United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 2006 No. 42

# House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO).

## DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*April 5, 2006.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHELLY MOORE CAPITO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

## PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Clyde P. Thomas, Pastor, Cherokee Avenue Baptist Church, Gaffney, South Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, our Heavenly Father, we humbly come to You today to seek Your guidance knowing that we take only one step at a time. Illuminate each step as only You can and keep us strong in our path.

O Lord, grant that we will live together as people of vision and understanding as well as promise and peace. We pray for our President and Members of this body as they serve. Encourage and strengthen them with Your power and wisdom. Protect our military and our law enforcement men and women. Give comfort to their families and refresh their spirit. Make us mindful of our responsibilities and grateful for our opportunities to do Your will. We pray this in the name above every other name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

## WELCOMING THE REVEREND CLYDE PICKNEY THOMAS, JR.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, the opening prayer was given by the Reverend Clyde Pickney Thomas, Jr. Reverend Thomas has served in the ministry of the Southern Baptist Church since 1974 and is now the pastor of Cherokee Avenue Baptist Church in Gaffney, South Carolina, a pulpit that he has filled with distinction since 1979.

Reverend Thomas is not only a prominent preacher of the gospel, but a pastor who has developed courses of study for adults, youth, and children, conducted an extensive sports ministry, and taken at least 10 mission trips to places as far away as the Amazon. He is married to Joanne Cash Thomas, and they have two sons, Clyde Preston Thomas and James Grady Thomas.

I have had the privilege of attending Sunday services at Cherokee Avenue and, afterwards, having lunch in the fellowship hall. I can attest to the fact that the preaching and the cooking were both first rate.

I want to thank Reverend Thomas and thank also the Speaker and Father Coughlin for allowing Reverend Thomas to open today's session with prayer. Thank you very much.

## THE NEW YORK TIMES GOT IT RIGHT AGAIN

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, last week I sat on this House floor and did something I never thought I would do: I praised the New York Times for accurately reporting the facts about the success of the new Medicare prescription drug program.

They say lightening never strikes the same place twice, so you can imagine my surprise when the New York Times ran an April 3 editorial that said aboout Medicare part D: ''Complaints and call waiting times are diminishing, and many uninsured patients are clearly saving money on their drug purchases.''

It is refreshing that the mainstream media is finally beginning to acknowledge that millions of seniors are saving thousands of dollars a year on their prescriptions under Medicare part D. This benefit has already lowered average monthly premiums from $37 to $25, and those seniors with limited incomes will incur nearly no expenses at all.

It is a real shame that my Democratic colleagues refuse to admit that this benefit is making a positive difference. Instead, they prefer to bash the program and scare seniors into thinking it is ''confusing.'' The Main Street press is finally starting to pay attention to millions of our seniors' success stories. It is about time that Democrats remove their ear plugs and start paying attention, too.

## WE ARE THE CHAMPIONS

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



Printed on recycled paper.

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this is a turtle. In Maryland, we call it a terrapin. Fear the turtle. But today we need to revere the turtle. Sixteen magnificent young women got on a court in Boston, and we had one of the most exciting, well-played basketball games, male or female, in the history of our country.

Madam Speaker, this morning I want to congratulate Coach Brenda Frese and the University of Maryland women's basketball team on winning the championship last night with a stunning 78–75 overtime victory over a valiant Duke University team. This game, Madam Speaker, was a demonstration of college athletics at its best.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina just spoke; our athletic director comes from North Carolina, Debbie Yow, and she recruited Brenda Frese. We thank you for that.

The Terrapins erased a 13-point second half deficit, the second largest in history, and Maryland freshman guard Kristi Toliver hit a three-point shot with 6.1 seconds remaining to send the game into overtime. ''We've played like this all year,'' said Terp Marissa Coleman. ''Nothing gets to us. We never thought we were going to lose this game.'' The Terps' win caps a tremendous 34–4 season and makes Maryland only the fourth college in America whose men's and women's basketball teams have captured national championships.

