts have succeeded in increasing the consumption of folic acid. This has resulted in a considerable decline in the rate of spina bifida and anencephaly.

The fact remains, however, that last year approximately 3,000 babies in the United States were born with preventable neural tube defects. Recent studies show that despite our efforts, only 40 percent of women ages 18 to 45 take a daily vitamin with the recommended level of folic acid. And Latino women, who have almost double the likelihood of delivering a baby with a neural tube

defect, have the lowest reported folic acid consumption of any racial or ethnic group.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt we have considerable work ahead of us in order to adequately protect our newborn babies from preventable neural tube birth defects. It is therefore our duty and our obligation to, first, increase our efforts to inform all women of childbearing age of the essential role folic acid plays in protecting their babies from spina bifida and anencephaly; second, to increase the required concentration of folic acid in enriched grain products as recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics, the CDC, and the March of Dimes.

And, finally, it is our duty and our obligation to encourage manufacturers to fortify cornmeal products with amounts of folic acid that meet the FDA requirements. This recommendation is especially critical to our Latino communities, which consume large amounts of the unfortified corn flour sold in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we have the knowledge and the ability to prevent the majority of neural tube defects in this country. It will be a tragedy if we choose to ignore this compelling public health challenge.

I urge my colleagues to work with me in the 109th Congress to support policies that enrich our foods with sufficient folic acid and to strengthen CDC's national folic acid education campaign. By working together, we can and will save thousands of babies and families from the suffering and the pain of neural tube defects.

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S EPA BUDGET

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because I believe that working Americans deserve a Federal budget which is compassionate, decent, hopeful, and accountable to their needs. Yet the budget shortchanges many environmental programs designed to protect public health and improve our communities' quality of life. It cuts funding for environmental justice programs by 28 percent and cuts funding for clean water infrastructure by \$199 million. It also fails to address the more than \$300 billion gap in drinking water infrastructure, funds for brownfields cleanup and redevelopment at less than 20 percent of what Congress has authorized, and zeroes out funding to bring more green space to our communities.

These cuts, Mr. Speaker, have very real implications on the quality of our health and our communities. Let us first consider the 28 percent cut in funding for environmental justice. For decades minority and low-income communities have lived in close proximity to industrial zones, power plants, toxic waste sites. These are the communities

nationwide whose health and quality of life are negatively impacted most by environmental injustices. For example, 5.5 million Latinos live within a 10-mile radius of a power plant, and 68 percent of all African Americans live within 30 miles, the range where health impacts are most severe. Over 70 percent of all African Americans and Latinos live in counties that violate the Federal air pollution standards, compared to 58 percent for nonminorities.

The administration is allegedly committed to protecting low-income and minority communities; yet the budget is just one of several actions taken recently which puts this commitment in doubt. Last year the Bush administration proposed removing race and income as considerations of environmental justice. Removing these considerations, in my opinion, would significantly disadvantage those communities which are already disproportionately affected by environmental toxins and the least able to defend and empower themselves.

Most recently the Bush administration proposed changing toxic reporting requirements to benefit polluting industries at the expense of the health of this Nation's communities. In California, the State I represent, this would include nearly 60 ZIP codes, over half of which have at least 45 percent minority residents and large proportions of people living well below the poverty line.

This budget also shortchanges our water infrastructure and water providers. It cuts funding for the Clean Water Revolving Fund by \$199 million and funds safe drinking water infrastructure at 10 percent below last year's level. Yet our water infrastructure needs at least \$300 billion invested just to maintain current services.

President Bush's budget fails to adequately address the more than 119,000 confirmed releases at underground storage tanks, like the more than 1,000 in my congressional district alone, and that is in Los Angeles. In the interim the onerous burden of shoring up our water infrastructure and protecting supplies falls on our cities, our States, and ultimately the water providers.

The budget fails the one in four Americans that live within 4 miles of a Superfund site, including 10 million children under the age of 12. There are three such sites in my own community. In fact, EPA itself admitted publicly the serious problems facing Superfund site cleanup. On December 2, 2004, then Assistant Administrator Thomas Dunne noted: "For the last 3 years, we haven't started cleanup at some new sites. If we assume that EPA's budget will remain flat for the foreseeable future, construction funding could be delayed at more and more sites. Within a few years, unfunded cleanup work could total several hundred million dollars."

Yet President Bush's budget is \$100 million less than the request which was

made in 2004 and \$20 million less than the fiscal year 2005 request.

Ultimately, the budget forces our country to continue to fall behind in its commitment to clean water, further disadvantages environmental justice communities like the one I live in, and passes the buck to our States. The Bush administration is putting its own policies above science, above the needs of public health, the environment, and our communities, and yet this administration is not being held accountable. Not once in the last 6 years has the Bush administration defended its budget in front of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Not once. It is well past time for this administration to defend its policies on environmental justice, water infrastructure, brownfields, and Superfund sites, where failures such as these will be even more costly for our country.

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 Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. WYNN 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 New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of S. 1932.

□ 2015

THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California

(Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this Special Order this evening because in the past several weeks and months we have seen a wide range of public opinion polls, including one that came out just recently from ABC News and The Washington Post showing that an overwhelming majority of the American people believe that we have an economy that is, if not in recession, in deep, deep trouble. For some reason, there is a perception that the U.S. economy is in the tank.

Today, in the East Room of the White House, President Bush signed the budget reconciliation bill, the first time since 1997 the Congress tackled a measure to reduce by \$39 billion the so-called entitlement spending which goes on without interruption unless the Congress takes action, and we did so in this body. It took, unfortunately, only Republican votes in both the House and the Senate to do it, but we were able to rein in the spiraling increase in spending. More needs to be done, but we took that first step.

Today, in the East Room, as the President prepared to sign that measure, he began talking, Mr. Speaker, about the tremendous improvement that we have seen in our economy. We all know that everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but no one is entitled to their own facts. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to offer some prepared remarks about the state of our economy, the challenges that lie ahead, and the work that we have done and the work that we need to continue to do.

It was just last Tuesday night, a week ago last night, that President Bush stood right behind where I am here and addressed a joint session of Congress, delivering his State of the Union address. Since 1934, Presidents have delivered such a speech following the first of every year.

In much that same way that we Americans take stock every new year, assessing the present and looking forward to the future, the President came here to this Chamber to describe where we stand as a Nation and where his leadership will be focused in the coming year. President Bush spoke about the strength of our Nation, our economy, our troops, our resolve. He also spoke about the challenges we face, the war on terror, maintaining our leadership in the global economy; but despite these challenges, we face a very promising future.

As President Bush said, and I quote: "And so we move forward, optimistic about our country, faithful to its cause, and confident of the victories to come."

During the speech, Mr. Speaker, I was reminded of the optimism of Ronald Reagan when his Presidency began exactly 25 years ago last month. As my colleagues surely remember, pessimism in January of 1981 would have been

well-founded. Economic growth was erratic, inflation was out of control, unemployment was abysmally high, interest rates were soaring through the roof, and communism, as we all know, was a global menace. Violence and chaos were spreading throughout Central America, right in our own backyard, in this hemisphere. Yet, Mr. Speaker, President Reagan was optimistic because he believed in the American spirit.

In his inaugural address on January 20, 1981, again 25 years ago just this past month, he said, and I quote: "If we look for the answer as to why for so many years we achieved so much, prospered as no other people on Earth, it was because here in this land, we unleashed the energy and individual genius of man to a greater extent than has ever been done before."

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan knew that when Americans are freed from the burdens of an intrusive government and are empowered to work hard and achieve success, we prosper. That is why Ronald Reagan embarked on an 8-year crusade of cutting taxes, reducing burdensome regulation, and opening up new global opportunities through free trade.

When we look at everything that has been accomplished in the 25 years since Ronald Reagan spoke those words, we see clearly that he was right to be optimistic, to have faith in the American spirit. But while Ronald Reagan had little more to go on than that faith, today we do have facts.

If we take a look at all the indicators of the strength of our economy, it is clear that we face a very promising future. I would like to take the opportunity to review these positive indicators, examine the policies that got us here, refute our economic nay-sayers, and outline our path to an even brighter future.

As The Wall Street Journal recently reported, over the past 277 months, our economy has been in recession for only 15 of those 277 months. Ninety-five percent of the time our economy has been growing and creating wealth. The 25 years since Reagan's first inaugural address have brought us 43 million new jobs and \$23 trillion in new wealth. There can be no question that when Americans are not held back by government we fulfill our own best hopes for the future.

Today, with over 143 million Americans working, more than ever before in our history, it is very important to note that. Over 2 million payroll jobs were created last year, according to the payroll survey. The household survey demonstrated even stronger job growth than that, with over 2.6 million new jobs created in 2005 alone. This strong pace of job creation has resulted in an unemployment rate of 4.7 percent, the lowest rate in 4½ years, and below the average of the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s.

Not only are more Americans working than ever before, but more of our

fellow Americans own homes than ever before in our Nation's history. Greater household wealth and rising living standards have resulted in a homeownership rate of nearly 70 percent. These gains have been achieved across a broad demographic range, as minority homeownership is also at an all-time high of over 51 percent. Household income and wealth are at all-time highs. Household net worth grew 11 percent in the last year alone. Real hourly compensation is steadily rising. Real after-tax income has grown 7.2 percent since the 2003 tax cuts were put into place.

America's working families are experiencing greater prosperity, greater financial autonomy, and an ever-improving quality of life. Growth in gross domestic product, the broadest measure of economic strength, tells the same story.

The GDP grew at 3.5 percent in 2005, as the President pointed out today in the East Room of the White House. Despite a dip in the fourth-quarter growth, the annual rate was very strong, and analysts predict a growth rate as high as 4 percent or more in the first quarter of this year. This robust growth is responsible for tax revenues surging to their highest levels ever. Total tax receipts were up 12 percent in December as the Treasury Department announced the first monthly budget surplus in years.

Perhaps the most telling and significant indicator of our economy's strength is productivity growth. Since the end of 2001, the recession that existed in 2001, productivity has increased at the fastest rate since World War II. Averaging at a pace of 3.4 percent growth annually, workers are now over 17 percent more productive than they were in 2001. Let me say that again: productivity, one of the most important gauges of success, is up to the point where workers today are 17 percent more productive than they were just 5 years ago.

These numbers are so important because no factor is more critical to long-term sustainable growth and increasing standards of living than improved productivity. It is essential to maintaining steady creation of increasingly better paying, better quality jobs.

Let me continue in my presentation in which we are talking about the level of productivity which has surged in the past several years and is such an important, important gauge of the kind of economic success that we are enjoying.

It is amazing. Given the storms of our economy, what we have weathered since the stock market bubble burst back in 2000, this level of strength and vitality that we have seen in productivity is truly astounding. In order to give the numbers some additional context, I think it is very useful to compare our current economic circumstances with the same point in the previous business cycle just over a decade ago.

In April of 1995, we were 4 years out of the recession that existed in the

early 1990s, just as we are today 4 years out of this past recession. Mr. Speaker, by virtually every measure, our current expansion economy is stronger and more promising than the expansion economy of the spring of 1995.

Today, we have an unemployment rate of 4.7 percent, as I said earlier. In April of 1995, unemployment was more than a full percentage point higher at 5.8 percent. Furthermore, employment is stronger today across minority demographics.

The current unemployment rate for African Americans is 8.9 percent. In April of 1995, a little more than a decade ago as we were 4 years out of economic recession, this rate was at that point nearly two points higher for African Americans than it is today. It was 10.7 percent versus the 8.9 percent unemployment rate for African Americans today.

The improvement for Hispanics is even greater. Today, the unemployment rate for Hispanics is 5.8 percent. At this point during the last expansion, April of 1995, the rate was 8.9 percent. That is 8.9 percent Hispanic unemployment at that point. Today, Hispanic unemployment is at 5.8 percent, a difference of almost three full percentage points.

Clearly, minority workers, as well as the workforce at large, are facing a much brighter economic outlook. This pattern holds throughout nearly every major economic indicator.

The homeownership rate is nearly four points higher today than it was in April of 1995. Minority homeownership is 7.7 percentage points higher today than it was in 1995, as I say, at record levels of homeownership and minority homeownership. Annual growth in household net worth over the past year is nearly 3 points higher than it was.

Mr. Speaker, real hourly compensation is now growing at a rate of 1.2 percent versus an actual decline in April of 1995 of seven-tenths of 1 percent, that is, actually a decline took place 4 years out of the last economic recession that we reemerged from in the mid-1990s to today, real hourly compensation growing at 1.2 percent today.

Today, that all-important investor class, those who have investments, has grown to include 56.9 million American families as the stock ownership rate for Americans has risen to nearly 60 percent of all households, or 19 percentage points greater than it was in April of 1995. Again, that investor class, Democrats and Republicans, all the way across the economic spectrum, has grown dramatically. GDP growth is 1.3 percentage points higher than it was in April 1995, again, when we were 4 years out of economic recession.

Mr. Speaker, annual productivity growth, which is so fundamental, as I said earlier, to sustaining rising living standards is a staggering 10 times greater than it was at this same point in the previous expansion. The rate of

growth over the past 4 years at 3.4 percent is not only impressive for an expansion economy; it significantly outpaces historic rates.

□ 2030

From 1973 to 1995, productivity grew at 1.4 percent; 1973 to 1995, 1.4 percent. At that rate it would take 50 years to double the standard of living. But stronger growth has now put us on the path to double living standards twice as quickly as it did from that period of time between 1973 and 1995, that 22-year period.

We recently witnessed a symbolic reminder of the 1990s economy as the Dow Jones Industrial Average broke through the 11,000 mark on January 9, closing above 11,000, pierced a barrier that had not been surpassed since June of 2001 when our economy was several months into a decline that had become a recession.

And we obviously should not gauge the markets on a daily basis. Today we saw the Dow Jones Industrial Average up by over 100 points.

A great deal of fanfare accompanied the return of the stratospheric level of the late 1990s when the Dow hit 11,000. But this milestone was significant not only for the symbolism. Whereas what was called by Alan Greenspan, the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve, as irrational exuberance, it played a great deal in driving the Dow up to this level before, back in the 1990s, this time the Dow hitting 11,000, up 100 points today, as I said, was soundly grounded in sound economic and market principles.

Several years of strong, steady growth, rising incomes, more jobs, and a growing and increasingly prosperous investor class have led to sustainable gains in the stock market. We did not reach this level of economic strength by accident or by chance.

Many people talk about the cycle. I was listening to the radio this morning, and some people were saying, regardless of policies, we still see these surges take place in the economy, whether you have had tax increases or tax cuts. That is just plain wrong. Our economic strength is the direct and predictable result of an aggressive Republican agenda of progrowth policies, decreasing tax and regulatory burdens, expanding free trade and opening new markets around the world. Empowering entrepreneurs and small business owners to innovate, adapt and grow is critical to sustaining this kind of success.

These policies have created an environment that has increased the prosperity of Americans, created new opportunities, and brought about all of the positive economic news that I have discussed from job creation to home ownership. Perhaps the starkest illustration of cause and effect comes from those 2003 tax cuts.

The day the Senate passed those tax cuts, the Dow Jones Industrial Average was at 8,601. Again, the Dow was at

8,601 the day that the Senate passed those 2003 tax cuts. Today, as I have said, we have seen the Dow once again surpass 11,000, up 100 points today. It has remained close to that 11,000 mark.

During that time, the bull market propelled by our booming economy, since we put into place the 2003 cuts, has created \$5 trillion in new shareholder wealth. The total return to stock investors since the tax cuts were enacted has been 41.3 percent.

Now, remember, that is not simply the rich. With nearly 60 percent of American families now members of the investor class, the total return to stock investors since those 2003 tax cuts has been, as I said, 41.3 percent.

We have seen the same direct benefit to job creation. Following the 2001 recession, the payroll jobs number hit its lowest point the very month the 2003 tax cuts were enacted. Since that time our economy has added nearly 5 million new payroll jobs. And as I have already cited, real after-tax income has increased by 7.2 percent over that same period of time.

Furthermore, we accomplished all of this while increasing Federal tax revenues. Revenues to the Federal Treasury have increased as a byproduct of implementing those 2003 tax cuts. Total receipts in 2005 were up nearly 15 percent. In all, tax receipts for last year totaled \$2.2 trillion, the largest margin, the largest amount of revenues ever collected, ever collected in a 12-month period, \$2.2 trillion. And that has all happened since we put tax cuts into place.

