

mechanisms to review state food safety laws and consider them for national application.

This act provides important federal protections, while retaining valuable input from states and coordination between state and federal food safety experts. I strongly appreciate my good friend Congressman MIKE ROGERS' efforts to ensure that Americans are confident that packaged food they find on our store shelves is safe for them and their families. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this important act.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4167, the National Uniformity for Food Act of 2005. I am opposed to this legislation for two reasons.

First, and foremost, this legislation would completely eliminate any State or local food safety law that is not identical to requirements established by the FDA. Even laws that go beyond the federal requirements to protect their citizens would be pre-empted. For example, in my home state of New Jersey, a number of labeling requirements for milk, restaurant food safety and many other State laws would be completely negated, thereby placing the health and well-being of our citizens at increased risk. How is that good public policy?

I also have to oppose this legislation for the way it has completely violated the legislative process. This bill has escaped any real scrutiny from the Energy and Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over such food safety matters. No hearings were held, no witnesses were called to testify, and no effort was made to determine the actual impact this bill will have on the safety of our nation's food supply. It is clear that this bill was insufficiently reviewed and I fear that Congress is acting far too quickly to enact legislation that will have such sweeping affects.

I believe improving the quality of our nation's food supply is one of the most important challenges facing Congress today. A vote for this legislation, however, would put consumers at increased risk. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4167, the National Uniformity for Food Act.

This is common sense legislation that will benefit both consumers and businesses— and particularly small businesses.

Consumers will benefit from being able to rely on scientifically-based national food safety and warning standards, just as they now rely on national standards for nutrition labeling.

When we think of the food manufacturing industry, we may not realize that small manufacturers account for the bulk of the industry. Specifically, nearly 73 percent of food manufacturers have fewer than 20 employees. These smaller firms are especially burdened by having to comply with up to 50 different food safety and warning regimens if they are in or wish to enter interstate commerce.

I know many of us have heard from our governors about important state food safety and warning requirements that could be pre-empted by a national standard. But it is important to underscore that this bill provides for a 180-day period after enactment for states to petition the FDA and make their cases for either permitting a state requirement to remain in place or to make a state requirement a national standard. Further, the state require-

ments will remain in place until the FDA makes a determination on the state's petition.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mrs. DRAKE). All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DEAL of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mrs. DRAKE, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
MARCH 6, 2006 AND HOUR OF
MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH
7, 2006

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 7, 2006, for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam 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 (Mrs. DRAKE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. MAC
THORNBERRY AND HON. FRANK
R. WOLF TO ACT AS SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN EN-
ROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESO-
LUTIONS THROUGH MARCH 7, 2006

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY and the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through March 7, 2006.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointments are approved.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

NO PLACE BUT TEXAS

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, today is my favorite day in Texas history. March 2 marks Texas Independence Day. On this day, 170 years ago, Texas declared independence from Mexico and its evil dictator, Santa Anna, the 19th century Saddam Hussein, and Texas became a free nation.

In 1836, in a small farm village of Washington-on-the-Brazos, 54 "Texians," as they called themselves in those days, gathered on a cold rainy day like today to do something bold and brazen: They gathered to sign the Texas Declaration of Independence and once and for all "declare that the people of Texas do now constitute a free, sovereign, and independent republic."

As these determined delegates met to declare independence, Santa Anna and 6,000 enemy troops were marching on an old, beat-up Spanish mission that we now call the Alamo. This is where Texas defenders stood defiant and determined. They were led by a 27-year-old lawyer by the name of William Barrett Travis. The Alamo and its 186 Texans were all that stood between the invaders and the people of Texas. And behind the dark, dank walls of that Alamo, William Barrett Travis, the commander, sent a fiery, urgent appeal requesting aid.

His defiant letter read in part: "To all the people in Texas and America and the world, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the enemy under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannon fire for the last 24 hours, but I have not lost a man.

"The enemy has demanded surrender at its discretion; otherwise, the fort will be put to the sword. I have answered that demand with a cannon shot, and the flag still waves proudly over the wall. I shall never surrender or retreat.

"I call upon you in the name of liberty and patriotism and everything that is dear to our character to come to my aid with all dispatch. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself for as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country.

"Victory or death," signed William Barrett Travis, commander of the Alamo.

Madam Speaker, after 13 days of glory at the Alamo, Commander Travis and his men sacrificed their lives on the altar of freedom. The date was March 6, 1836.

Those lives would not be lost in vain. Their determination for the cause paid off, and because heroes like William Barrett Travis, Davy Crockett, Jim Bowie and others held out for so long, Santa Anna's forces took such great losses they became battered and demoralized and diminished. As Travis said in his last letter, "Victory will cost the enemy more dearly than defeat."

He was right.

General Sam Houston, in turn, had devised a strategy to rally other Texas volunteers to ultimately defeat Santa Anna at the battle of San Jacinto on April 21, 1836. The war was over. The Lone Star flag was visible all across the bold, brazen, and broad plains of Texas. Texas remained an independent nation for over 9 years.