Madam Speaker, I know that all of us join together to congratulate those 16 young women who showed America what women can do and what an extraordinary athletic event they can provide. Both teams were magnificent. We in Maryland are proud of our victory. But those in North Carolina who come from Duke ought to be proud of their team as well.

## SECURITY SUCCESS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the American Forces Press Service reported on Monday that Iraqi and coalition forces have scored several successes against insurgent fighters, seizing weapons caches and capturing suspected enemies during missions over the past several days.

From Karabilah to Ramadi, Iraqi troops and coalition forces have captured terrorists during raids and discovered weapons including hand grenades, rocket propelled grenade launch motors, sticks of plastic explosives, and AK–47 rifles. The Victory in Iraq Caucus is grateful to recognize their successes to protect American families in the central front of the global war on terrorism.

With every terrorist they detain and each weapon they discover, Iraqi troops and American forces save lives and improve our security. The events over the past several days are commendable, but they are not unique. By facing the terrorists overseas, we are confronting mass murderers before they strike American families again at home.

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

## YUCCA MOUNTAIN

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, later today, the Bush administration, with the aid and comfort of the Republican Congress, will once again propose to remove all congressional oversight of nuclear waste in this country to be stored at Yucca Mountain and double the amount of nuclear waste to be stored in the mountain.

Let me remind everybody that Secretary Bodman, the Secretary of Energy, just testified last week that he has no idea how much Yucca Mountain is going to cost, and he has no idea how long it is going to take to ensure that they could build Yucca Mountain; but he wants to remove congressional oversight over the nuclear waste budget.

Let me remind everyone, there are no radiation standards now. The court threw them out. There is no way to safely transport nuclear waste across our country. And after 9/11, it is incomprehensible to me that we have not come up with a threat assessment. There are no canisters that currently exist that will not corrode. We have a thousand e-mails from the scientists at the National Geologic Survey that demonstrate that they fudged or made up the scientific data that went into making the decision that Yucca Mountain was okay.

Now they want to eliminate the oversight of Congress over the budget of Yucca Mountain. I think that would be a dereliction of our duty. We ought to stand up to the administration and do our job.

## YALE WINS

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, Yale University has won first place in the Annual Campus Outrage Award. The award is given to universities that worship the God of political correctness. Yale wins this year because according to the College Network who bestows the award, ''Yale enrolled a former Taliban official with a fourth grade education in the name of the sacred cow, diversity, which now appears to extend to the enemy combatants who make war on the United States.''

According to the Washington Times, second place went to DePaul University, which ''suspended a professor without a hearing after the professor attempted to debate students handing out pro-Palestinian literature.''

DePaul was also recognized for suppressing free speech rights of students who protested a professor's writings that said the United States deserved to be attacked on September 11, 2001.

Other universities who received awards were Stanford and Holy Cross for attempting to prohibit articles in their campus newspapers that criticized left wing philosophies.

Madam Speaker, have some of our universities lost their way by prohibiting liberty to those individuals who disagree with the university's elitist, narrow-minded snobbery? And that's just the way it is.

## WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, just when we thought things could not get any worse at the Department of Homeland Security, today we find out that a senior official was arrested for child porn.

Last night Brian Doyle, the deputy press secretary at DHS, was arrested while attempting to seduce a detective posing as a 14-year-old girl. He has been charged with 23 counts related to using his computer to seduce a minor.

How did they catch him? He told the agent posing as a girl that he worked for the Department of Homeland Security, going so far as to give out his office phone number and sending her copies of his ID. He even used his office phone for explicit conversations. Not only that, he is giving out sensitive information.

This is not the first time something like this has happened. This week Frank Figueroa, another senior Department of Homeland Security official, is on trial for exposing himself to a teenage girl at a mall in Tampa.

From the Katrina disaster to now this. It gives a whole new meaning to the word ''incompetence.''

Madam Speaker, for once I am at a loss for words. What is going on at Homeland Security? How many things can go wrong and still nobody is held accountable?