And I remember vividly debating my colleagues on program after program when they would say that if we put into place these tax cuts, we would see the U.S. economy go right into the tank, and we would see a great reduction in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. The exact opposite is the case. In fact, tax receipts have been at record highs since last August when the previous 12-month record of \$2.1 trillion was broken.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us review. By every major economic indicator, our economy is booming. Gains are being made by the economy at large, and by individuals of all demographics. Across the board the American people are benefiting. Our economic strength is remarkable by any standard, but it is even more impressive when compared to the same point, as I said, that previous postexpansion period, in April of 1995, 4 years out of the economic recession. The markets are returning to their bubble-era levels, but this time these levels are solidly grounded, as I said, in real growth.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, all of those tremendous gains have been achieved through the Republican commitment to a progrowth agenda of lower taxes and greater economic freedom.

And yet incredibly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle deny this good economic news. I have listened to

the Special Orders that they have taken out here on the House floor, and I can understand if the American people simply listen to that message why they believe the economy is in the tank. And even more incredibly, they claim that our progrowth agenda is actually hurting our economy and bankrupting the Federal Treasury.

Now, it is one thing to predict failure at the outset. It is one thing to predict failure as they did when we were looking at implementing these tax cuts in 2001 and 2003. It is quite another to claim that our agenda has failed amid clear and overwhelming evidence of its success.

Mr. Speaker, our economy has recovered from the bursting stock market bubble, a recession, terrorist attacks, and corporate scandals. Our economy has weathered storms, literally and figuratively, such as Hurricane Katrina, high oil prices and stagnating growth that is existing for some of our trading partners in their economies.

Our economy, Mr. Speaker, has increased the prosperity of Americans, and all the while the rhetoric that we hear from the leadership on the Democratic side has remained constant. But we in the majority have worked, sometimes in a bipartisan way, but unfortunately not in concert with the Democratic leadership.

Well, we have worked to ensure everyone has the opportunity to pursue and potentially achieve the American dream. They have worked only to advance the myth of, you remember this line, two Americas. They have tried to instill that standard old but failed argument of us versus them, the class warfare mentality that disregards the truth, and tragically, Mr. Speaker, it greatly divides our country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when perpetuating this myth that only a privileged few have access to the American dream, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will frequently invoke the threat of outsourcing. Do you remember that word, outsourcing? You could not turn on cable television news without hearing that word outsourcing.

That is a term that you do not hear all that often anymore. Frankly, whenever they tried to explain away all of the positive economic news of the past few years, American jobs moving to places like China and India were usually held up as Exhibit A. They are still talking about it. They tell us of struggling plants such as the Paper Converting Machine Company in Green Bay, Wisconsin.

They tell us about how this company, PCMC, the Paper Converting Machine Company, and its workers faced some very, very difficult times. We are told that first the recession was bad for business, and then one of its biggest customers demanded drastically reduced prices, encouraging PCMC to outsource, to move production to China. And then when things could hardly get worse, PCMC was acquired by another company that cut workers

and cut pay. Throughout this whole process, sales for PCMC plummeted by 40 percent, and jobs were slashed from 2,000 American jobs to 1,100 jobs. Times were indeed very hard.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, what my Democratic colleagues, when they hold up that example of PCMC of Green Bay, Wisconsin, they do not tell the rest of the story. The story of PCMC does not end with lost jobs and plunging sales. They at PCMC had a strategy for reversing these losses and prospering once again, and it included the process of outsourcing to India.

They saw that they were losing orders because of the limits in their engineering department. So their chief engineer developed plans to utilize an engineering center in Chennai, India. Because U.S. and Indian engineers can now collaborate around the clock, PCMC has been able to expand their engineering services while making the whole process more cost-effective.

The result has been a strengthened U.S.-based company that continues to grow in Green Bay, Wisconsin. The CEO, Robert Chapman says and I quote, we can compete and create great American jobs, but not without offshoring or outsourcing.

This is the true story, Mr. Speaker, of the American economy. It is not a story of the haves and have-nots. It is not a story of doom and gloom. Mr. Speaker, the American economy thrives and grows, because when entrepreneurs face adversity, they have the freedom and flexibility to innovate, pursue new strategies and prosper. Allowing business owners to tap into the vast resources of the global economy is essential to our continued economic strength right here at home.

But you do not have to just take my word based on one anecdote of PCMC and their success. If all the positive economic data demonstrating the strength and vitality of the U.S. economy is not enough, the Information Technology Association of America, the ITAA, recently conducted a study on the direct impact of trade in services, otherwise known as offshoring or outsourcing. The study looked specifically at outsourcing in the IT field, the information technology field, and it found that trade in IT services is a clear net benefit for our economy. The new economic activity generated by increased trade in services ripples throughout the economy, creating jobs, boosting growth and increasing exports.

Specifically, this study that the ITAA did found that offshore outsourcing resulted in the creation of 257,000 net new jobs in 2005. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, because I realize it is counterintuitive. I was actually talking to the President today about this study, and I know that people have a difficult time understanding this. Offshoring, outsourcing, actually in 2005 created a net new job increase of 257,000 jobs, meaning if we had taken action here and somehow tried to stop

that, it would have cost 257,000 new jobs that were created right here. And more than 337,000 net new jobs are expected to be created within the next 5 years, just from this issue of outsourcing.

It is true that greater engagement in the global economy contributes to a considerable churn in our workforce and accelerates the rate of change. And I am not going to stand here and claim that there has been no American who has been detrimentally impacted from this change. But we all know that change is inevitable, and we also know that the net increase in jobs that has taken place because of so-called outsourcing or offshoring has been dramatic, in excess of a quarter of a million net new jobs created in the last calendar year alone.

□ 2045

But as we saw with the manufacturer in Green Bay, PCMC, it creates new opportunities for American workers and ultimately leads to stronger job growth right here at home. Again, remember, we have a 4.7 percent unemployment rate, Mr. Speaker. So all of those people who predicted that outsourcing was going to wipe out the U.S. economy have got to recognize that we have the lowest unemployment rate that we have had in 4½ years, lower than the average for the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s.

The study also demonstrates overall gains in economic growth. ITAA estimates that IT offshore outsourcing contributed an additional \$68.7 billion in real GDP growth in 2005; \$68.7 billion in real GDP growth right here in the United States of America because of so-called outsourcing, offshoring. Greater global engagement in IT services is expected to create another \$147.4 billion in real GDP growth by 2010, within the next 5 years, 4 years now I guess.

Exports are boosted as well, Mr. Speaker, with an additional \$5.1 billion in exports in 2005 and another \$9.7 billion predicted by 2010. Again, \$5.1 billion in new exports that have been a byproduct of policies that have included offshoring. These gains are an obvious and direct benefit to the workers who gain jobs and the business owners who boost both sales and revenue.

But the increased efficiencies and economic activities spread throughout the economy at large. These disbursed benefits, as I said to everyone, by lowering inflation, increasing productivity, and helping to keep interest rates low, the economic benefits of greater engagement impact every single one of us. We as Americans reap the benefits through higher wages, new opportunities, and rising living standards.

Opponents of open trade and a policy of global economic engagement paint outsourcing as an effort by, and you will recall this term that was used in the 2004 Presidential campaign, "Benedict Arnold CEOs" who supposedly ex-

plot cheap labor overseas while American workers are suffering. But as I discussed, Mr. Speaker, the empirical as well as the anecdotal evidence proves precisely the opposite. When American entrepreneurs are free to leverage all of the world's resources, the result is new and better opportunities for workers right here in the good old United States of America.

The benefits of being free to globally engage are just further demonstration of what has always been true of the American economy: our strength lies in our ability to innovate. Change has always been an inescapable part of the American economy. We have grown from an agrarian economy, as we all know, to an industrial economy, to what is today's 21st century high-tech Information Age economy. We prosper not because we have resisted change. We prosper because we have used change as an opportunity to innovate, to think creatively, to adapt, and to grow. Outsourcing simply presents a new opportunity for the United States to maintain its role as the world's leading innovator.

The cost savings of outsourcing have enabled businesses to remain competitive and have spurred new economic activity. But business analysts agree that the real power of outsourcing is in enabling companies to innovate and transform themselves. The new buzz word in the business world is "transformational outsourcing."

Business Week recently noted: "Many executives are discovering offshoring is really about corporate growth, making better use of skilled U.S. staff, and even job creation in the United States, not just cheap wages abroad." They go on to say: "True, the labor savings from global sourcing can still be substantial, but it's peanuts compared to the enormous gains in efficiency, productivity, quality and revenues that can be achieved by fully leveraging offshore talents." Meaning that we can take advantage right here at home of utilization of offshoring.

Mr. Speaker, outsourcing provides an opportunity for businesses to stage 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week operations. U.S. workers can collaborate with other skilled workers around the world. New solutions to old challenges can be explored. Limited resources can be shifted from routine low-tech processes to higher value-added activity. By tapping into all the resources the global economy offers, American entrepreneurs have the opportunity to revitalize struggling businesses, spur innovation, and develop new projects that would otherwise be impossible.

All of this potential has led many business analysts to believe that U.S. companies are on the cusp of a new burst of productivity, driven by this transformational outsourcing. We saw this worked for that manufacturing company that I have used as anecdotal evidence, PCMC, in Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Now let me go close to home for me. IndyMac Bancorp, Inc., which is a

Pasadena, California-based financial services company, is an example of a 21st-century services company that has made offshore outsourcing an integral part of its business model, and it is thriving.

Three years ago, IndyMac was the 22nd largest mortgage issuer in the United States. Today, Mr. Speaker, it is number nine and I believe moving up. IndyMac's consumer banking CEO credits its success in large part to their strategy of aggressive outsourcing. He has said that outsourcing has made IndyMac "more productive, cost efficient and flexible than our competitors with better consumer service."

Now, Mr. Speaker, by working with an Indian firm, IndyMac is developing new software platforms and applications that it expects will boost efficiency another 20 percent at least over the next 2 years. They have also moved 33 back-office functions offshore. Thirty-three of those back-office functions have moved offshore. And what has been the impact on job creation right here in the United States?

Mr. Speaker, by moving 33 of their operations offshore, IndyMac has doubled its American workforce to almost 6,000 in the past 4 years, and at this moment they continue to hire more Americans. All of this is possible because of the openness and flexibility of our wonderful U.S. economy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our goal as Republicans is to reduce the burdens on workers and business owners and increase their access to the global economy.

Now, I mention the fact that Democrats have assailed, they talk about Benedict Arnold CEOs, they would say the CEO of the consumer bank operation, IndyMac, is some sort of Benedict Arnold CEO I am sure. And, of course, Democrats have proposed a massive tax increase and barriers to innovation and entrepreneurship. We as Republicans have pursued greater engagement. We have cut taxes, regulation, and other market barriers of entry. We have continued a policy of greater trade liberalization. We have worked to reduce the size and scope of government so that Americans are increasingly free to prosper.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we have continued the Ronald Reagan vision of hope and optimism in the American spirit. We have carried Ronald Reagan's legacy of empowerment and prosperity through greater economic freedom. Mr. Speaker, I wish that President Reagan could have seen last year's great milestone in the fulfillment of his vision, the passage of the Dominican Republic-Central American Free Trade Agreement. He had envisioned, as we all know, and announced it on November 6 of 1979 when he proposed his candidacy, he put forward his candidacy to be President of United States, he at that point did something that many thought was heresy. He proposed a free trade area of the Americas stretching from the Arctic to Tierra

del Fuego, as President Reagan used to love to say.

When he first spoke, as I said, of this FTAA when announcing his candidacy, the idea seemed even more far-fetched than his optimism for the U.S. economy at his first inaugural address 25 years ago last month. Much of the Americas at that time, particularly Central America, as we all will remember, was ravaged by violence and dictatorship; and yet these last 25 years have seen the birth and growth of democracy and free markets in the region.

The passage of DR-CAFTA last year was hugely significant in pursuing that ultimate goal and vision that President Reagan put forward: first, as a further commitment to the region of greater political and economic freedom and liberalization; and, second, as a major stepping stone, as I said, towards implementation of that vision of the FTAA.

There may still be those who believe the idea of a free trade area of the Arctic to Tierra del Fuego to be far-fetched, and it is being undermined, we all know, by some leaders in this hemisphere; but Ronald Reagan and the continued Republican legacy have proved that any people can prosper when given the freedom to do so. We have seen this demonstrated right here at home throughout this region and, Mr. Speaker, in this hemisphere when we have seen improvements in trade opportunities developed.

We have seen it demonstrated worldwide, Mr. Speaker. Every year Canada's Fraser Institute publishes a report on economic freedom throughout the global, documenting the direct link between economic freedom and quality of life. The 2005 report finds that economic freedom continues to be determinative in individual well-being and opportunity. The report's authors at the Fraser Institute, in conjunction with nearly 70 public policy organizations from around the world, found that life expectancy in the world's economically freest countries is more than 25 years longer than in countries with the least economic freedom.

Freer countries have lower unemployment; those living in the poorest 10 percent demographic have much higher incomes and a much better standard of living in countries with high economic freedom than in those countries that are most restrictive.

Corruption in public office goes down as freedom goes up. Political rights, political stability, and civil liberties all go hand in hand with increased economic freedom. Year after year, the economic freedom of the World Annual Report finds the same thing. Everyone experiences greater prosperity with greater economic freedom while the world's poorest gain the most. By pursuing greater liberalization abroad through free trade, we help to increase prosperity for our allies and our neighbors. By reducing taxes, regulation and other economic burdens here at home,

we increase the prosperity of Americans. And as we all engage in the global marketplace, we prosper together.

Ronald Reagan knew this to be true and then went on and proved it. President Bush and our Republican majority have built on this success by continuing to liberalize our own economy as we encourage our trading partners to do the same.

□ 2100

The result has been a strong and growing economy, new job opportunities, and a rapidly rising standard of living.

So when we look to the coming year, what is the path that we will choose? First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, we must remain committed to the agenda that gave us this tremendous success. This Republican Congress will continue to reduce the tax burden on America's working families. We will continue to reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government, as was evidenced today by the President's signing of that \$39 billion reduction by signing the budget reconciliation package. We will work hard to reduce the size and scope of government, as I said, and to rein in the reach of the government by minimizing regulation and decreasing the bureaucratic red tape that strangles job creation. And we will continue to liberalize our trade relationships. We will continue to pursue more free trade agreements.

This agenda will not only continue to increase our prosperity; it will enable us to maintain our global competitive edge through innovation. The lesson of trade and outsourcing has been that global engagement has helped us to remain competitive. President Bush spoke a great deal about competitiveness at the State of the Union address. He spoke about it today when he announced, first here and again he is continuing to talk about this moving across the country, referring to his American Competitiveness Initiative. The President's plan will contribute an additional \$136 billion to scientific research and the promotion of math and science education.

By strengthening the fundamentals of education, research, and with a well-educated, highly skilled workforce, we can ensure that we will continue our global competitiveness far into the future. As President Bush said when he stood right here in this Chamber last week, Mr. Speaker: "The American economy is preeminent, but we cannot afford to be complacent." The President said: "In a dynamic world economy, we are seeing new competitors. To keep America competitive, one commitment is necessary above all. We must continue to lead the world in human talent and creativity."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the coming months and years, this Republican majority remains committed not only to expanding economic freedom at home and abroad. We are fully committed to an agenda of competitiveness and innovation. As we begin this new legislative

year, it is important that we recognize where we are and how we got here, and look optimistically, as Ronald Reagan did, to the future.

I am very proud of the fact that we have achieved such economic success. As I said, everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but no one is entitled to their own facts. I am even prouder of what we have been able to achieve through our Republican pro-growth, pro-economic freedom agenda. And, Mr. Speaker, as Ronald Reagan said so well, he believed that the American spirit has the ultimate potential when it is unleashed, and that is why I join that spirit of Ronald Reagan, as I know President Bush and our Republican colleagues do, and we certainly welcome Democrats to join in this effort as we look optimistically, hopefully, and very confidently to our future.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is very important for us to note that many people have tried their darnedest to claim that somehow the U.S. economy is in the tank. I hope that what I have shared over the past few minutes, which provides both anecdotal, through companies like PCMC in Green Bay, Wisconsin, and IndyMac Bank in Southern California, that that anecdotal information shows the success that we are enjoying.

I also hope that the empirical studies done by the Information Technology Association of America, the ITAA, showing that a net 257,000 new jobs were created in 2005 because of so-called outsourcing and offshoring, and that the Fraser Institute study from Canada demonstrating that when you unleash potential through greater economic liberalization, standards of living grow, and even those at the lowest end of the economic spectrum in those countries have higher standards of living than those who live in restrictive societies, that those facts are understood by the American people so that the American people will have an understanding that the gloom and doom negativism consists of nothing but words, because the facts belie them.