The Alamo defenders were from every State in the United States, 13 foreign countries. They were black, brown, and white, ages 16 through 67. They were mavericks, revolutionaries, farmers, shopkeepers, and freedom fighters. They came together to fight for something they believed in. Liberty. And, Madam Speaker, they were all volunteers.

In 1845, Texas was admitted to the United States by only one vote. Some have said they wished the vote had gone the other way. Be that as it may, every day, each school day, kids across the vastness of Texas pledge allegiance to not only the American flag but they also pledge to the Texas flag; and by treaty with the United States, the Texas flag flies next to the American flag but never below it.

We all know that freedom has a cost. It always has. It always will.

And we also pause to remember those who lost their lives so that Texas could be a free nation. And as we do so, we remember the brave Americans in our military that are fearlessly fighting in lands far, far away to preserve and uphold freedom from a new world threat of terrorism.

Texas Independence Day is a day of pride and reflection in the Lone Star State. Today we remember to pay tribute to heroes like William Barrett Travis, Jim Bowie, Davy Crockett, Juan Seguin, Jim Bonham, and General Sam Houston and the rest of those volunteers who fought the evil tyrant and terrorist, Santa Anna.

Madam Speaker, I hope that Congress and the rest of the country will join me in celebrating Texas Independence Day. In Colonel Travis' final letter and appeal for aid, he signed off with three words that I leave you with now. "God and Texas." "God and Texas." "God and Texas."

And the rest, as they say, Madam Speaker is Texas history. And that's just the way it is.

PORT SECURITY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, it is hard to believe, but the Bush administration, through its Director of National Intelligence, John Negroponte, has given a nod and green light to the Dubai Ports World deal.

Mr. Negroponte says the Bush administration "assessed the threat to U.S. national security posed by Dubai Ports World to be low. In other words, he said, "We didn't see any red flags come up during the course of our inquiry."

Now the questions I have to ask: Why should we trust the Bush administration or their analysis on intelligence on anything certainly when it comes to the Middle East? It seems to me their record on assessing risk is not good.

Let us review some of their intelligence predictions:

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, back in February, 2003, said about the war in Iraq, "It is unknowable how long that conflict will last. It could last 6 days, 6 weeks. I doubt 6 months." That is what he said. His estimate was dead wrong.

Vice President DICK CHENEY, March, 2003, said, "We will, in fact, be greeted in Iraq as liberators . . . I think it will go relatively quickly . . . in weeks rather than months." His estimate was dead wrong.

President Bush told us that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. Well, the United States called off that search in January, 2005. There were no weapons of mass destruction. His estimate proved to be dead wrong.

□ 1400

This administration seems to make wrong decisions about a lot of things, like knowing who the enemy really is, like knowing what causes enemies to rise in the first place, and working to prevent that by avoiding cozy deals with dictatorships of all stripes.

I think it is clear to even the least interested of observers that the architects of this war, starting with the President, the Vice President and the Secretary of Defense, allowed our troops to go to war in insufficient numbers, with inadequate resources, with fantastic escalating costs and with absolutely no plan whatsoever to win the peace. Globally, their approach is yielding more terrorism every day. Their approach is yielding more anti-Americanism every day globally.

Why then should we trust the Bush administration? Why should we believe their intelligence that the Dubai Ports World deal will not risk U.S. national security? Those who seek to do us harm know a lot about ports. Two weeks ago, in Yemen, 23 al Qaeda members escaped from prison. Thirteen of them were men convicted in involvement in the 2000 suicide attack on the USS *Cole* that occurred in Yemen's harbor which killed 17 American soldiers. The others were attackers of the French supertanker Lindbergh in 2002.

Some of those who are our enemy have spent decades working the oil fields and sea lanes of the Middle East.

Supertankers like the Lindbergh now wend their way to our shores because we irresponsibly are dependent on oil imports to sustain this economy. Those who want to harm us know this system well.

The quagmire in Iraq is bringing contempt for the United States around the world and our enemies seek to harm us. That is why port security must be upmost in our minds.

America is fast becoming a dependent Nation, dependent on other countries for oil, for food, for autos, for electronics, for toys, even for clothing. Our maritime system includes over 95,000 miles of open shoreline, and 316 U.S. ports and ships carry more than 95 percent of our non-North American trade. But only 2 percent of what comes into this country is even inspected. Just last week, we saw what happened in Saudi Arabia as an al Qaeda attack occurred at their largest oil facility.

In this era, when vastly more is shipped into our ports than goes out, we had best be on the alert to protect our portals. I am introducing legislation to prohibit any foreign government or foreign-owned company from owning, leasing, or in any way controlling a U.S. port. The bill will ask our Coast Guard to assume full oversight and control over these bloodlines and all inspection of all cargo flowing into them until America is no longer at war.

The Federal Government controls and operates the agencies that admit people into this Nation. Our Federal Government controls and operates the systems and agencies that admit airplanes into this Nation. We should have the very same system of control over our port systems, one that, by the way, is increasing and expanding at a very rapid rate. In 2005, more than 11 million containers came into our country from abroad, and the estimate is that will quadruple in the next 20 years if we don't get this trade balance in line.

We have invested billions in other systems and pennies in our port system. Isn't it time to put America's national security first before any private deals?

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

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

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

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