The White House is under fire for spying on average Americans but maybe they should spend time looking into the backgrounds of people they hire in their administration. It is time for new priorities here in Washington.

## BALANCE OUR BUDGET

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is budget time again. This is when people in Washington outline a

blueprint of how much money the government is going to spend on what. Sadly, some in Congress want to spend, spend, spend. It is a shame because the American people deserve better. They deserve a commonsense budget that controls spending and eliminates wasteful programs.

The RSC budget balances the budget by 2011 and cuts useless programs like Asian elephant conservation historic whaling programs.

It is time for Congress to take a hard look at how we spend our money and support the RSC budget for a better America.

□ 1015

## WOMEN AND THE BUDGET

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise to address the House about how the Republicans' fiscal year 2007 budget resolution will create serious problems for women and children.

The budget resolution put forth by the Republicans, which we will vote on tomorrow, undercuts and undervalues women's contributions to the American labor force.

The wage gap among women and men continues today. Women earn on average 76 cents to every dollar that a man earns.

The Republican budget resolution eliminates the Women in Apprenticeships and Nontraditional Occupations Act. This program, which only costs $1 million per year, provides grants to employers to help recruit, train and retain women in nontraditional, well-paying jobs.

The budget also cuts funding for the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor, the only Federal agency with primary responsibility for serving and promoting interests of working women.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Republican budget resolution.

## REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, last year the Republicans did support the Deficit Reduction Act that reduced $39 billion in Federal spending, and yes, indeed, as we are hearing, this is budget week here on Capitol Hill. It is something that we are tasked to do.

I know that a lot of the big spenders would still like to be getting rid of that Deficit Reduction Act that we passed last year. It was a good bill. We should be doing more like it, as my colleague from Texas said.

Today, conservatives in the House are working to bring to the floor a budget that goes after the programs that show little results for the taxpayer dollars.

We have got some great ideas on the table. I would like to see further across-the-board cuts. My colleague from Texas, Representative CONAWAY, has a bill that goes after eliminating a program if you are going to create a new one.

Madam Speaker, we Republicans are bringing ideas and putting solutions on the table, and we are going to hear more about this as we go through the week. We are the party debating how to reduce spending at the Federal level. It is what America expects of us. It is what we are fighting to make happen.

## THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, when you have a budget like this Republican budget, a budget where those who have the least are being forced to live on even less, less help with student aid, less protection for children's health, less food assistance and less child care, less support of prescription drugs, less funding for home heating, less protection to ensure a place to live and a job that pays a livable wage, when you have a budget like this, women and children are the most impacted because women and their families are the poorest of the poor in this country of much.

Stop this injustice. Vote ''no'' on this Republican budget.

## CAPITOL POLICE RESOLUTION

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, we live in an age that requires constant vigilance. We work in a building that requires steady security. The scourge of terrorism is genuine, tangible and real in today's world, especially when your office is in the center of a terrorist bull's eye, the Capitol Building and Capitol Hill.

Even with this knowledge, I come to work confident that my safety and security is in capable hands. There are over 1,500 of the most highly trained men and women guarding the gates and guarding this building. These are the dedicated officers of the Capitol Police Force. They provide safety and security for Members of Congress, the staff, as well as 3 million visitors who come and go through this building each year.

In extreme cases, the Capitol Police Force must endure physical and verbal assaults. These men and women deserve a pat on the back, not a punch in the chest.

Madam Speaker, that is why Congressman MARIO DIAZ-BALART and I introduced a resolution thanking Capitol Police and commending them for their service, dedication and commitment to security on Capitol Hill.

## CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice concerns about the impact of budget cuts on the States' Children's Health Insurance Program, that is called CHIP.

CHIP is jointly financed by the Federal and State governments and is administered by the States.

While it is good that each State determines the design of its program, the eligibility groups, benefits, co-pays and administrative procedures, I am concerned that misplaced fiscal priorities are squeezing the States and negatively impacting children's health.

A Dallas Morning News article from March 27 cites numerous problems with CHIP in Texas. Administrative errors and budget cuts are resulting in lost or delayed coverage.