THE PEAKING OF WORLD OIL

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago, our Department of Energy commissioned a study with SAIC, Science Applications International Corporation, to do a study on the peaking of world oil production, impacts mitigation, and risk management. This very prestigious scientific organization took some time to complete this study; and when they completed it, they made a recommendation to the Congress and to the Department of Energy. Part of what they said in their recommendation is included here:

"The peaking of world oil production presents the U.S. and the world with an

unprecedented risk management problem."

That is quite an adjective to use. No risk problem like this ever in the history of the world is what they are saying: ". . . unprecedented risk management problem. As peaking is approached, liquid fuel prices and price volatility will increase dramatically. And without timely mitigation, the economic, social, and political cost will be unprecedented."

Again, Mr. Speaker, they are pointing out, and they will use these words in a chart I will have a little later, that the world has never faced a problem like this.

"Viable mitigation options exist on both the supply and demand side, but to have substantial impact they must be initiated more than a decade in advance of peaking."

When will peaking occur? Do we have a decade? And they are saying if we do not have a decade, we're going to have problems. Dealing with world oil production peaking will be extremely complex, involve literally trillions of dollars, and require many years of intense effort.

Our next chart, which speaks to the same phenomenon, inspired 30 of our leaders, Boyden Gray, McFarland, James Woolsey, and about 27 others, many of them four-star retired admirals and generals, to write a letter to the President. In that letter they said, Mr. President, the fact that we have only 2 percent of the world oil reserves, that we use 25 percent of the world's oil, and we import almost two-thirds of what we use represents a totally unacceptable national security risk. Mr. President, we need to do something about that.

Two other numbers here are of significance. We represent a bit less actually than 5 percent of the world's population, about one person out of 22. And in spite of the fact that we have only 2 percent of the world oil reserves, we produce about 8 percent of the world's oil. We need to keep this in mind for some of the later charts we are going to show, because what this means is that we are pumping our little reserves, only 2 percent, four times faster than the rest of the world.

If we were pumping it as fast, with 2 percent of the reserves, we would be producing 2 percent of the production; but we are producing 8 percent. So if the world is going to run into trouble with decreasing amounts of oil, Mr. Speaker, we are going to get there first because we are pumping our oil more rapidly.

How did we get here? The next chart speaks to that, and we need to go back about six decades. There was a scientist by the name of M. King Hubbert, who worked for the Shell Oil Company; and he noted the exploitation and exhaustion of individual oil fields. We would find an oil field, we would start pumping, and the oil field would reach a maximum production. And then after the maximum production, at about half

of its total ultimate production, it would start falling off. No matter how hard they pumped, it would produce less and less oil, until finally the field petered out.

He rationalized that if he knew how many oil fields there were in the United States and roughly what their reserves were, and if he could predict how many new oil fields the United States would find, he could then add up all these little bell curves and he would get a big bell curve which would tell him when the United States was going to peak in oil production. So he did that in a paper in 1956, and he wrote in that paper that with this analysis he predicted that the United States would peak, and that was the lower 48 at that time, that the United States would peak in oil production and consumption of our own oil about 1970.

Right on schedule, and some authorities will say 1970 and some will say 1971, but as this chart shows, the smooth green curve here was his prediction peaking about 1970, and the more ragged large green symbols represent the actual production, which pretty much followed his curve. And it did peak, as you can see, at about 1970; and it has been downhill since then.

By 1980, we knew very well that we were downhill, and the early Reagan years provided a lot of incentives for drilling. There were a lot of oil wells drilled in our country. Notice the tiny increase from that. It simply brought us back to the curve that had been predicted by M. King Hubbert.

Now, the red curve here is the curve for the Soviet Union. They had more oil than we, and they peaked higher than we. And when the Soviet Union fell apart, you see that they broke away from the predicted decline. They are now going to have a second little peak here, and then it will be falling off. They will never get back to their earlier peak of oil production.

The next chart shows some detail about where our oil has come from through the years. And if you are looking only at the lower 48, you are going to be following this curve. And if you add to it the liquids that we are getting from gas, you will see that it still followed Hubbert's curve. It peaked in 1970 and then fall off.

But we found a lot of oil in Alaska. As a matter of fact, I have been there, Mr. Speaker, at mile zero, at Dead Horse, Prudhoe Bay. And through that pipeline has come for the last several years a fourth of all of our domestic production. But notice that in spite of that enormous find of oil in Prudhoe Bay, there was just a little blip on the downside of Hubbert's peak.

This yellow here on the chart is very interesting. That, you may remember, Mr. Speaker, was the fabled Gulf of Mexico oil discoveries. I remember how that was hyped. That was going to save us. There was plenty of oil there.

That was all it did, Mr. Speaker. It hardly slowed us down. In terms of the total amount that we were producing,

you can hardly see any effect of the Gulf of Mexico oil discovery.

We were thinking about that discovery and those wells in the recent hurricane. There are 4,000 wells in the Gulf of Mexico. By the way, Mr. Speaker, that is about 10 times as many wells as there are in all of Saudi Arabia. We have about 530,000 oil wells in our country, about 80 percent of all the oil wells drilled in all the world. Maybe that is why we are able to produce oil from our reserves relatively four times faster than the rest of the world.

The next chart looks back through history, and it shows two things. It shows two curves, one superimposed on the other. One of the curves is the discovery curve, and this shows when we found the big oil fields starting way back in the 1930s, and then a lot of them in the 1940s, and some big oil fields found in the 1950s. But notice that this follows kind of a curve like so, and it peaks at about 1970, and it has been falling off ever since that. In spite of very large profits from the oil companies, they are not finding much more oil.

I might note, Mr. Speaker, that the profits for the oil companies was inevitable. They do not set the price of oil. Chevron and BP and ExxonMobil, they do not set the price of oil. The price of oil is set by you and me and all the other roughly 7 billion people in the world who use oil.

□ 2115

We set the price by our demand relative to the supply. As supply has fallen off in the last several years, the price has gone up. Oil companies that were making money at \$25 a barrel, how much more money do you think they will make when oil is \$65 a barrel? We should not be carping about how much money they make; what we should be looking at is how responsibly they use the profits they make.

Some of those profits need to be invested in finding new oil fields, but the experts do not think there is much more to find.

Several Congresses ago I was chairman of the Energy Subcommittee on Science, and I wanted to determine the dimensions of the problem. We had the world's experts in to talk about how much oil is out there that we can realistically pump. There was general agreement, quite surprising agreement, that it is roughly 1,000 gigabarrels. Giga is used because in Europe a billion is not our billion so if you say billion, not everybody will understand it. So giga means a billion, and it means the same thing around the world.

A thousand gigabarrels is about a trillion barrels of oil. That may sound like a lot, but it is about the amount of oil that we have pumped so far in all of history. If you divide the 84 billion barrels a day that we are using today into that trillion barrels of oil, it comes out to about 40 years. Most of the experts believe we have found about 95 percent of all of the oil we will find. We now

have very sophisticated seismic techniques with 3-D computer modeling. This is what they believe will be found, this gray-shaded area over here. It is not going to follow that smooth curve, but on average that is how much they think we will find.

The solid black line here represents the amount of oil we have been using. Up until about 1980, we always found more oil than we were using. There was always a big reserve out there. Since 1980, we have found less and less oil, and we have been using more and more oil. We have been able to do that because we are now using up some of these reserves we found before.

All of the oil that we can use has to be all the oil that is there. If you have not found it, you cannot pump it. So you make your own judgment how much oil you think we are going to find in the future, then you add that to the reserves back here. That is going to be the area under this curve from now on.

By the way, this 40 years that I mentioned, that is not a plateau. You do not plateau out for 40 years and then fall off a cliff. It is going to follow that typical bell curve of every oil field. By the way, 33 of the top 45 oil-producing countries have now peaked. It is only a few that have not peaked.

What will this curve look like from here on? We can change the shape. If we use some of our good recovery enhancement techniques, we can pump oil a little faster, and we may pump a little more, so we may get a little more out of these fields than depicted here. This is not all of the oil in the fields because probably half of the oil there will not get pumped because it is so difficult to get, it is going to cost more energy to get the oil than you get out of the oil. So you get to the point of you stop getting the oil. As the old farmer said, at that point "the juice ain't worth the squeezing," so we stop trying to get oil at that point.

The next chart shows a simple schematic that depicts the problem and where we are. Everybody may not agree this is where we are. Most of the people that have thought about peak oil think we are here or will shortly be here. This is a 2 percent growth curve. With 2 percent growth, that doubles in 35 years. This point is twice that point, and so this is a 35-year period from here to here.

Notice what this chart points out is that you start having a problem before peaking because the exponential use curve, the demand curve keeps going up like this, whereas when we reach peak oil, it will of necessity level off, and then no matter what we do, it will inexorably go downhill after that. It does for individual oil fields. It has for the United States.

By the way, the same M. King Hubbard that predicted we would peak in about 1970, he was right on. He predicted that the world would peak about now. If he was right about the United States, maybe he is right about the

world, and maybe we should have been paying some attention to that.

I would submit that we have now, in common parlance, we have blown 25 years when we knew very well M. King Hubbard was right about the United States. If he was right about the United States, would not it have been prudent to recognize that maybe he just might be right about the world? If he is right about the world, the world is about to peak in oil production now, then we should have been doing something during these last 25 years so this would be a smoother transition.

The next chart shows us the alternatives. As the world peaks in oil production, we are going to have to, first of all, turn to some finite resources, and we are now doing that. I will chat for a moment about those. And those will not last forever. They are finite, as the word implies, except for nuclear, which is kind of different. The only nuclear that is finite is light water reactors that use fissionable uranium. If we go to breeder reactors, as the term implies, you make more fuel than you are using, and that could go on and on. You have to accept the problems you buy there with the enrichment and moving fuel around that could make bombs and so forth.

Of course, the one thing that gets us home free is nuclear fusion. If we could harness the kind of energy that the sun sends down to us every day, we are home free. But, Mr. Speaker, the odds of our doing that are a bit like you or me solving our personal economic problems by winning the lottery. That would be nice, and by the way, I do not play the lottery, but I do not think that rational people count on solving their economic problems by winning the lottery, and neither do I think that we should count on solving our energy problems of the future by nuclear fusion. That does not mean I do not support it. I vote every year for all of the money, \$250 million or so, that we put into that, because we have to try. If we do not successfully harness nuclear fusion, we have a really challenging road ahead.

Let us look at these finite resources and what kind of potential we can expect from them. There is a lot of suggestion today about the tar sands up in Alberta, Canada. There are enormous reserves there. The reserves there are at least as large of all of the oil reserves in all of the world. Then what we are worrying about? Well, because it is there does not necessarily mean that we can harness it in enough quantities or soon enough to really make a big contribution.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, every day the Moon goes around the Earth roughly in a day, and it lifts the oceans about 2 feet. That is an incredible amount of energy. I carry two gallon buckets of water and lift them up, that is a lot of energy. If we could harness the energy of the tides, we would be home free. There is an old adage that says energy to be effective must be

concentrated, and because those tides are spread out over all of the oceans of all of the world, it is difficult to harness them.

The tar sands are a little like that. There is an incredible amount of energy there, and the Canadians are working very hard at harnessing that. Let me see if I can remember the numbers. I think they have a shovel in Alberta, Canada, that lifts 100 tons at a time and dumps it into a truck that carries 400 tons, and I think those are the right numbers. It carries them to a place where they are cooked, because the oil in those tar sands is a bit better, but kind of like the oil in your asphalt road. If you put a blow torch on an asphalt road and mix it with some lighter fuels, it will flow. That is kind of like what we are doing with the tar sands. They are working very hard, and they are producing a million barrels a day. We will talk in just a moment about energy profit ratio. They are making a lot of dollars doing that because it costs them less than \$30 a barrel to make it. The oil is now bringing \$60-some a barrel, so the dollar-profit ratio is up there. They are using, I have heard, maybe more energy from natural gas to produce the oil than they are getting out of the oil. That makes good sense for them because they have natural gas there, and it is hard to ship, and it is relatively cheap, and the oil is easy to ship and in high demand at \$60-some a barrel.

Mr. Speaker, by the end of the day, we really need to be thinking about energy profit ratio because that is what will be telling. They are now producing a million barrels a day, and if they work real hard, they will be producing 2 million barrels a day in 5 years. Big deal.

The world today is using 84 million barrels a day, and if they work really hard, 10 years from now they will be producing 3 times as much as today, 3 million barrels a day, but the world would like to be using another 40 million barrels a day. I do not think it will be there, but if you project our current demand for those 10 years, we would like to be using another 40 million barrels of oil, and they will be producing another 2 million barrels of oil, $\frac{1}{20}$ of the additional oil the world would like to use. Although there is a lot of energy there, and I am sure that we will find techniques to get it out that have some energy profit ratio so there will be energy there for a long time, but it is not going to be available anywhere near the quantities needed to meet the needs of contending with the crisis that will occur with peak oil.

Now, the oil shales in our country are very much the same thing. Recently you may have read of an experiment out in Colorado. I think it was Shell Oil Company that devised a new technique for getting the oil out of the oil shales, which is like the oil in the tar sands. It is very thick and will not flow.

What they did to avoid polluting the groundwater was drill a series of holes

in a circle, and then they froze the ground because the oil will not move through frozen ground. Inside that frozen vessel, if you will, they cooked and cooked it for a year. They put steam down and cooked it for a year. After that year, they started sucking on the oil, and for another year they cooked and they sucked, and they got a pretty meaningful amount of oil out of that.

There is an awful lot of oil in the oil shales, maybe about as much as in the tar sands, but the scale, scaling up for this is incredibly difficult. I am not sure what the energy profit ratio is, because if you have to freeze the perimeter of that big vessel, if that is what you want to call it, and then you have to cook it for a couple of years, obviously you are putting a lot of energy in. They believe they got more energy out than they put in. But still, the energy profit ratio is not going to be enormous. Even if you can make that attractive, you still have the problem of scale. With the world using 84 billion barrels of oil a day, you have to have a lot of a million here, a million there before it adds up to what we are using.

Coal, you may hear people do not worry about energy, we have 500 years of coal. That is not true. At current use rates, we have about 250 years of coal. That is a long time, so why are we worrying? If we have 250 years of coal at current use rates, and obviously you can do with coal what we do with oil. Hitler did it. When we denied him access to oil, he made oil out of coal. When I was a little boy, the lamps that we call kerosene lamps today, we called them coal oil lamps because they were filled with oil, made from oil. So if you must use coal, if you have greater demand than we use today, that 250 years quickly shrinks. I have a chart a little later that shows that. But it quickly shrinks to about 85 years, and if you have to use some of the energy to convert the coal since you cannot have a trunkload of coal in your car, the energy to do that now shrinks that supply. There is only a 2 percent growth rate, and I think we will have to use it at much more than 2 percent growth rate, and it shrinks it to 50 years. So we have to husband that resource very wisely.

We have already chatted briefly about nuclear fission and nuclear fusion. Today we produce 20 percent of our electricity from nuclear. France produces 75 or 80. If you have some concerns about nuclear power, when you drive tonight note that every fifth business and every fifth house would be dark if were not for nuclear energy.

□ 2130

One-fifth, 20 percent, of all the electricity in our country comes from nuclear. Well, once these are gone, and they will be gone, except nuclear breeder reactors, as many of those as we want to have and maybe, maybe if we are lucky nuclear fusion. But we will transition, Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, as the world runs out

of oil, we will transition to the renewables. What are they? They are solar and wind and geothermal. Geothermal is when we tap into the molten core of the Earth when we are close enough to that that you can get some heat from that. If you go to Iceland, there is not a chimney there because all of their energy comes from geothermal.

We are trying very hard, as I mentioned previously, to tap into ocean energy. It is not just the tides. It is the waves. It is the thermal gradients in the ocean, the cold water at the depths, the warmer water on top, kind of a thermal couple effect that you can get there.