Many families are unaware of the benefit. Enrollment has been more complicated and fewer children are participating in the program. Privatization of many State-Federal health programs is lessening access to care.

Madam Speaker, I am concerned that the fiscal year 2007 budget plan for the House of Representatives will hurt America's uninsured children.

April is National Child Abuse Prevention Month. Cutting health programs for young people is cruel at worst and irresponsible at best.

## HONORING DOC DODSON

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding citizen of the city of Midland, Texas. James ''Doc'' Dodson was born in Fort Worth, Texas, on April 22, 1936. In 1958, he moved to Midland where he became an athletic trainer at Midland High School. It was there that he touched the lives of MHS Bulldogs for the next 32 years.

Doc's greatest joy is his family. He married Gayle McMullan in 1963, and they have two daughters, Kelly Hullender and Jamie Dodson. Kelly and her husband, Todd, have Doc's three grandchildren: Blair, Mills and Sam.

In 1972, Doc was the first high school athletic trainer selected to be a part of the U.S. Olympic team in Munich, Germany. In 1978, he was the first recipient of the Outstanding High School Trainer award, an honor he was given twice.

Doc is now the director of physical rehabilitation at Southwest Orthopedics in Midland where he continues to help many people each day.

Doc is truly an outstanding American. We are blessed to have him live in

Midland, Texas, and District 11 in Texas, and I am proud to be his Congressman and call him my friend.

## PRESIDENT'S BUDGET CUTTING OUR CHILDREN'S EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, despite rising college tuition costs and rigid standards of the so-called No Child Left Behind Act, the Republican budget makes the largest cuts to education in 10 years.

It cuts $15 billion from education that was promised: 3.7 million children in our country will be denied help with reading and math; 2 million will be denied after-school programs that offer a safe place to play and learn. But the majority does not stop with just broken promises.

Their budget eliminates funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools, eliminates funding for vocational education, eliminates programs that help ensure high-risk students can attend college, and eliminates 36 programs that help teachers and students succeed. They drastically cut Pell Grants and Perkins loans that American families need to help afford college.

Republicans are risking our children's future to pay for more tax breaks for the wealthy few. The promise to our children's education must be kept. This budget must be rejected.

## CONGRATULATING BRIAN LEONARDI

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I ask you and all my colleagues to join me in congratulating Brian Leonardi on his recent acceptance of a full football scholarship to Presbyterian College in Clinton, South Carolina.

Brian is the 18-year-old son of my niece, Allyson Leonardi, and Ed Leonardi. He played linebacker for Aiken High School Hornets, and for 2 years he and his teammates advanced to the semifinals of the 4–A State playoffs. Brian was chosen this year to play for the North squad in an annual all-star game in Conway, South Carolina.

His parents, sister Megan and brother Danny are very proud of his accomplishments, as are his Uncle Doug and Aunt Cindy, but I think the happiest and most excited of all are my brother Bill Gingrey and sister-in-law Gail, who are the fortunate grandparents of this outstanding young man.

Brian's Congressman, GRESHAM BARRETT, and I join our colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to say Godspeed, Brian. Study hard and play well.

## CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM ON WINNING NCAA CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. WYNN. Madam Speaker, the sun is shining a little brighter in the great Free State of Maryland. Today, I rise to join my colleague STENY HOYER in offering exuberant congratulations to the University of Maryland women's basketball team on winning the NCAA national basketball championship. In winning the championship, they had to overcome a very fine and very tough team from Duke University.

Hats off to Coach Brenda Frese, starters Crystal Langhorne, Laura Harper, Marissa Coleman, Shay Duron, Kristi Toliver and the rest of the team, the assistant coaches, managers and the tremendous fans of the University of Maryland. You have made us all proud in the State of Maryland.

You are a particular inspiration to all the young women around the country, like my 11-year-old daughter Gabriel, who have become tremendous fans of women's basketball.

Today, all of Maryland salutes the University of Maryland's women's basketball team. Go, Terps.

## ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, as complex as illegal immigration may be, I think the House got the logic right dealing with the issue. Illegal immigration needs to be split into two separate, but equally important, issues, first being security enforcement.

Once the first portion is set and in place, the time will be right for Congress to come back and address the second part, which deals with illegal workers. While they contribute in positive ways to our society, unfortunately, because they are here illegally, they place burdens on our job market, our educational system and our health care costs, burdens that are shouldered by hardworking American taxpayers.

My advice to the other Chamber is listen to the American people. They are tired of their elected officials turning the other cheek and playing politics with the ideals on which this country was founded and the security of our Nation. They want us to plug the holes and stop the flow of illegal immigrants before we do anything else.

It is time we listened. It is time we stop illegal immigration.

## REPUBLICAN BUDGET ON WOMEN MILITARY RETIREES

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I want the women who have served in uniform to know one thing. Some of us in Congress understand your struggle, and we are fighting for you.

Shockingly, the Republican budget adopts significant increases to out-of-pocket costs for our women retirees who depend on the TRICARE program for their health care.

Managed care enrollment fees for senior enlisted women retirees would double, and those for retired female officers would triple.

I have serious doubts about the validity of any projected cost savings from these fee increases. It is insulting to even think of shifting such costs onto the backs of the brave women who have sacrificed so much and so selflessly.

Moreover, this budget sends a terrible message to our past and present servicewomen at a time when we should be doing all that we can to appreciate and to reward their contributions.

The United States made a promise to these women and to every woman before them who has worn the uniform. This Nation promised to take care of them, and the Republican budget just does not fulfill that promise.

## IMMIGRATION REFORM A MUST

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we have all seen the recent protests around the country by thousands of people demonstrating in the streets. However, the fundamental issue that we are dealing with is illegal immigration, and we must not forget that.

No one has a problem with those who have come to this country legally, respected our laws and become U.S. citizens. That is part of the American Dream. What we are talking about are the millions who cross our borders illegally and now demand to be treated as citizens.

American goodwill, in education, in health care and in government services, is being abused by those who do not go through the legal process of citizenship, and that does not add up, Madam Speaker. That is not the American way.

There are serious problems with our current immigration policies. Benign neglect over the last 20 to 30 years has led us to this state of crisis, and we must fix it. Our constituents appropriately demand that we fix it, and Congress has that opportunity, and we must not let it pass us by.

## TURNING BACK THE CLOCK

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise to turn back the clock. No, I am not referring to the annual daylight savings time change that occurred this past weekend. Nor am I having a moment of nostalgia. Rather, I am referring to the famous clock that tallies the Nation's growing debt.

The surpluses of the late 1990s put the clock that tallies our Nation's debt into retirement. But now, the borrow-and-spend policies of the Bush administration and the Republican Congress put the clock back in operation, adding $1 million to the Nation's debt every minute, for a total of $3 trillion in new debt since 2002.

The Republican Party's 2007 budget, which we will vote on this week, continues their borrow-and-spend policies. It also will cause a problem that the designers of the Time Square clock did not anticipate. It cannot accommodate the extra digit that will be required to display a debt of over $10 trillion.

American taxpayers, along with our children and our grandchildren, should not be saddled with this debt. We should stop this fiscal irresponsibility and reject the President and the Republican Congress' budget.

□ 1030

## AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO BYRON NELSON

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, this weekend is the Masters golf tournament, and while I am not a golfer myself, it is a big deal in the golfing world. The PGA tournament of today is carried on the shoulders of those who have gone before. Names like Ben Hogan, Sam Snead, and Lee Trevino are common household names for those of us of a certain age, but it is truly the gentleman from Roanoke, Texas, Byron Nelson, who has done more for the credible start for the sport of golf in this country than anyone else.

Lord Byron, as he is known back home, will turn 95 years of age this year. He was a gifted athlete, winning two Masters Tournaments in 1937 and 1942. He won two PGA tours in 1940 and 1945, and won the U.S. Open in 1939. His true service is his generosity of spirit and his humility.