Then there is lots and lots of talk about getting energy from agriculture. Soy diesel, bio diesel, ethanol, methanol, biomass. The President mentioned it in his State of the Union. He said we are hooked on oil and have got to wean ourselves from that, and technology will do it. And he talked about some exciting technology, about taking some biomass like soybean stubble and corn stalks and switch grass. What is switch grass? Switch grass is prairie grass, and a lot of it grows. Of the prairie that we did not plow up and let that return to switch grass, it is a big crop every year. And they are talking about harvesting that and using something like culling cellulosic ethanol. We bioengineered a little organism that can split cellulose into its requisite glucose molecules. It is made of sugar. Sure does not taste like sugar. See, because the human's molecules are so closely tied together that the enzymes in our body cannot split them. But these little bioengineered organisms can do that, so we break cellulose down to glucose, and then we ferment the glucose, and we get ethanol from it. And there is a lot of talk about that.

And biomass. Waste energy. Burning waste. There is a plant not far from here in Montgomery County, I would be proud to have it by my church. It looks like an office building. You do not even know it is an incinerator burning trash and producing electricity. They bring the trash in by truck or train in containers. You do not even see it until it is inside the building and then they dump it. Really interesting to watch it because that trash comes in with all sorts of things in it. They have a crane there that picks it up and drops it to see if there is something evil in it like a tank of propane. You would not want to put that in the fire. It might explode. And if they drop it and there is nothing evil-looking in it, they pick it up again and drop it over into the fire. It is really worth a trip there. And we now get a meaningful amount of energy, as a later chart will show from waste to energy.

Then hydrogen. Many people think that we do not have to worry about energy because we have got hydrogen. Hydrogen, Mr. Speaker, is not an energy source. Hydrogen is simply a way of transferring energy from one point

to another. It will always cost more energy to make hydrogen than you will get out of the hydrogen. I can say that with some confidence because just as sure as there will never be a perpetual motion machine, we will never suspend the second law of thermodynamics. And that says that when you transfer energy from one form to another, you will always lose some energy in that transfer. Why are we so enthusiastic about hydrogen if that is true? It is because hydrogen has some incredible capabilities. When you burn it, you get water. That is really not very polluting, is it? And further more, hydrogen is a great thing to put in a fuel cell. And a fuel cell gets twice the efficiency of a reciprocating engine. So I am not depreciating the value of looking at hydrogen. I am simply pointing out that hydrogen is little more than a battery which takes energy from one place to another place. As a matter of fact, in a recent hearing, we had three experts on hydrogen, and there are three ways that you could transport hydrogen. One is as a liquid. It must be really, really cold, several hundred degrees below zero to keep it as a liquid, which means you have to have a lot of insulation, and even then it is going to boil off, so you have got to use it faster than that boils off.

The other way to carry it is as a gas. Well, hydrogen is the lightest element we have. Those gas molecules are really trying to get apart from each other, so it takes a really high pressure vessel to contain hydrogen.

The third way to transport hydrogen is in solid state. You adhere the hydrogen either by some adhesion or by some chemical process. You carry it in a solid state. That is very much like the way we carry electrons in what we call a battery. Hydrogen is a proton plus an electron; and so, and I asked the question, is a hydrogen battery inherently going to be more efficient than an electron battery? Well, we really need to look at hydrogen, but it is not a salvation to our problems.

The next chart looks at the characteristics that we are going to want to find in whatever alternative we turn to, and here we have on the ordinate the energy profit ratio. I have talked about energy profit ratio. That is how much energy you put in compared to how much energy you get out. And our big oil fields here, you see, they are up at 60 to one. As a matter of fact, the charts were even higher. Some of those were more than 100 to one. By the way, there were none of those in our country. They exist only in the Middle East and most in the big Darwar oil field. The granddaddy of all oil fields is in Saudi Arabia.

And the energy profit ratio is 60. You put in one unit of energy, one BTU, and you get out 60 BTUs. The abscissa here is economic effectiveness in transport, that is, how handy is it to use. And we are talking primarily about transportation and liquid fuels, how handy is it to use. Well, oil of course is the hand-

iest thing to use. It is way over here on the right. And it had an enormous energy profit ratio if it came from the giant oil fields. In 1970, when we peaked, our energy profit ratio was down here. Now it is harder and harder to get our oil, and so by 1985 the energy profit ratio had slid down to here. Notice where the energy profit ratio is for tar sands and ethanol and that sort of source: way down here, just about zero. In fact, some people think that the energy profit ratio for ethanol, the way that it is frequently made, is below zero here, that more energy goes into making ethanol from the fossil fuels that made the tractor and plows field and makes the fertilizer and so forth than you get out of the ethanol.

Well, here we have some of the other things: hydro, coal fired, nuclear, photovoltaics. They now are getting much better. They are moving up in energy profit ratio. Wind machines should be on here too, and they would be about in this same category. So whatever alternative energy source we use, to see how useful it is going to be, we need to put it on this chart: does it have a high energy profit ratio, and is it really convenient to use for transportation.

The next chart is one which really has the long look. I like this chart because it is kind of humbling. It kind of puts us and oil and our whole history into perspective. Here we have only about 400 years, a little less than 400 years out of 5,000 years of recorded history. But for the first 4,600 years not a whole lot happened. And so if you extended this back 4,600 years, it would look very much the same. Very little energy produced. Here you see it. Wood. And then we learned how to use it more effectively. The Industrial Revolution started here in the early 1800s. We denuded the hills of New England to send charcoal to England to make steel. There is a little historic place called Catocin Furnace up in Frederick County, and we denuded our hills up there to make charcoal for Catocin Furnace. And then we found coal.

Oh, the ordinate here is quadrillion BTUs, how much energy you are producing. And then we found coal. And boy, look what happened. Look what happened. We really took off. The coal was very limited in what it could do compared with gas and oil, and the red curve here is gas and oil. And look what happened. It just took off and was reaching for the sky. Notice here the worldwide recession after the Arab-induced oil price spike hikes, worldwide recession, and we did use less oil. So we can economize. We can be more efficient. We can use less.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the world's population has pretty much followed this. Just this afternoon I was looking at a chart of world population. Half a billion, a billion people for way back as far as we can look in history. And then we start the Industrial Revolution, and the world's population took off and it mirrors this. From a half a

million, half a billion to a billion people up to now nearly seven billion people.

If, in fact we are at peak oil, and almost nobody denies, the most optimistic estimate I have ever seen is that we will reach peak oil at about 2035 or 2036. You know, that is not forever in the future. Most authorities believe that we are either here or it is very imminent. But if we have reached peak oil, we are about halfway through the age of oil. That is incredible. Out of 5,000 years of recorded history, 150 years now we are into the age of oil. In another 150 years we will be through the age of oil. Our great grandchildren will live then. What will their world be like? We face a lot of really serious challenges.

Mr. Speaker, when I think back, and someone asked me the other day how long I have been thinking about this subject, and maybe it is because I am a scientist. I knew that the fossil fuels could not be forever and so maybe 30, 40 years ago, when I was teaching school and doing research, I started asking myself that question, what does that mean, not forever? Do we have another 10 years, a hundred years, a thousand years? Obviously, it is not going to last forever. But what does that mean? And so I have been following this for 30, 40 years now.

The next chart looks at something that I have spoken briefly about and that is coal. And some will tell you, and I have heard a lot of people who ought to know better say, do not worry, we have got 250 years of coal. That is true, at current use rates. But if you start increasing coal only 2 percent a year, you know, Albert Einstein was asked after the discovery of nuclear energy, what is next? What is the most powerful force in the universe, Dr. Einstein? You know what his response was? The power of compound interest. That is exponential growth. Compound interest.

And if you grow only 2 percent a year, that 250 years now immediately shrinks to about, what, 85 years here? And obviously you cannot fill your trunk up with coal. You are going to have to convert it to a gas or a liquid. And so when you have used some energy to convert it to a gas or a liquid, after conversion you have got about 50 years left. That is a long time. And it is a meaningful resource. But it is not forever. And by the way, there are one of two penalties you are going to pay for burning coal. Either you are going to pay a big environmental penalty if you do not clean it up. And every year we vote some billions of dollars for clean coal technology. And still we have too much CO₂, too much pollution from coal.

And by the way, Mr. Speaker, the use of coal is not without its price. We have had, what, 16 miners killed in West Virginia in the last couple of weeks in producing coal.

When was the last time you heard that a worker in a nuclear power plant

was killed or injured? The answer is, never in this country. It just has not happened. I lived through the Three Mile Island disaster. I was not very far from it in Frederick, Maryland. There was a lot of hoopla about that. Very little actual effects of that. I have some friends who have been avidly antinuclear. When they are considering the alternative of shivering in the dark as we run down the other side of Hubbert's peak, they are wisely taking a new look at nuclear.

Our next chart is a very interesting one. We have talked about the potential from agriculture. Let me make two generalizations as a caution. We are barely able to feed the world. Tonight, 20 percent of the world or so will go to bed hungry. How much food can we convert to energy and still feed the world, particularly if we permit the world's population to increase as it is today?

The other caution is, how much biomass can we take from our land and still have topsoil? With all of our good techniques today, no till farming and so forth, every bushel of corn we grow in Iowa is accompanied by three bushels of topsoil that go down the Mississippi River.

Now, topsoil is topsoil, rather than subsoil simply because it has organic matter in it. And that organic matter, the humus comes from decaying organic material. And if you are taking all that organic material off to burn or to ferment or whatever you are going to do with it, I am not certain how long we can maintain the quality of our topsoil so that we can continue to produce the food and fiber that we need and that the world needs.

On the top here are shown two depictions. One is the amount of energy you get out of petroleum. Obviously, you do not get all the energy in your car. It takes energy to drill the wells, to pump it out, to transport it, to refine it, to haul it to the gas station and so forth.

□ 2145

So when we get out 1 million BTUs, there are probably, they estimate, it took 1.23 million BTUs input. So you do not get it all in your car. You would not expect to.

Now, what about the energy profit ratio here of ethanol? And here we are getting a lot of energy from the sun. What does that mean in terms of the final product? And I am told by some this is a pretty optimistic assessment here. But even if we reach this, you have put in .74 million BTUs. Almost three-fourths of the energy you get out of ethanol is represented by the energy that went into producing ethanol. There is an energy profit ratio, although some have disputed that. There is a doctor in the East here and one in the West, and they have done what they say is a very good analysis of all the energy, and it is hard to keep track of that, Mr. Speaker. It is not just the diesel fuel they use in the tractors. How much energy does it take to make

the tractor? Every automobile tire has the equivalent of 6 gallons of oil in it. As you burn the tire, you get some sense that that is probably pretty close to the truth.

These two scientists believe that today in the way that some ethanol is made, it takes more energy from fossil fuels to make the ethanol that we get out of the ethanol. Even if that is true, there is a good byproduct remaining, all the fat and all the protein. Tofu is a protein, by the way. That is the protein from soybeans. We get a similar protein from corn. So we can use that as animal food or human food.

The bottom chart here shows some of the challenge of getting energy from corn. This is a pie chart which shows the total amount of energy that goes into producing a bushel of corn. And notice, Mr. Speaker, that almost half of that total energy comes from nitrogen. That is because nitrogen fertilizer is made from natural gas. Before we learned how to do that, the only source of nitrogen fertilizer was barnyard manure and what we call guano. Guano is the droppings of bats and birds for very long periods of time, hundreds of years, maybe thousands of years, and it accumulated on the tropical islands, and in the case of bats, we mined that to get guano. That is gone. If we wait another 10-, 20-, 30,000 years, there will be some more. But it takes a very long time to accumulate that.

This is all the other energy that goes into producing a bushel of corn. Potash was mined using fossil fuels. Phosphate was mined using fossil fuels. The lime was quarried using fossil fuels. Here is the diesel fuel that ran the tractor and the combine, the gasoline that is used in some of the farm equipment, liquid gas, electricity, all of which is produced by fossil fuels, most of it by fossil fuels, some by nuclear, 20 percent by nuclear. The custom work, the diesel that went into doing the work, the energy, the fossil energy it took to build the tractor and so forth. And many of the chemicals we use in agriculture are made from oil. The water is pumped using energy. The hauling, the seed, fossil fuel energy goes into producing all of this.

Mr. Speaker, how will we feed the world once we run down the other side of Hubbert's peak?

The next chart, this is a really interesting one. I use an analogy here that helps me to understand this. I imagine a young couple that has just gotten married, and their grandparents died and left them a pretty big inheritance. So they have now established a lifestyle where 85 percent of all the money they spend comes from their grandparents' inheritance and only 15 percent from their income. And they look at the amount they are spending and at the size of the grandparents' inheritance and say, gee, this is not going to last until we retire. So obviously they have got to do one or both of two things: Either they have got to spend less money, or they have got to earn more money.

I use that 85-15. Others may use 86-14. The 85 or the 86 is the percentage of energy in our economy that we get from the fossil fuels, natural gas and petroleum and coal. Only 15 percent in this depiction do we get from nonfossil fuel sources. A bit more than half of that, nuclear energy, 8 percent, that is, 8 of 15, a bit more than half, comes from nuclear. That is 20 percent of electricity, but 8 percent of our total energy use heating buildings and manufacturing and so forth. Seven percent of it comes from renewables. Remember that previous chart? Ultimately we will transition to these renewables, with the exception of what we will get from nuclear. When we are through the age of oil, it will all be renewables.

What are they? Solar. This is a 2000 chart. We are better today. In 2000, solar represented 1 percent of 7 percent. That is .07 percent. It has been growing at 30 percent a year. That doubles in about 3 years. So now, big deal, it is .28 percent of our total energy.

Wood, 38 percent. Not the West Virginia hillbilly, but this is the timber industry and the paper industry wisely using a waste product, what would otherwise be a waste product.

I mentioned waste before. That is 8 percent of our total renewable energy. We ought to be producing a lot more of that. Landfills are pretty silly when you think that you could be producing electricity with that rather than worrying about the methane that is produced there. They do harvest some of that, by the way, and use it.

Wind, another 1 percent. By the way, wind and solar are essentially the same energy source. The wind blows because of the differential heating of the sun; so they both go back to the sun. We can now produce electricity from wind at 2½ cents a kilowatt hour. That is really competitive. Why are we not producing more of it? Wind farms are growing. You may see them. Some people do not like the look of those. I think that the big wind machines are pretty handsome. That is about where solar is today, about .28 percent of our total energy.

How long will it take us to get to any meaningful percentage there? Because that is increasingly what we are going to have to rely on in the future.

Conventional hydro, almost half of all of our renewables comes from an energy source that is not going to grow in our country. We have dammed every river that should be dammed and probably a few that should not; so that is not likely to grow.

Now we are down here to agriculture, alcohol fuels and so forth. Again, almost in the noise level. And geothermal, where we are close enough to the molten core of the Earth, we really should tap into that. That is free. It is forever if you use it properly.

The next chart shows us something very interesting. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get some input from statisticians on this because everybody knows

the jargon of something which is statistically significant. There is a 95 percent probability, there is a 5 percent probability, and so forth. And here they have done something which I find very strange. If you are looking at the path that a hurricane is going to take, you notice it starts out very narrow. It could get pretty good for the next few hours, but when it gets out to hours and days, it gets broader and broader. Now, the hurricane maybe will go down the middle, but there is just as big a chance it will go to the left as there is that it will go to the right. And what these folk are doing and what they are using here is statistical jargon. They are saying a high 5 percent probability, low 95 percent, and the mean is what is in the middle. Now, that could just as well be a whole lot less as that much more. So the real peak is probably going to occur about right here.

This is where we are now. This is the 2000 chart. We are about right here. They are using this mean here. No one that I know of believes that the ultimate recovery, 1 billion barrels of oil, is 3 trillion. But even if you use the 3 trillion, that takes you only to this point. It pushes peak oil out only to 2016.

The next one is a really interesting one. If you assume that you are going to get it faster and move the peak out to 2037, look what happens after that. You fall off a cliff.

So we need to be careful about this enhanced oil recovery, because if there is only so much to pump, and you pump it sooner rather than later, later you are going to have less to pump.

Back to Robert Hirsch and the study done by SAIC. They say on Page 64, "World oil peaking is going to happen." And down here he says that oil peaking presents a unique challenge. The world has never faced a problem like this without massive mitigation, more than a decade before the fact. And remember, Mr. Speaker, very few authorities believe that peak oil is more than a decade from now. So we are pretty much here.

The next chart points out something very interesting, and that is that this really is a worldwide problem. We are all in the same boat on this little planet Earth traveling through space. There is only so much oil. There are about 7 billion people, and clearly we would do better to engage the nations of the world in a competition to achieve sustainability instead of a consumption contest, which is now what we are doing: Who can use the most oil to grow their economy the fastest?

The next chart shows ideally what we need to be about.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I think that if we do not have a national and indeed international program which kind of has the breadth of putting a man on the Moon and the intensity of the Manhattan Project, I think we are in for a pretty rough landing.