In World War II, he traveled with Bob Hope and Bing Crosby on the USO tour entertaining our troops overseas. He has given over $88 million from his Salesmanship Club Youth and Family Services. He and his wife, Louise, have created an endowment fund at Abilene Christian University totaling over $15 million. He is the head of the Metroport Meals-on-Wheels, delivering services to shut-in seniors back in my district.

His career as an athlete is worthy of recognition, but his service to community is indeed exemplary. For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 4902, the Congressional Gold Medal honoring Byron Nelson.

## BUSH PRESCRIPTION DRUG TAX COUNTDOWN

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, President Bush simply has no compassion for millions of seniors who are trying to determine which of the prescription drug plans is best for them. Forty days from now, seniors must choose a plan or face a Bush prescription drug tax for the rest of their lives.

Last month, a woman struggling to help her elderly mother pick a prescription drug plan asked the President to extend the enrollment deadline. President Bush refused, telling the woman that helping her mother was her responsibility. The President's answer shows that he is still listening to drug companies and not the American people.

Seniors, people with disabilities and their families, need more time before making a crucial health and financial decision. Democrats do not believe seniors should be penalized because they cannot understand this complicated drug plan. That is why Democrats are fighting to extend the enrollment period by 6 months.

As we check off another day on the calendar, House Republicans now have 40 more days to stand up and support America's seniors. It is time they joined the Democrats in fighting to ensure the prescription drug tax, pushed by this President, does not take effect on May 15.

## WOMEN AND THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, there is a saying that ''the road to hell is paved with good intentions,'' and once again, my Republican colleagues have missed the mark.

To be a strong Nation, we need a strong family. The glue that holds the family together are our Nation's women. Unfortunately, this administration and my colleagues across the aisle continue to send a clear message in the form of a budget that strips all of the support and programs that aid in fortifying that crucial glue. We should call the budget that they are bringing to this House the ''Women, Children and Family Left Behind Act.''

How can an administration that professes to be pro-value and pro-family get it wrong? The President's budget cuts education by 29 percent. The President's solution is to freeze funds for Head Start and Pell Grants. What is wrong with this picture?

The President's budget completely eliminates programs like the Women's Educational Equity Act and the Women's Apprenticeship Act. The President's budget cuts funds out for the Commodity Supplemental Food program that serves 420,000 seniors as well as 50,000 mothers and children.

Stand up America.

## CONCERNED ABOUT AMERICA'S DEBT

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to not only share with the American people, but also with the majority side that constantly talks about the fact that they are responsible with the people's money. I just want to, again, come to the floor and say that this Republican majority, along with this President, has increased the debt owned by foreign nations by $1.05 trillion, something that 42 Presidents before him were not able to accomplish.

I further want to bring to the attention of the House here, Madam Speaker, the fact that Newt Gingrich, who was a former Speaker of this House and delivered this Republican majority to the majority, is now saying that they are seen by the country as being in charge of a government that cannot function.

Now, I can tell you, Madam Speaker, as a Democrat, I would be concerned if a former Speaker was referring to the Democratic Caucus as ''they.'' That means that the American people are very concerned about what is going on here. I am concerned as an American. And as we go to vote on this budget, we have to think about the people that have sent us up here.

So I want to say here on the Democratic side, we are willing to pay as we go. But the bottom line is, third-party validator, former Speaker Newt Gingrich, is calling the Republican majority ''they.''

## IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, this past weekend, I met with many students from schools in our district and hope to meet with many more. This banner is signed by students from the Alta Charter School in our district. These students are voicing their concerns because they want to keep their families together and felt their heritage was not being respected.

They are concerned about the possibility of their parents being deported, even though their children are citizens. They are worried about the possibility of them being deported, although this is the only life they have ever known.

I believe we should improve border security, and every Nation in the world should control their borders and know who is crossing it, but I voted against H.R. 4437 because this bill doesn't realistically deal with the 10 to 12 million people who are living in this country.