First of all, there is voluntarily conservation, and we can do that. We can

conserve. California did. They had no rolling blackouts because they voluntarily reduced their electricity use by 11 percent in a single year. That is big. We start out with voluntary conservation, ride with two in the car, turn our thermostat down, put a sweater on. To organize voluntary conservation, working together to provide for the van pools and so forth, then the government can provide some monetary incentives, giving you the incentive to do the right thing. And then efficiency, of course. These were two words that were absent from the President's very good message on energy, conservation and efficiency.

I am a conservative. My wife says she thinks that there ought to be some relationship between conservation and conservatives. Does that make sense, Mr. Speaker?

The next chart we are going back again to the Hirsch report. That was such a great study. They said on page 24, "We cannot conceive of any affordable government-sponsored crash program to accelerate normal replacement schedules so as to incorporate higher energy efficiency technologies into the private-owned transportation sector. Significant improvements in energy efficiency will thus be inherently time-consuming of the order of a decade or so."

For instance, if everyone was to drive a hybrid car, which gets two or three times the mileage of an ordinary car, it takes one or two decades to turn over the motor fleet; 28 years, I think, for the big trucks; much less than that for the vanity of cars and so forth.

The next chart, this is something that we are doing out in Frederick. We wanted to demonstrate that it was possible to be totally self-sufficient, so we have proposed, and we have funding to do it thanks to the generosity of the taxpayers, that we are going to build a welcome center coming down into Frederick that is totally energy self-sufficient. We will get all of our water from the rain. We will handle all of our waste without putting anything into the ground, with composting toilets and constructed wetlands and so forth. We will produce all of our energy with wind machines and solar panels and so forth. This should in the next couple of years be existing. If you go up 270 into Frederick and start down the hill where you look over the Frederick Valley and see the city there, on your right will be the Goodloe Byron Overlook. If you pull in there, you will be at this welcome center, which will have a lot of what we call benign technologies.

In the few minutes remaining, I would like to use the *Apollo 13* as an example of the challenge that we have. You may remember the *Apollo 13*. They had an explosion in one of their oxygen tanks. They had two oxygen tanks. And that explosion caused the other oxygen tank to leak. So not only were they going to be short of oxygen for themselves if they were not careful, they were going to be short of energy

because they were using that oxygen to combine with hydrogen in a fuel cell to produce energy.

□ 2200

What they had available to them was the module, the lunar lander. They turned around, as you may know. They had to evaluate what they had to work with, and that is all they had to work with, what was in that little spacecraft out there. What could they do with that? They had a big challenge of CO₂ buildup and what they were going to do to manage that so that they could get back. They had a very narrow window.

There are a lot of analogies between the *Apollo 13* and where we are today. They had a challenge not of their choosing. We did not choose to reach peak oil at this time, but they were faced with the inevitable decision of either making the right choices or not making it through, and we are faced with very much that same kind of a dilemma. We have some choices to make now, and the next chart points to the kinds of choices that we have and what I think we need to be doing.

I want to refer you to an earlier chart which, by the way, we had that bell curve and we had the consumption going up like so, and there is a gap there.

A lot of people are trying to fill the gap. Here is that chart. Put that in front of this one. We will talk about that in just a moment. A lot of people are talking about filling the gap so that we continue on this course and use ever more and more.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is not what our challenge should be. As a matter of fact, to get alternative energy sources, we are going to have to invest three things. Money, we will not worry about that. We will borrow that from our kids and our grandkids, I am sorry to say; but we cannot borrow time from them, and you cannot borrow energy from them. We have run out of time. We are using all the oil that is available. If there was more oil than we would like to use, it would not be a sixty-couple dollars a barrel, would it? So in order to have any energy to invest in the alternative, we have to reduce our demand for oil so we have something to invest.

Trying to fill the gap just puts off the inevitable. If, in fact, we are able to do that momentarily, since there is not going to be much more oil found out there, the experts believe all you are doing now is setting yourself up for a bigger fall later. The old adage, in a hole, stop digging, the corollary to that is you are climbing a hill and you are going to fall off the other side, the higher you climb, the further you fall. This is pretty much where we are with oil. Let us go back now about the choices before us now.

Like *Apollo 13*, we have got to develop those contingency plans. What will we do? We need to prepare proactively. We have almost run out of time to do that. We must reduce energy consumption to make some energy available. That will

buy some time. By the way, the cheapest oil is the oil you do not use. We have bought some time so we can make investments now in more efficiency, first of all, and then in these alternatives which we will increasingly turn to.

The ultimate goal is to achieve sustainable growth. By the way, Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as sustainable growth, whether short term you may make it appear to be so; but ultimately there is no such thing as continued forever sustainable growth. We are going to have to learn to be happy with being satisfied with what we have got.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we have some really, really great times ahead of us. I can imagine nothing more than all Americans feeling really good about contributing to a solution to this problem.

What we really need is leadership that the American people understand that they really can contribute. We have enormous creativity and entrepreneurship. We need to harness that. The next big burst in economic efficiency and growth can be in developing these alternatives and more efficient ways of doing things.

The ultimate goal, and we will get to that goal, we will transition. When the age of oil is finished and there is no more oil that can be gotten without paying more for the oil than you get out of it, we will have been transitioned to the renewables. What will life be like then? What will life be like in that transition?

This is really a good-news story. The sooner we start to address this problem, the less traumatic will be the transition. I like to think, Mr. Speaker, that if we harness the creativity and the energy of the American people, there is nothing that will make sleep so refreshing other than just knowing you really contributed something that day.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have a bright future ahead of us. Unless we recognize, we probably are approaching peak oil. I would encourage, Mr. Speaker, that you go do a Google search for peak oil, pull up the articles on peak oil or do Hubbert's peak, you will find essentially the same articles there. There is a lot of information out there.

The average person is so consumed with the necessities of life, the tyranny of the urgent that pushes the important off the table: you really need to change the diapers; you really do need to be responsible; you also need to be thinking about tomorrow. We think about our next election. The board of directors thinks about the next quarterly report. Who is looking 5 years from now, 10 years from now?

Mr. Speaker, I think we have a great future ahead of us. The American people will respond if properly challenged.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under the

Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and let me first say to the gentleman regarding his presentation here tonight regarding alternative energy sources, not only was it impressive and thorough, but I think he hit the nail right on the head. I think this is an issue that the next generation is going to have to deal with, and I know that our 30-something Working Group is very interested in working with the gentleman for alternative energy sources and figuring out what we are going to do.

Our topic tonight, Mr. Speaker, is what is going on here at home regarding the budget and regarding the budget deficit that the Republican Congress has run on an annual basis, but also the national debt.

The President will be coming back to the Congress to ask the Republican Congress to raise the debt ceiling, the debt limit. This is *deja vu* all over again. This Republican Congress continues to borrow and borrow and borrow and spend and spend and spend, really, like drunken sailors, like there is no end in sight; and our country cannot continue to go down this irresponsible path. We would like to talk a little bit about it tonight.

In order to borrow money, the Congress needs to pass legislation and the President needs to sign legislation that will allow the U.S. Treasury to borrow money; and the more deficits we run on an annual basis, the more we have to borrow. So the debt ceiling gets lifted.

The Republicans went out, borrowed more and more money till they hit that ceiling and had to pass legislation to raise that ceiling again to allow the Treasury to borrow even more money. That is what is happening right now.

To give you some perspective here, Mr. Speaker, when President Clinton came into office in January of 1993, we were running tremendous budget deficits. In 1993, a Democratic Congress and President Clinton passed a budget without one Republican vote and passed the budget that led to the greatest economic expansion in the history of the United States of America, created over 20 million new jobs. The stock market went crazy. There were benefits for everyone in our society because of the tough decisions; and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, several Members in the Democratic Caucus lost their seats over that tough vote. They made very difficult decisions in the early stages of President Clinton's Presidency in order to balance the budget and do the right thing; but even though they made this difficult decision, we were still running tremendous budget deficits early in the 1990s, mid-1990s.

So President Clinton came to this Congress in his 8 years, and as we can see here as President Clinton came in, running budget deficits and then even-

tually running surplus into the later years of his Presidency, but President Clinton early on, because of the deficits that were run up through the Reagan administration, through the first George Bush administration, and then into the Clinton administration, President Clinton had to come to Congress and ask to raise the debt ceiling.

Just to give you some perspective, Mr. Speaker, in 8 years, President Clinton asked the Congress to raise the debt ceiling twice, two times, in order to fix this problem. Then we had economic growth, we had balanced budgets, we had surplus money, and we had arguments in this Chamber about where the money was going to be spent. Two times in 8 years President Clinton early on asked to raise the debt ceiling.

President Bush, current President Bush, has asked this Congress to raise the debt ceiling five times already, five times, because there is runaway spending from this Congress. I am joined by my friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ). Five times, because of the runaway spending, the corporate welfare, time and time and time again to the pharmaceutical industry, to the HMOs, to the energy companies the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) was talking about earlier. We continue to give this corporate welfare, and with a blatant and reckless disregard for the fiscal responsibilities that we have here.

We all know now that we are borrowing the money from the Chinese Government and Japanese Government, the Saudi Arabian family, the house of Saud. So we are not going to the Second National or Sky Bank or Bank of America to get the money. This Congress and this President are going to the Chinese Government to get it.

I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my friend.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank so much my good friend from Ohio. I am particularly struck by your comments and your laying out of the real significance of the problem we are facing here.

I have only been here a year now. I am a new Member, and I came from 12 previous years in the Florida legislature. The whole concept, I mean, I certainly understand what the debt limit is and the debt ceiling, and I have watched the President's brother, Governor Bush, do the exact same thing in Florida and asked repeatedly for our debt limit to be extended. So there is clearly a pattern running through this family.

But what is so foreign to me as a State legislator, and I know we have many former State legislators in this Chamber, is the whole concept of debt and operating in the red to begin with. Most States cannot deficit spend. Most States have to adopt a budget that balances. You do not borrow against next year. You spend what you have, just

like the concept of PAYGO that the Democrats in the Congress have supported for years and continue to support, and then for some reason we cannot get the Republican leadership here to go back to that concept.

It is mindboggling. How does a party and a group of people who supposedly pride themselves on their fiscal responsibility not support the concept of paying as you go? I do not understand. I mean, those two concepts are opposites. Fiscal responsibility, yet five increases in the debt limit in the debt ceiling. It is really tough for me to understand.

We are borrowing away our children's future, and it is a concept that I have not been able to get my mind around. We want to make sure that we reduce the deficit, but the President talks about it in his State of the Union address. You constantly hear Republican Members of Congress profess that they have an interest in cutting the deficit in half or eliminating the deficit. Yet, the budget that the President submitted does no such thing. In fact, over the next 10 years it ensures that the deficit continues to stay significantly high, does not even come close to cutting it in half; and, actually, he presented us a budget on Monday that includes no assumption that we would spend no money on the war in Iraq after next year.

I mean, to me, I analogize the reality of the budget the President gave us on Monday to one that my first graders might sit down and write because they have about the same similarity in terms of likelihood of success here in this Chamber, the same similarity that my first graders would write to the ability to actually meet the needs of the people in the country.

□ 2215

You know what it really boils down to? It boils down to hypocrisy, because the same people who accuse Democrats of being tax and spend liberals, you know, and I am loathe to repeat that misnomer because it is so insulting, but if we are tax and spend liberals, they are borrow and spend. They are borrow and spend.

Because if we say that we do not think tax and spend is a good idea, which I think universally Republicans and Democrats would say taxing and spending as a way to solve our problems is not a set of solutions for the future of this country, how is borrowing and spending any different?

I mean, you are mortgaging our children's future, and that, you know, I think if we had some semblance of bipartisan here that some people profess to be supportive of, I would love to sit down around a table. Maybe Mr. BOEHNER, the new majority leader, will be different, I am certainly hopeful. But I would love to sit down around a table with a bipartisan group of Members and find a way to pay as we go.

I will yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think the pay as you go is basic common sense. It is the

same thing that people have to do at home. You get the checkbook out, you take in so much, you can only spend so much, or you have to end up borrowing money or putting it on your credit card, and we know that is definitely a downward spiral.

But exactly what you were saying, I think the President signed it into law today, the Deficit Reduction Act, which is hysterical, because it actually increases the deficit. Now, our Republican friends are saying, well, it cuts \$39 billion, the deficit by \$39 billion, or there is \$39 billion in cuts, but at the same time, they gave \$70 billion, or close to it, in tax cuts that went primarily to people who make more than 4- or 5- or \$600,000 a year. So it is very simple math to realize that, well, you may cut tell by 39, but if you are reducing your revenues by \$70 billion, that there is still a deficit increase. And that is basically what happened.

Now, you can check the rolls here as far as what Democrats have voted for. Time and time again, the Democrats have supported middle-class tax cuts. We have supported tax cuts for small businesses. We supported tax cuts and credits for college tuition. But I am not ashamed to say that we are going to ask Bill Gates and Warren Buffett to pay their fair share in taxes, because right now they are getting a free ride. And I am not afraid to say, and the 30-something Working Group is not afraid to say, that we do not want to give public tax dollars to the tune of \$16 billion to the energy companies. You got to be kidding me.

I mean, you know, Mr. Speaker, people who may be watching this in the Chamber or Members in their offices should be startled that we are going to go out and collect tax dollars from the public. Average people making minimum wage, or 10 bucks or 15 bucks an hour, send money down here to us, and the Republican majority is taking that money and giving it to the energy companies when, you know, Exxon-Mobil is making \$39 billion in a quarter, and all of the other oil companies are doing extremely well.

Or we are going to take that money, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we are going to take the public money, and we are going to give it to the HMOs, or we are going to make sure that we are wasting it and giving it to the pharmaceutical companies, without any kind of price controls.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Essentially what that is is a manifestation of the culture of corruption. I mean, that is how you translate the culture of corruption which shows itself in individual Members in some cases, and people who are under suspicion and investigation, although not charged. And that is how you take it, or that is how they take it a step further and translate it into policy.

I mean, when we are providing significant tax dollars for energy companies, when we are essentially ensuring that special interests have their pock-

ets lined via people's tax dollars, then that is the manifestation of the culture of corruption and how it impacts people in terms of the policymaking that goes on here.

And we talking about third-party validators. It would be easy for us to just say what we think standing on this floor. But, you know, it would be very easy for us to lay out, you know, progressive liberal Democratic organizations to validate what we are saying here.

I am going to read you a few third-party validators who laid out their opinion of the President's budget in the last several days. Goldman Sachs, for example. They said that the deficit forecasts that were laid out in the President's budget this week were unrealistic.

Bush's budget proposal assumes that the Federal deficit would jump from \$318 billion last year to \$423 billion in 2006, then slide back down to \$183 billion in 2010. Those factors led Goldman Sachs economists to tell clients yesterday that the deficit forecasts are unrealistic.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Goldman Sachs is not a liberal organization?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. No. And also not a liberal organization is the Heritage Foundation, who says that the budget does not deal with retirees. Brian Riedl, budget analyst for the conservative Heritage Foundation, said that Bush's budget is clearly not enough to feasibly solve the most important economic challenge of our era, how to deal with 77 million baby-boomer retirees.

The Concord Coalition, also not a liberal bastion, said the White House was working off very unrealistic assumptions. Robert Bixby, executive director of the Concord Coalition, said of the Bush budget, when you look at the bottom line that they are putting out, it is important then to look at the assumptions. And I think there are some very unrealistic assumptions there that would probably keep the deficit much higher than the administration is showing.

When I say that my first-graders could sit down and write a similar budget that bears the same resemblance to reality, I am really not kidding.

You know, I am not just being tongue in cheek here. The President owes the American people the responsibility that he has taken when he took his oath to uphold the Constitution, a budget with realistic projections that does not just paint the rosiest picture possible so that he can coast through the rest of his term.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right. This is not a game. This is not a game that needs to be played. We switch the numbers here, and we switch them here. This is important, because as of February 8, which I believe is today, \$8,200,380,327,202 is the national debt. And we will have a chart next week that is updating this. And the President is going to come and ask to rise

the debt ceiling so that we can go out and borrow more money. But your share of the national debt, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, is \$27,518. That is what you owe, the debt you owe to the United States Treasury.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Now, Mr. RYAN, is that just adults?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No. That is yours, your kids'; each one of your kids, every citizen in the United States owes \$27,000 for the national debt. And the President is going to ask Congress for the ability to go out and borrow even more so that each citizen can owe even more.