If this bill is enacted, 3 million U.S. citizens will be left without their parent or guardian. Family values should apply to our immigration laws. This is why we see students marching in our communities all across our country and why you see this banner on the floor of the House today.

We need comprehensive, fair immigration reform that includes increased border security, more detention beds to prevent catch and release, requiring applicants to go through criminal background checks, to learn English and also pay a penalty. That way, we can make sure these people, these children who are here know that their parents won't need to be deported or they won't be.

## OPPOSED TO BUDGET

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I express my sincere opposition to this year's budget because it is immoral, especially to women.

Our health care system is in bad shape. We all know that women use health care more than men and are more likely to need it. Under President Bush, the number of uninsured has risen. Yet what does this budget propose? Health savings accounts, which would only benefit the wealthiest and healthiest, those who could already afford health coverage. It cuts or levels funds for all but one of the Institutes of National Health, and at a time when we are making important advances in medical research, when we are just beginning to learn the ways that women are affected differently than men by certain diseases. And it cuts funding for nutritional programs that are designed to keep women and their families healthier.

We have an obligation to ensure that everyone can have access to health care services. I urge my colleagues to reject this irresponsible and immoral budget, and instead, to pass a budget that lives up to our commitment to American women and their families.

## BUSH BUDGET AND IMPACT ON WOMEN

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, misplaced priorities in the Republican budget result in ballooning deficits and the underfunding of programs women and their families need to succeed in today's economy.

By cutting funding for education and training programs that help women pursue careers in nontraditional occupations, this budget does nothing to address one source of the gender wage gap that leaves women earning only 77 cents for every dollar earned by a male.

By freezing funding for child care subsidies and housing vouchers, this budget ensures that fewer women receive the support that they need to make work pay and stay off welfare. Women deserve better. We deserve a better budget.

## TIME FOR DEMOCRATS TO TAKE CHARGE

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, the father of the Republican revolution is now saying it has turned into a Republican devolution, with $3 trillion in increased debt since President Bush has been President. This Nation owes $8 trillion-plus, with $27,000 per citizen that they owe back just for the national debt. And this money is being borrowed from foreign interests, the Japanese, the Chinese, and OPEC countries.

We are selling off our country piece by piece, Madam Speaker. Borrow and spend, borrow and spend, borrow and spend. This President, with the Republican bobblehead Congress that just can't say no to the President, has borrowed more money from foreign interests than every previous President. Madam Speaker, that is an atrocity. That is an assault on the American people.

The father of the Republican revolution says it has turned into a devolution and that this government cannot function. Madam Speaker, it is time for new leadership. It is time for the Democrats to take charge of this House.

## DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S WORKING GROUP BUDGET

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

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans' fiscal year 2007 budget resolution. It will hurt millions of women and children around our country. The resolution includes cuts to vital programs that help middle-class women, children, the elderly, and, in particular, Americans living in poverty.

The budget will lead to cuts in funding for young women who need financial aid to go to college. As a result, young women will have a more difficult time attending college and pursuing their careers. The Perkins loans program is due to be cut dramatically. More than 450,000 college students would lose a key part of their financial aid.

Young women, and especially minority students, disproportionately rely on Pell Grants. I was one of those students myself. For example, 40 percent of African American students will be affected, 30 percent of Hispanic students will have reduced Pell Grants compared to 23 percent of students overall.

The aid is being cut while tuition costs are skyrocketing. The increase in the cost of tuition has increased by 57 percent under this President. Please do not support this Republican budget that would harm our students.

□ 1045

## CHILD CARE AND THE BUDGET

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

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to highlight the cuts in the Republican budget resolution that target low-income children and women. A number of Federal block grants that help women, especially single and low-income mothers, are going to be forced to cut services to families as a result of these cuts in the Republican budget. Also, there will be continued flat funding.