Now, what we are trying to say here in the 30-something Group is that we have got to be responsible, we have got to balance the budget. We have got to make sure that we stop borrowing money from the Chinese Government, because ultimately it is going to lead to each citizen having to pay more of their paycheck in taxes to fund the debt, and we do not want that to happen.

So our friends on the other side can talk about tax cuts all they want, but as they continue to go out and borrow money with the full faith and credit of the United States Government behind it, it means our taxpayers are good for it. So if you are home, you are good for it. We can count on you to raise your taxes so that you can give the Republican majority more money so that they can pay the bills.

Now, would not it be nice, you know, if you are at home and you get your credit card statement, your credit card only allows you to borrow \$10,000. Whew. Boy, I am at \$10,000. I am at \$9,990. Would it not be nice if I could just call up the credit card company and say, you know, I realize I am not making any more money, I am probably making less, I realize that health care costs have doubled, tuition and everything else, can you give me another \$10,000 so I can borrow more?

And really the worst thing that can happen is the credit card companies says, yes, go ahead. Then you owe them more. And you owe more interest. It is this downward spiral that we are in right now. It is ultimately robbing the future of our country.

I want to kick it to you, but I just want to share one more statistic here that we have been using that I think is astonishing, astonishing. In the first 224 years of this country, from 1776 to 2000, we borrowed as a country \$1 trillion from foreign interests. Okay. They were foreign holdings of U.S. debt, \$1 trillion dollars in 224 years.

President Bush and the Republican House and the Republican Senate in the last 4 years have borrowed \$1.05 trillion. They borrowed more money from the Chinese, the Japanese, the Saudi Arabians in 4 years than this country has borrowed in 224 years.

That is unbelievable to think that our friends on the other side, who many of them are friends, can say with a straight face, we are fiscally respon-

sible. We are the party of fiscal responsibility. We want to cut taxes and reduce government burden. Reduce government burden? My goodness gracious. Borrowing money from the Chinese Government is somehow being fiscally responsible to the tune of \$1 trillion?

So this all adds up to a real cost of the kind of corruption that we have down here, because you give tax cuts to your rich friends, you give subsidies to the energy companies, you give subsidies to the pharmaceutical companies, but you are borrowing the money on the backs of your kids.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. To take that a step further, and, Mr. RYAN, before I do that, we have used this chart repeatedly because it is so illustrative of the stark ineptitude, for lack of a better term, of this administration, you know, compared to all of the other previous administrations combined.

I am wondering, sometimes people catch this Special Order hour, and sometimes they do not. I know we have a Website, and we have recently revamped it, and my understanding is that the charts that we use are going to be available on our Website in the event that people want to go and look at them more closely. Is that right?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is correct. www.housedemocrats.gov/30-something. And this will be the Web page that pops up, 30-something Working Group. Then you go to the bottom and it says, our posters. So you will be able to get to our posters here.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They can peruse them at their leisure.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yeah. And they are really good, because we have taken all of the information that Tom Manatos here, who is our go-to guy with the 30-something Working Group, kind of boiled it down, and you will be able to see our third-party validators.

Now, for example, this poster here, now we have added the pictures, obviously, to help make our points to see that this is President Bush, he is responsible for the last 4 years, and all of those pictures of all of the other Presidents, Andrew Jackson, President Kennedy, there is Taft, Lincoln, they are all here. But at the bottom it says, source, where we cite our source, is U.S. Treasury. We are not making those numbers up. So go to the Website and you will be able to see this poster that our crack staff has put together.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We have sort of interchangeably been talking about two different things. There is the debt, and then there is the deficit. Both things are startling when it comes to this administration's record. Under this President the deficit and the national debt are out of control.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The deficit is the annual.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Right. The deficit is the annual ongoing difference between the revenue we take in and the money we spend. And then the

debt is what we have to borrow in order to stay afloat.

Over the last 5 years, it is clear that President Bush has lost control of both. Under this President we have gone from a projected 10-year surplus of \$5.6 trillion to a projected deficit over the same period of \$3.3 trillion, which is an \$8.9 trillion reversal.

Under President Bush's budget, when omitted costs are included, we have deficits for as far as the eye can see. You have a projected rise in the deficit to \$556 billion by 2016. And when we talk about omitted costs, people might say, what do you mean by omitted costs? Like the fact that this budget does not include any spending on the war in Iraq and Afghanistan after next year.

Now, I wish, oh, were that to be true, that we would now be in a position where Iraq would be, and the Iraqi people would be, able to sustain themselves without our assistance. Unfortunately, we have created a situation in which that continues to be impossible, and it is a virtual certainty that we are going to need to spend money after next year in Iraq and Afghanistan, despite the President's claims.

When omitted costs are included, the President's budget does not cut the deficit in half by 2009 as he continues to claim that it will.

□ 2230

What continues to be mind-boggling is that we could fix this if you go back to the pay as you go rules of the 1990s, which is what turned the deficits into surpluses, tough votes that people took. Like you said, there were Members that lost their seats, but at the end of the day, it has to be more important to do the right thing than to continue to be here for each one of us, and that is something that we have to internalize. This is a good job. This is a job that we all really enjoy. I have not met a Member of Congress who does not like the job a lot, and that is why many of us, most of us, fight hard to keep it every election cycle. But at the end of the day, you have to be willing to look yourself in the mirror and say you did the right thing and be willing to walk out of this Chamber and know that you may not come back after you did the right thing.

Unfortunately, we do not have enough people who serve in this body that are willing to do that. And unfortunately, it appears to be a little lopsided when it comes to the partisan breakdown of that willingness.

This is literally the worst reversal, the worst fiscal reversal, in American history. We have never had the kind of turnaround from a record surplus to a record deficit like the one we have had. And the national debt, as you said, continues to skyrocket. They have had to raise the debt limit five times, but total combined it was \$2.2 trillion that the debt had to be raised since President Bush took office. I mean, it really is astonishing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. What is interesting about the \$2.2 trillion is that is more money than this country borrowed from the inception of the country to the beginning of Ronald Reagan's Presidency. So just in the Bush administration alone we have had to raise it \$2.2 trillion, which is more than whatever the math would be from Reagan back to George Washington. This Republican Congress is setting records here on this issue.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is something else I want to bring up, if you do not mind. I think it is important to compare words and deeds. And we both sat in this Chamber during the State of the Union and listened to the President lay out his vision for America. I want to read out from one of the paragraphs from the State of the Union and compare it to a couple of weeks later when he introduced his budget.

He said in the State of the Union that "our economy is healthy and vigorous and growing faster than other major industrialized nations. In the last 2½ years America has created 4.6 million new jobs, more than Japan and the European Union combined. Even in the face of high energy prices and natural disasters, the American people have turned in an economic performance that is the envy of the world."

Now, during my time in the legislature, and I spent a little bit of time in leadership in the statehouse in Florida, one of the things that the party leadership generally engages in is choosing words carefully. You choose the words as carefully as you can so that what comes out actually reflects the reality on the ground. Now, I can see why the President would have chosen to say that our economy is growing faster than other major industrialized nations, because he probably could come as close to the accuracy as possible when it comes to the economy.

But just take this AP story, again, a third-party validator that we like to use, just from January 27, which talked about the economy grows at slowest pace in 3 years. The economy grows by just a 1.1 percent pace in fourth quarter, slowest in 3 years. The annual rate in the fourth quarter of last year was 1.1 percent amid belt-tightening by consumers facing spiraling energy costs. The 1.1 percent growth rate in the fourth quarter marked a considerable loss of momentum from the third quarter's brisk 4.1 percent pace. The fourth quarter's performance was even weaker than many analysts were forecasting. Before the release of the report, they were predicting the GDP to clock in at a 2.8 percent pace. The weakness in the final quarter of last year reflected consumers pulling back, cuts in government spending, and businesses being more restrained in their capital spending.

This is not a columnist that wrote this. This is an actual story that is reporting facts on the ground.

I just feel resentful when I sit in this Chamber and I listen to the President

respectfully, and I expect on behalf of my constituents to hear accurate statements, to hear a true reflection of the state of our Nation. And instead what I felt like we got was a lot of partisan rhetoric, a lot of rhetoric that was not matched up with action as I would have liked to have seen it reflected in the budget.

He turned in a budget that actually gives us \$36 billion in Medicare cuts. I mean, in a State like mine, I represent the State of Florida, as you know, that is going to significantly disproportionately impact a vulnerable senior citizen population when they are already reeling in the midst of this disastrous Medicare Part D prescription drug benefit that was handed to them by this Republican leadership.

So it is just kind of one insult after another. When is it going to stop? When are we going to actually have some true commitment to back up the words?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely.

Just to continue to reinforce your point on the PAYGO, on the fiscal responsibility. We call it PAYGO. It means pay as you go, which means you have to have the money to pay for it. If you have a program, you either have to raise taxes or cut the money from somewhere else to pay for it. Cut the energy subsidy if you need \$14 billion or whatever to pay for Medicaid; find a way to control spending with the prescription drug program that is \$700 billion and not doing anything to control the costs by allowing reimportation or allowing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate down the drug prices for the Medicare program and take that money and pay for what you want to pay, whether it is some of the Medicaid cuts that came up, or whether it was some of the college PELL grants or students loan cuts that were made in this recent budget.

But just to reinforce the PAYGO, the Democrats have supported PAYGO, period, and we have tried to get it reinstated time and time again. We will talk to our staff to make sure this gets up on our new Website. March 30, 2004, Representative MIKE THOMPSON, a Democrat from California, tried to instruct the budget conferees to include pay as you go requirements in the 2006 budget resolution. The Republicans voted, almost in lockstep to a number, 209 to 209, which I think every Democrat voted for it, to block it and to reject the pay as you go requirements to be included to instruct the budget conferees, it is a lot of mumbo jumbo. But Democrats were for pay as you go; the Republicans blocked it. That was March 30, 2004.

On May 5, 2004, Republicans voted by a vote of 208 to 215 to reject a motion by Representative Dennis Moore, a Democrat from Kansas. Again, we tried to get PAYGO established in the budget. Vote number 145. Then on November 18 of 2004, Republicans voted to block consideration of Mr. Stenholm's amendment from Texas to the debt

limit increase. Last time they tried to get the debt increased, we wanted to say that if you are going to increase the debt, you better put the PAYGO requirements in. That was in 2004, and that was vote number 534. Three times Democrats have tried to institute fiscal discipline in this Chamber, and it has been rejected every time from the Republican majority.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you hear a Republican come up here, although there is a handful that have been supportive, but the leadership on the Republican side has time and time again rejected our amendments, Democratic amendments, to try to put in place fiscal restraint on this runaway spending that is going on, mortgaging our children's future by borrowing the money from the Chinese Government in order to fund their huge and their runaway spending, and we are trying to fix this.

We are just asking for an opportunity to implement some of these restraints that, as you stated earlier, were implemented in the '90s. I think George Herbert Walker Bush implemented them; Clinton; the Democratic Congress; the Republican Congress earlier that actually believed in fiscal discipline. This is a different outfit that we are dealing with now.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And it is not like there are not Members on both sides of the aisle who have not lived under this before. I am not sure if it is the majority, but there is a significant plurality of Members in this Chamber who served in their State legislatures. And you talk to any Governor, talk to anyone currently serving in the State legislature, that is what they live every day.

Really, it is like you get to Congress, and you become a drunken sailor. You are suddenly freed from the restraints of fiscal conservatism. You do not have to think about operating in the black anymore. You can spend to your heart's content and not think about fiscal restraint and not think about how you are going to pay for it. It is essentially like, oh, I get to Congress, and I get this humongous Visa or Mastercard, and I get to do whatever I want with it. Well, that is not how it works for the American people on an everyday basis. If it does, they end up ultimately declaring bankruptcy.

Do we want to continue to travel down that path in the United States of America and be in a position where we cannot pay our debt one day? I mean, I am raising little kids. That is literally the future that we are planning for right now for the next generation.

Again, I want to draw some comparisons to words and deeds here, if you do not mind. The President again, as I said, talked about how our economy was healthy and vigorous. I do not know how you have a debt like this, bigger than any combined in the last 224 years, just in the last 4 years, and say that the economy is healthy and vigorous, but I guess we all use a different dictionary from time to time of health and vigor.

The President said that in the State of the Union, and let us just detail some facts related to the economy. President Bush, despite what he says about the 4.6 million new jobs that were created, still has the worst record on jobs since President Herbert Hoover. He added 108,000 jobs in December. He has lost a total of 2.8 million manufacturing jobs, 2.8 million manufacturing jobs. At this point in the last recovery, the economy had created about 5 million more jobs than we have seen in this supposed recovery, and millions of Americans who want to work still do not have jobs.

Now, last week I was sitting at home. I was on my couch watching CNN, and I saw the head of the Ford Motor Company announce plans to cut up to 30,000 jobs and close 14 plants. I was dumbfounded. I had just heard from the President not 10 days before that the state of our economy is healthy and vigorous, and he created 4.6 million jobs, and now Ford Motor Company is cutting 30,000. General Motors just announced plans to eliminate their set of 30,000 jobs. Adelphia, now in bankruptcy, is asking workers to accept a 55 percent pay cut. Verizon is phasing out its defined benefits and pension plans for about 50,000 management employees. We are not talking about management employees who are on the high end of the pay scale; management employees like middle management, regular people, people who are living close to if not paycheck to paycheck every single day. And IBM recently announced it would freeze pension benefits for its 117,000 U.S. workers.

In 2005, U.S. employers announced more than a million job cuts, which marks the first time since 2001 that annual job cuts increased. Now, like I said, I understand that leaders often use the words that paint the rosier picture or paint the picture that they would like to see or that they would like people to perceive. I think it is pretty clear that the jobs record, the health of our economy, the vigor of our economy, the debt we are saddling our children with, the deficit that continues to balloon compared to the surplus that we had just 3½ short years ago, there is no resemblance to the reality that President Bush has painted and the reality that our constituents are living every single day. None. It is wrong.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And I just found out, too, today Wal-Mart is going to open another 1,500 stores. Now, Wal-Mart one way or the other. Now, that is not economic development. That is not economic growth, Wal-Mart jobs. Now, they may have a place in our society. You can argue it one way or another. That is not what we are talking about.

□ 2245

We are talking about this President saying that we are having real economic growth; and Wal-Mart is opening up 1,500 stores is not, to average Americans, actual economic growth.

And as you stated with the budget and the deficits, let's just look at what this President has done. We saw the numbers here, that he has borrowed more than the previous 200 years. He has run up the four largest deficits in the history of the United States of America, an annual deficit of \$378 billion in 2003, a deficit of \$413 billion in 2004, a deficit of \$318 billion in 2005, and a projected deficit this year of \$423 billion.

We are going to be spending more than we are taking in, and we are borrowing the money from the Chinese Government. Now, we are putting ourselves in a very difficult position, not only because we are borrowing money and we have to pay interest on it, which is reckless as could be, but strategically trying to deal with the Chinese Government, how can you be firm in your foreign policy when the Chinese Government is your bank? You can't go to your banker and negotiate from a position of weakness. If you have a lot of money and then you want to borrow some, you are in a good position. But if you go and you owe and you owe and you owe the bank, eventually the bank has the knife at your throat and you have got to deal on their terms, not on your terms. If you really need the money, well, then, the rate is going to go up because, hey, you're a little risky here. It is a risky loan to make.

My point is that although we may have good credit, the more we borrow from the Chinese Government, then the weaker our positioning is when we need to deal with the nuclear situation in North Korea or we need help in Iraq or we need to deal with the Russians or we need to work on the human rights violations that are going on in China, as they are totally suppressing freedom of speech and they are arresting journalists, with Google and a lot of our American companies helping them. There is religious persecution in China. No human rights, no labor rights, no environmental protections in China. They are just dumping things in the river, like we did 30 or 40 or 50 years ago.

So all of this borrowing is putting us in a real weak position to negotiate on a lot of other fronts.

So we are weakening ourselves at home and weakening our position abroad. And if we want to be helpful in the world, we have to be strong at home. A stronger America starts right here in the United States.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am just looking at some of the facts and figures that our staff has put together for us, and sometimes I have difficulty thinking about the size and scope of what it means to have the largest deficit in American history and a debt that combined with the previous 224 years is greater than the debt from those years. It is easier to deal with that information in nuggets, so let us talk about debt and its impact on individuals for a moment.

And since this is the 30-something Working Group and we often try to highlight the difficulty our generation is having or what our generation lives through, let us just go through some facts and figures comparatively for our generation through the years.

Since 1992-93, the average college grad student loan debt has grown from \$12,100 to \$19,300 in 2003, just 10 years. Over 25 percent of college graduates in 2003 had a student loan debt higher than \$25,000, which is a 7 percent increase from 10 years ago. In 2002, 14 percent of young adults reported that student loans caused them to delay marriage, which is up from 7 percent in 1991. One in five said their debt had caused them to delay having children, up from 12 percent in 1991. Forty percent reported they delayed buying a home because of their loans, compared with 25 percent in 1991. And 17 percent significantly changed careers because of their debt, about the same as 1991.

The policy decisions that are made here, Mr. RYAN, the culture of corruption that translates into special interests and the wealthiest few being at the top of the heap here as opposed to the average working family or the average hardworking recent college graduate being put first or being considered at least on the same level has caused real strife, real difficulty.

Imagine being in love, finding the person you want to spend the rest of your life with, knowing you want to have children, knowing that you could potentially buy that house that you would love to live in and have the dream of homeownership, essentially the American Dream, and you have so much debt that you are saddled with because your government, your Congress did not at least provide the ability for you to get a higher education because it was more important to provide tax cuts to the wealthiest few; more important to provide tax breaks for Big Oil and for pharmaceutical companies and ensure that they are first in line. That is real life. Those are the real-life decisions that real people, our people, have to make. It is just so wrong.

I used to think about this in the legislature, too. You come up to Tallahassee in Florida, which is our capital, and Washington here, and we make policy in this body thousands of miles from our constituents, most of us, except those who live right around here. Sometimes I think that is really a significant cause of the insensitivity that clearly goes on in Washington. Because we are so disconnected from our constituents when we make policy.

It is not like a city council people, who has to deal with the in-your-face aspect of that type of governing. You know, if there is a dead dog on someone's driveway, that city council person knows about it and they will have to deal with that person in the supermarket or you are right up in their face in the dais. We cannot talk to the people that come here and are sitting

in the gallery, and so we are insulated from making those decisions. And perhaps that is wrong. As a result, we make decisions where the people who can get access to us, the people who have the money to pay to get in front of us, they get to be first in line; and I think that really ruins lives for people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely. And when you talk about investment and the result of the ripple effect of investment in education, the shortsightedness in making these cuts that Republicans have made, increasing student loans, or a 50 percent increase in interest rates in college loans, where rates will increase from 4.1 percent to 6.8 percent in dealing with the college loans, if you look at what countries like Ireland have done as part of a reform package which included some tax cuts, which we are for, but we have to do them in a targeted responsible way. But one of the things they did in Ireland was they made college education free. Everybody goes. There are no barriers.

I think, why is it so complicated to figure out what the student loan process is like? Why can't we just have a form for student loans and it says how much you make, how much you get, and sign on the dotted line? This should be readily available. Because we know now that investing in a kid's education is the best investment we could possibly make in the return that we get. Because with a high school diploma you make \$20,000 a year, \$25,000 a year. With a college diploma, you make \$40,000. With a master's degree you make \$60,000. You are paying back more in taxes. So let us make the initial investment and make sure these students get through college, make sure there are no barriers, and long term we will get money back.

I have used this statistic before: the University of Akron did a study a few years back that said in Ohio for every dollar the State of Ohio invested in higher education, they got \$2 back in tax money, for the very reason that people with college degrees make more money and, therefore, pay more in taxes back to the State. So it is a great investment to make.

Right now, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we are really being very shortsighted in what we are doing. Here is a chart that you can find on our Web page. The number, by the thousands of students that will graduate with engineering degrees this year. In an economy where we want to create jobs, you need engineers in order to create the kind of wealth that we need. In China, they will graduate 600,000 engineers. In India, they are going to graduate 350,000 engineers. In the United States, 70,000 engineers.

Now, I recognize that there are some population differences here, but the United States needs to compete with these folks in these other countries. And if we don't focus on making sure we reduce the barriers to college education so that everyone gets involved,

create incentives for our students to get involved in engineering and chemistry and computer programming and the new high-tech jobs that are going to drive the economy and create wealth and lead to addressing some of the issues that Mr. BARTLETT was talking about with alternative energy sources, we are not going to be able to compete.

You can't have a tier-one military if you don't have a tier-one economy. So these investments that we want to make in education lead to economic growth, which expands the economy, which means we are going to be able to keep our military a tier-one military and a leader in the world. And it puts us in a position of strength, because as we grow the economy, we can stop borrowing money from the Chinese Government in order to fund our deficits; and then we will be in a stronger fiscal position here at home and then better able to deal with the problems that we have abroad.

We need to begin to do the kinds of things we are talking about, investing in education and at the same time not just throwing money at the problem but making sure that parents and teachers and principals and superintendents and local communities are held accountable. This isn't going to be we are just going to throw money at the problem like our Republican friends are doing. They want to curry favor with the senior citizens, they throw money at a \$700 billion prescription drug program and they do not do anything to contain the costs. They do not allow reimportation from Canada to drop the price down, and they do not allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate down the drug prices. You can't just throw money at the problem like our Republican friends want to do without having any accountability.

So the Democrats are looking for opportunities and have ideas to make sure we fund these programs. We do it in a responsible way, knowing that in the end the long-term growth is going to lead to budget surpluses like it did in the 1990s.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I want to jump off from what you are saying in terms of America lagging behind global education standards with more emblematic examples of the difference between their rhetoric and their deeds.

The President, again in the State of the Union, talked about our one commitment being necessary above all in that we must continue to lead the world in human talent and creativity. Our greatest advantage in the world, he says, has always been our educated, hardworking, ambitious people and we are going to keep that edge. That evening he announced what he calls the American Competitiveness Initiative to encourage innovation throughout our economy and to give our Nation's children a firm grounding in math and science. He proposed doubling the Federal commitment to the most critical basic research programs and the phys-

ical sciences over the next 10 years and a number of other really lofty goals.

Let us match the rhetoric with the reality. Republicans have consistently, consistently failed to even come close to matching the rhetoric that the President laid out in the State of the Union in their deeds and actions in terms of making those words reality. Last year, Republicans provided less than one-third of the promised investment in the Math and Science Partnerships program, which is designed to increase student academic achievement in grades K through 12 in math and science. They have shortchanged the Tech Talent Act, which strengthens postsecondary education to increase the number of degrees in math, science, and engineering, by nearly 33 percent.

This comes at a time when only 36 percent of fourth graders and 30 percent of eighth graders tested proficient in math, but our twelfth graders scored at or near the bottom of math and science compared to other countries.

□ 2300

We could listen to the President say it until he is blue in the face, but until the Republican leadership here and the Members of Congress match what the President is saying with their votes, until he proposes a budget that actually reflects what his words said in the State of the Union, why should people believe them? They should not. They should not believe them because this is another example of how a pervasive culture of corruption and cronyism permeates itself all the way through the process and results in the reality on the ground in a budget that does the exact opposite in terms of producing the competitive talent that the President talked about in the State of the Union, because that cannot happen if you are slashing and burning the programs that accomplish that.

The American people are not stupid. They understand the difference between saying it and doing it. When I have traveled across the country, I hear from people that want to believe the things that their politicians tell them. They want to believe in us, and their confidence in this body, in Congress, in the government is so badly shaken by everything that has gone on through the culture of corruption that has gone on here. It has shaken the confidence that people have in this institution to its foundation. We have to do something about it. We have an opportunity to do something about it later this year. I hope that in my second term that I hope to serve in this Congress that things will change.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If you look at what the Democrats are offering, they say the Democrats do not have any ideas. That may sound good, but we are the party of ideas. We are beginning to communicate them, I think, in a way that is effective. If you look at Ms. PELOSI's innovation agenda that we came up with in our caucus by meeting with high-tech companies and asking

them what they want, if you look at our competitiveness agenda that we have, investments in research and development, R&D funding has stayed flat under the President's watch, and it is way below what it was 20 years ago. If we are going to be competitive, we have to make some investments in research and development. We are blowing money by giving subsidies to the energy companies when we should invest it in basic research.

I was in Israel in November. They are doing some fantastic things with venture capital and business incubators and research and development, and the Israeli companies have just surpassed Canada on the NASDAQ, and I asked one of the top dogs over there, what do we need to do in America to try to imitate what you are doing here?

He said the biggest mistake you are making in the United States is not making investment in research and development, because of the tremendous impact that has leading to new innovations. So cutting this funding, flat-lining the research and development funding is the wrong thing to do, where the Democrats are saying we need to make targeted investments into research and development, targeted investments in education, targeted investments into broadband penetration. Everybody in the country should have access to broadband in the next 5 years.

The President wants to do alternative energy, and he says we are going to become energy competitive, and this is typical of the kind of leadership we are getting from this President. We are going to make this country energy-independent by 75 percent in the next 20 years.

It is like, come on, Mr. President, let us go. We want to get things rolling in the country. We want to get things moving. We need your help, we need your leadership, and the country is dying for an alternative energy program; not to say we are going to be 75 percent in 2025. That is not the kind of leadership we need.

Democrats have a plan to do it in 10 years. This is the broadband penetration I was talking about that is going on. These are broadband subscribers per 100 inhabitants as of January 1 of last year. This is Korea, almost 25 percent; Hong Kong-China, almost 21 percent; Iceland, 15.5 percent; U.S., only 11 percent.

If we want every child to have an access to education, we need to make sure that they are not getting left behind technologically, which is what happens in many of these neighborhoods and many of these rural areas. Kids and families who do not have access to these kinds of things.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Again, I want to highlight where words did not match deeds. The candidate President George W. Bush said before the election that we would have "universal, affordable access to broadband technology by the year 2007." Well, the Bush administration has had no national policy to

develop a universal broadband access even though building a robust, nationwide network would expand employment by 1.2 million new permanent jobs in our country.

This is the House Democrats' innovation agenda, which is available on HouseDemocrats.gov. We have a plan laid out how, which includes how we would get to universal broadband access within 5 years, and that we would make sure that we grow the math and science and engineers that we need in this country and make sure that we can match our rhetoric with action.

DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for the remainder of the time until midnight.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, we again want to thank Leader NANCY PELOSI for the opportunity to talk about the things that are important to the American people. Again, we have laid out our vision for America's competitiveness into the future and how we can keep America number one and actually match rhetoric with what the President laid out in his State of the Union with action and deeds. You can get a copy of this, you can peruse a copy of our innovation agenda, which was developed not in Washington, not sitting around a conference table in a hearing room in the Nation's Capital, but out in the country, in the high-tech centers around this country, with bipartisan input, with the leaders and CEOs of some of the major technologically advanced corporations across this country that can be viewed at HouseDemocrats.gov. That is our Web site where you can get a copy of this.

Again, in addition to broadband access, we are the ones that laid out our commitment to growing a new generation of innovators. We committed in this document to educate 100,000 new scientists, engineers and mathematicians in the next 4 years by proposing a new initiative by working with States, businesses, and universities to provide scholarships to qualified students who commit to working in the fields of innovation.

But the Republicans could not say that they were going to do that because in every successive budget, they have cut student financial aid. You cannot make sure that you expand access to higher education in the math and sciences and in areas that are significantly underrepresented now unless you provide the aid that these students are going to need.

It is not that we do not have the students in these programs because there is a bumper crop of wealthy kids that are just not going into the math and sciences; it is to make sure that we go into the communities across this country and encourage and nurture the de-

sire from the smallest children and the youngest ages and across the cultural and ethnic spectrum to ensure that people of all colors, of all economic walks of life choose to pursue math and science and engineering.

I read something earlier this morning that talked about China graduating 600,000 engineers. I think the number is right, that we graduated 50,000. I believe that it is that drastic a difference in terms of the proportion.

We have always been known as the innovators in the world. Every major accomplishment scientifically, at least in my lifetime, in our lifetime, has been achieved by Americans. But we are slowly but surely not going to be the leaders in those areas of science and math unless we go back to our traditional financial commitment to ensuring that kids can get access to education.

□ 2310

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Absolutely.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One of the interesting things when I was over in China in August, they were talking about the engineers. And they have this tremendous advantage on us as far as numbers go. And so we were asking what is the advantage that the U.S. engineers have. And they were saying, well, U.S. engineers they are just the best in the world, they are the most creative in the world, and they work in teams better than any other engineer, any other country. And it is funny, because this week, and we have talked about this before, but this week we had the school board associations down here. And wouldn't you know, the programs that are getting cut because of lack of funding. No Child Left Behind, the burden that is being pushed, the bonds that need to be gathered at a local level in order to fund the local public schools across the country, the programs that are being cut are those programs that teach our kids how to be more creative and how to work in teams better.

You hear a lot about the art programs getting cut, the music programs getting cut, the visual arts getting cut, the performing arts getting cut, language arts getting cut in a lot of these schools because they do not have the resources they need, or the school districts or the school systems are not organized the way they need to be organized.

And then you also see a lot of pay-to-play: \$350. Well, a lot of families do not have an extra \$350 to get their kids in activities. And if you have two or three kids, you are talking about a thousand bucks. That is a lot of money, I hate to break it to a lot of our friends on the other side who do not seem to understand this. So the very advantage that we have, we are cutting off our nose to spite our face. And those are the kinds of investments that we need to make,

not only invest, but restructure and reorganize the way that our education system runs today. And I think if we do a couple of these things and have the courage to lead, I think we are going to be able to do it.

Part of this, too, we need the parents involved; we need the parents to be accountable. We need the parents to be there with their kids. We need to make sure that the parents know that their kids have to do the homework. This is going to be a team effort. This is going to be us doing our job, the parents doing their job, the local school district doing their job, everybody coming together if we are going to be competitive in the 21st century. That is the only way this is going to happen.

And I think it is important, one final point here. I think it is important that if we are going to ask kids to get involved in the math and science and engineering and chemistry and all these things and areas of studies that we need them to get involved in, there needs to be a goal. And I think, really, the goal for the next generation is what Mr. BARTLETT was talking about a little while back, about what are we going to do with the alternative energy realm; who is going to develop the new and the latest technologies? Is this going to be a national effort? Not in 2025, Mr. President. Now.

You know, we went to the Moon in less than a decade. And it is going to take us 20 years to figure out how we are going to become energy independent so we can get out of these entanglements that we find ourselves in in the Middle East and in other countries.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And I mean, forgive me. But, come on, am I the only one that felt it was a little disingenuous to hear from this President that America is addicted to oil and we need to end that addiction? I mean, come on. Where has the commitment to that been? In the two energy bills that we were asked to vote on in the last year since I have been here, where we were basically giving away the store to the energy and oil companies? I mean, where is the financial commitment? Where has it been to exploring alternative energy sources? Has there been a miraculous transformation in the White House that I am not aware of?

I just do not understand how the administration could not see that you have to, in order to get the American people to believe what you say and to have faith and restore their confidence and belief in you, you have to do what you say you are going to do. And that just does not seem to happen on almost any score, particularly not when it comes to energy independence and exploring alternative energy sources.

And you know, I am proud to be a member of the Democratic Caucus, because when we say something, we mean it. But when we lay out a goal, we back it up with how we might do it were we in charge. You know, we would make a

funding commitment to exploring alternative energy resources. We would invest our energy and effort into the Midwest so that not only can we become foreign-oil independent, we can become independent from oil, period.

You know, I am from a State where I do not want to see drilling off the coast of my shoreline. None of my constituents want to see it either. So we need to explore other ways of generating energy in this country that are not dedicated solely to the production of oil, whether it is developed here or in another country. But we actually have to have a plan that would do that, and have Members who actually cast votes in favor of that plan, which just has not happened by any stretch of the imagination here that I have seen.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, we spent a great deal of time tonight talking about the challenges that are facing our country, and the thing that I have noticed that is the most frustrating for me, Mr. RYAN, is in the short time that I have been here, you know, I was hopeful that just like when I was in the Florida senate, I was able to work effectively across the aisle and on the major issues that were important to our State, just like I was hopeful that we would be able to do here for the important issues in our country.

I was hopeful that I could come to the Congress and sit down, and I was ready to continue to work with Members on the other side on the major issues, not the issues on the margins, because, you know, you are able to find individual Members who you can work with one on one or in small groups on various issues, but on the hot-button issues, on education, on health care, on energy, on prescription drugs, on any of the issues that are really significant to the American people.

It is like those issues are radioactive somehow, and there seems to be an impenetrable wall around the Republican Conference, where it is virtually impossible to get any Member from the other side of the aisle to sit down with a group on our side of the aisle and try to hammer out compromise.

I just do not come from a place where I was used to dealing with my-way-or-the-highway rules of engagement. And you know, maybe now that there is new leadership in the Republican Conference, things will change. Certainly we are hearing words to that effect. It remains to be seen whether those words will be backed up by action. And I look forward to that possibility. I know you do too.

Do you want to talk about the Web site and tell people how they can get in touch with us and reach out to us?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely, I do.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We have a new Web site, Mr. RYAN. We revamped it, and it has a lot of new cool bells and whistles.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yeah. We are getting really high-tech here.

Www.housedemocrats.gov/30something. The innovation agenda that you mentioned will be available so you can hear the new ideas that the Democrats are coming up with. And I think if you look through this, I mean, this is exciting stuff. And you know, I am not just toeing the party line here. I am very, very excited about what we are offering and what we get to talk about over the course of the next year. As we ask the people of this country who put us in charge of the House of Representatives for oversight purposes, with the war, and everything else that is going on, we need to make sure that there is balance in government, and I think that the folks at home and the folks, Members of Congress and their offices, will be able to come to the Web site, see what we are talking about.

Www.housedemocrats.gov/30something. You go to the bottom, you can see all the posters that we have up. You can see our innovation agenda. We have got a lot of really good things going on, and we are going to keep plugging away over the course of the next year to try to let the people know at home that we have good ideas that we want to help move this country forward.

And one final point that I would like to make regarding all of this is that the country of China has 1.3 billion people. The country of India has over a billion people. And we have 300 million in this country. The Democratic agenda, whether we are talking about energy, investments, education, health care, we are about pulling our country together as a community, as a family and moving forward and knowing that you cannot compete against that many people and not be unified. And what the Democratic innovation agenda, our agenda on health care, energy independence, whatever it may be, is about pulling everybody together, making sure that every kid in the country has a quality education, has health care, has an opportunity to live and work and create wealth in the United States and live the American Dream as they see it. So, again,

www.housedemocrats.gov/30something. Got to give a shout out to our guy from Florida who was not able to make it here tonight, Mr. MEEK. It is never the same without him. Sometimes it is never the same good, sometimes it is never the same bad.

□ 2320

But we miss him here tonight.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. We do miss our good friend from the great State of Florida, who is in the neighboring district next to me.

I do want to point out to people who might have seen this tonight that they not only can find all of the posters that we use usually on the next day once we have first introduced one on the floor, but they can also submit questions and comments to us through our Website. We want to make this as interactive as possible and get their feedback and

input, and we want to know what their concerns are.

The leader has given us this opportunity to speak to the American people, and our generation is often underrepresented in terms of the things that we care about in this country. And it is a privilege to serve in this body with you, Mr. RYAN, and under the leadership of NANCY PELOSI.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

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

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

Mr. HINCHEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of family 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 Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, February 14.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, February 14 and 15.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill

of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4636. An act to enact the technical and conforming amendments necessary to implement the Federal Deposit Insurance Reform Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1932. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95).

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 332, 109th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Accordingly, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 332, 109th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 14, 2006.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 332, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 14, 2006, at 2 p.m.

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 February 7, 2006]

6080. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Lance W. Lord, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6081. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Philip R. Kensinger, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6082. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonel John D. Johnson, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6083. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Gary D. Speer, 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.

6084. A letter from the 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. (Wheatland, Rock River, Lusk, Gillette, Moorcroft, Pine Haven, Upton, Wyoming, and Edgemont, Custer, Murdo, Wall and Ells-

worth AFB, South Dakota) [MB Docket No. 05-98] (RM-11187; RM-11252; RM-11253) received January 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6085. A letter from the Principal Deputy General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Accounting and Financial Reporting for Public Utilities Including RTOs [Docket No. RM04-12-000; Order No. 668] received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6086. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Requirements on Content and Format of Labeling for Human Prescription Drug and Biological Products [Docket No. 2000N-1269] (formerly Docket No. 00N-1269) (RIN: 0910-AA94) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6087. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

6088. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a six-month report prepared by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001, and continued on August 14, 2002, August 7, 2003, and August 6, 2004 to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

6089. 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. 01-06 which informs of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the United States and the United Kingdom concerning Joint U.S./UK Sea-Ballistic Missile Defense Studies, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

6090. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

6091. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser 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(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6092. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser 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(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6093. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser 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(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6094. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report of the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on International Relations.

6095. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000; to the Committee on International Relations.

6096. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting consistent with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997, and Executive Order 13346 of July 8, 2004, certification for calendar year 2005; to the Committee on International Relations.

6097. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for a drawdown to support the Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan, pursuant to Section 202 and other relevant provisions of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act (Pub. L. 107-327, as amended) and Sections 506 and 652 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on International Relations.

6098. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997, and Executive Order 13346 of July 8, 2004, certification pursuant to Condition 7(C)(i), Effectiveness of the Australia Group; to the Committee on International Relations.

6099. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Registration Fee Change (RIN: 1400-AB97) received January 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6100. A letter from the U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, Department of State, transmitting on behalf of the President, the report, "the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief: Annual Report on the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria," pursuant to Public Law 108-25; to the Committee on International Relations.

6101. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Report on Congress on Arms Control, Nonproliferation and Disarmament Studies,"

pursuant to 31 U.S. 1113 note; to the Committee on International Relations.

6102. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-270, "Parkside Terrace Economic Development Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6103. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-266, "Terrorism Prevention in Hazardous Materials Transportation Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6104. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-267, "Nuisance Abatement Reform Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6105. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-276, "Department of Health Functions Clarification Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6106. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-275, "Office of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Affairs Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6107. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-274, "Low-Emissions Motor Vehicle Tax Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6108. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-272, "Contracting and Procurement Reform Task Force Establishment Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6109. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-273, "Uniform Mediation Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6110. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-271, "Motor Vehicle Definition Electric Personal Assistive Mobility Device Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6111. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-269, "Office of Administrative Hearings Term Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6112. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-265, "Domestic Partnership Equality Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6113. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-264, "Library Enhancement, Assessment, and Development Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6114. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-251, "New Columbia Community Land Trust 22nd and Channing Streets, N.E. Tax Exemption Temporary Act

of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6115. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-253, "DC-USA Economic Development Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6116. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-250, "Washington Convention Center Authority Advisory Committee Continuity Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6117. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-268, "Health Care Benefits Expansion Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6118. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer/Director, HR, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6119. A letter from the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement and independent audit of The American Legion proceedings of the 87th annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Honolulu, Hawaii from August 23, 24, and 25, 2006 and a report on the Organization's activities for the year preceding the Convention, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 49; (H. Doc. No. 109-87); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

[Submitted on February 8, 2006]

6120. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on U.S. military personnel and U.S. individual civilians retained as contractors involved in supporting Plan Colombia, pursuant to Public Law 106-246, section 3204(f) (114 Stat. 577); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6121. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting as required by Sections 913(b)(2) and Section 902(g) of the Healthcare Research and Quality Act of 1999 (Pub. L. 106-129), reports entitled "The National Healthcare Quality Report 2005" (NHQR) and "The National Healthcare Disparities Report 2005" (NHDR); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6122. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 and the FREEDOM Support Act, pursuant to Public Law 103-160, section 1203(d) of Title XII Public Law 102-511, section 502; to the Committee on International Relations.

6123. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Inspector General's semi-annual report for the period April 1, 2005 through September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6124. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6125. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6126. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6127. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6128. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6129. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6130. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum 05-01, the Department's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6131. A letter from the Deputy Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Title VI of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Commission's Report to Congress on FY 2005 Competitive Sourcing Efforts; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6132. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the FY 2005 annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA), pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6133. A letter from the Acting Chief of Staff, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the FY 2005 annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6134. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Administration's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6135. A letter from the President and CEO, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Title VI of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Foundation's Report to Congress on FY 2005 Competitive Sourcing Efforts; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6136. A letter from the Director, National Gallery of Art, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Gallery's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2003 and 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6137. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Commission's Report to Congress on FY 2005 Competitive Sourcing Activities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6138. A letter from the Executive Secretary/Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6139. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Develop-

ment, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Agency's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

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. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3729. A bill to provide emergency authority to delay or toll judicial proceedings in the United States district and circuit courts; with the amendment (Rept. 109-371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2791. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to patent fees, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4093. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, to improve the administration of justice, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4707. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restructure and replace the income tax system of the United States to meet national priorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 4708. A bill to increase the refundable amount of the child credit in the case of taxpayers who had a primary residence in the Hurricane Katrina disaster area on August 28, 2005; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. HERSETH, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 4709. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen protections for law enforcement officers and the public by providing criminal penalties for the fraudulent acquisition or unauthorized disclosure of phone records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4710. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve the delivery of Federal judicial services by requiring the equitable and rational calculation of rent to be paid to the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 4711. A bill to establish a Federal District Court of American Samoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 4712. A bill to amend the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 to clarify that the Buy America provision applies to an entire bridge project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to make it unlawful for a packer to own, feed, or control livestock intended for slaughter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 4714. A bill to make the sale or fraudulent transfer of telephone records a criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4715. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the 2006 annual coordinated election period for Medicare prescription drug plans through August 15, 2006; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. GOODE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CASE, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 4716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide credits for individuals and businesses for the installation of certain wind energy property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 4717. A bill to designate the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located at 2820 Rungius Road, Jackson, Wyoming, as the National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 4718. A bill to require prescription drug manufacturers, packers, and distributors to disclose certain gifts provided in connection with detailing, promotional, or other marketing activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 4719. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to payments to Medicare Advantage plans and to reinstate protections in the Medicaid program for working families, their children, and the disabled against excessive out-of-pocket costs, inadequate benefits, and health care coverage loss; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 4720. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Gateway Drive in Lincoln, California, as the "Beverly J. Wilson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. EMANUEL (for himself and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 4721. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide Federal Medicaid funding for State costs associated with ensuring access to prescription

drug benefits to part D eligible individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island):

H.R. 4722. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate cost-sharing under part D of such title for certain full-benefit dual eligible individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 4723. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the 2006 open enrollment period for Medicare prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans through September 30, 2006; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself and Mr. GILCREST):

H.R. 4724. A bill to establish requirements with respect to the transfer of oil to or from an onshore or offshore facility, or a vessel with a capacity of over 250 barrels in United States waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MICA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 4725. A bill to terminate the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4726. A bill to enhance the adoption of a nationwide interoperable health information technology system and to improve the quality and reduce the costs of health care in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CASE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island):

H.R. 4727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an extension of the period of limitation to file claims for refunds on account of disability determinations by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 4728. A bill to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management

Agency to provide caseworker assistance to persons evacuated from their homes as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATOURETTE (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. NEY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 4729. A bill to provide a refundable tax credit for certain home energy costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 4730. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to require the phased recovery of overpayments of pay and allowances made to members of the uniformed services, to delay the start of overpayment recovery from members who are wounded or injured, or who incur an illness, in a combat operation or combat zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4731. A bill to require owners of Internet websites to destroy obsolete data containing personal information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 4732. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal penalties for killing federally funded public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama):

H.R. 4733. A bill to establish the Office of the Congressional Trade Enforcer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 4734. A bill to establish a comprehensive education program to bolster the economic competitiveness and national security of the United States by promoting science, technology, engineering, and math education, careers, and capacity, as well as foreign language acquisition; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, 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. ROYCE:

H.R. 4735. A bill to create a national commission, modeled after the successful Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, to establish a timely, independent, and fair process for realigning or closing outdated, ineffective, or inefficient executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 4736. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize assistance to provide contraceptives in developing countries in order to prevent unintended pregnancies, abortions, and the transmission of sexually transmitted infections, including HIV/AIDS; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr.

BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. CASE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. SALAZAR):

H.R. 4737. A bill to provide additional funding for State health insurance counseling programs for Medicare part D enrollment; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 4738. A bill to establish a commission to strengthen confidence in Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4739. A bill to provide compensation to individuals who, during the Vietnam conflict, were employees of the Federal Government or contractor employees of the Department of Defense and suffered disability or death from exposure to Agent Orange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.J. Res. 77. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize the President to reduce or disapprove any appropriation or authorization of new direct spending in any bill presented by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.J. Res. 78. A joint resolution approving the location of the commemorative work in the District of Columbia honoring former President Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FILNER:

H. Con. Res. 334. Concurrent resolution commending the persons who were inducted for service in the United States Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SABO, Mr. FARR, Mr. WATT, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MELANCON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Con. Res. 335. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

on the occasion of its 97th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H. Con. Res. 336. Concurrent resolution commending the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists on the 60th anniversary of publication; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. FORD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BASS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DENT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. HART, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PITTS, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 337. Concurrent resolution encouraging all Americans to increase their charitable giving, with the goal of increasing the annual amount of charitable giving in the United States by one percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the activities of Islamist terrorist organizations in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GINGREY:

H. Res. 671. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 672. A resolution urging the Government of Sri Lanka and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam to engage positively in the forthcoming peace talks and prevent a return to armed conflict in Sri Lanka; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 111: Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 115: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H.R. 202: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 282: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 390: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 398: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 503: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 517: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POE and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 547: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 550: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 551: Ms. MATSUI and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 552: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 591: Mr. FOSSELLA and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 654: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 676: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 698: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 759: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 761: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 769: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 799: Mr. OWENS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 910: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 916: Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 964: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CASE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 995: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 997: Mr. MICA and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 999: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1053: Mr. PASCRELLE.

H.R. 1106: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1107: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1227: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 1245: Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1259: Mr. WALSH, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SWEENEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1264: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1277: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1310: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1317: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1322: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1356: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1360: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1366: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1375: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1384: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1554: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1558: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1561: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1562: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 1632: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1642: Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1646: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1652: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1696: Mr. BOYD and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1749: Mr. CHOCOLA.

H.R. 1807: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HONDA, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1951: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 2014: Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 2063: Mr. OTTER and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 2071: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2355: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 2369: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CASE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. SERRANO. Mr. WELLER, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2389: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 2533: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 2561: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 2642: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2669: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2671: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2694: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 2730: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 2828: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2861: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2869: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2872: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. CLAY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WU, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 2943: Mr. RUSH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DENT, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2962: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3006: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3038: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 3052: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 3072: Mr. OWENS and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3127: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DENT, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 3137: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3142: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 3145: Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CASE, Ms. LEE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 3162: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 3195: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 3255: Mr. OWENS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3307: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. STARK, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 3334: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CASE, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 3337: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3352: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 3358: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3373: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 3379: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 3380: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 3449: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3468: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 3470: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 3471: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 3476: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. GERLACH, and Ms. GRANGER.

- H.R. 3499: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 3559: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 3565: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 3601: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 3760: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3858: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 3876: Ms. HERSETH.
H.R. 3933: Mr. KIRK, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 3940: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 3944: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 4005: Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 4019: Mr. FORBES, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 4023: Mr. EVANS and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 4030: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 4033: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4042: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4045: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4071: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4091: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 4098: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 4129: Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 4156: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4229: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 4264: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 4272: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 4304: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4315: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4318: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SODREL, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4350: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4357: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4361: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 4366: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H.R. 4399: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 4447: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 4448: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4450: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.
H.R. 4452: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. STARK, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RENZI, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 4472: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 4507: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4535: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 4542: Mr. WEINER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 4547: Mr. NEY.
H.R. 4550: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WU, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4565: Mr. OWENS, Mr. FALBOMAVAEGA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 4573: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4597: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 4604: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4608: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. MICA, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CASE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 4619: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4622: Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 4623: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4629: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4650: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 4662: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4663: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4665: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 4666: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4668: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 4672: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4677: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 4681: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 4682: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4683: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4685: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FARR, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4695: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4697: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 4704: Mr. WOLF, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.J. Res. 67: Mr. GOODE, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.J. Res. 71: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. HALL and Mr. RAHALL.
H. Con. Res. 197: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. HOOLEY.
H. Con. Res. 235: Mr. WYNN and Mr. PITTS.
H. Con. Res. 323: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 85: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Res. 222: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. PASTOR.
H. Res. 477: Mr. SABO.
H. Res. 498: Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 518: Mr. WAMP, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 521: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Res. 556: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Res. 566: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 573: Mr. EVANS.
H. Res. 593: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 600: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H. Res. 608: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. McNULTY, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 628: Mr. EVANS.
H. Res. 635: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 636: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 637: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 642: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. STARK, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 657: Mr. NUSSLE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. OSBORNE.
H. Res. 660: Mr. FORD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 665: Mrs. CAPITO.
H. Res. 670: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. OXLEY.