Child Care Development Block Grant funding is frozen for the fifth year in a row. Since the beginning of the Bush administration, child care assistance for 250,000 children has been cut. In the next 5 years, 400,000 fewer children will receive child care assistance. This means that 25 percent fewer children will receive assistance in 2011 than did in 2000; and during the President's tenure the number of children living in poverty has increased, not decreased.

This is an immoral budget. It sacrifices funding for our children to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. It should be soundly rejected. We talk about welfare reform and we talk about women being able to work, how in the heck are women going to work if child care is not available.

## CULTURE REPUBLICANS BROUGHT TO WASHINGTON IS NOT GOOD

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, last night former majority leader TOM DELAY blamed Democrats for his fall from power. He said Democrats were upset because Republicans changed the culture of Washington.

Well, Republicans changed the culture around here all right. Two of Congressman DELAY's former aides, Deputy Chief of Staff Tony Rudy and Press Secretary Michael Scanlon have already pleaded guilty as part of the ongoing Jack Abramoff scandal.

Then there are the revelations that the President's chief domestic adviser, Claude Allen, was forced to resign from

his position at the White House after he was caught repeatedly shoplifting from Target stores in Maryland.

And just last night, a deputy press secretary at the Department of Homeland Security was arrested on charges that he used the Internet to seduce what he thought was a 14-year-old girl. Fortunately, an undercover deputy sheriff detective was on the other end of the computer and Brian Doyle, a Bush political appointee, has now been arrested.

Madam Speaker, the culture has changed around here, that is for sure, but certainly not for the good.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). 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 later today.

## DARFUR PEACE AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2006

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3127) to impose sanctions against individuals responsible for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, to support measures for the protection of civilians and humanitarian operations, and to support peace efforts in the Darfur region of Sudan, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3127

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

***SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.***

*(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006'' .*

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

*Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.*
*Sec. 2. Definitions.*
*Sec. 3. Findings.*
*Sec. 4. Sense of Congress.*
*Sec. 5. Sanctions in support of peace in Darfur.*
*Sec. 6. Additional authorities to deter and suppress genocide in Darfur.*
*Sec. 7. Multilateral efforts.*
*Sec. 8. Continuation of restrictions.*
*Sec. 9. Assistance efforts in Sudan.*
*Sec. 10. Reports.*
*Sec. 11. Rule of construction.*

***SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.***

*In this Act:*

*(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.*

*(2) GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN.—*

*(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Government of Sudan'' means the National Congress Party, formerly known as the National Islamic Front, led-government in Khartoum, Sudan, or any successor government formed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act (including the coalition National Unity Government agreed upon in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan), except that such term does not include the regional Government of Southern Sudan.*

*(B) OFFICIALS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN.—The term ''Government of Sudan'', when used with respect to an official of the Government of Sudan, does not include an individual—*

*(i) who was not a member of such government prior to July 1, 2005; or*

*(ii) who is a member of the regional Government of Southern Sudan.*

*(3) COMPREHENSIVE PEACE AGREEMENT FOR SUDAN.—The term ''Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan'' means the peace agreement signed by the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) in Nairobi, Kenya, on January 9, 2005.*

***SEC. 3. FINDINGS.***

*Congress makes the following findings:*

*(1) On July 22, 2004, the House of Representatives and the Senate declared that the atrocities occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan are genocide.*

*(2) On September 9, 2004, Secretary of State Colin L. Powell stated before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, ''genocide has been committed in Darfur,'' and ''the Government of Sudan and the [Janjaweed] bear responsibility—and genocide may still be occurring''.*

*(3) On September 21, 2004, in an address before the United Nations General Assembly, President George W. Bush affirmed the Secretary of State's finding and stated,''[a]t this hour, the world is witnessing terrible suffering and horrible crimes in the Darfur region of Sudan, crimes my government has concluded are genocide''.*

*(4) On July 30, 2004, the United Nations Security Council passed Security Council Resolution 1556, calling upon the Government of Sudan to disarm the Janjaweed militias and to apprehend and bring to justice Janjaweed leaders and their associates who have incited and carried out violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, and establishing a ban on the sale or supply of arms and related materiel of all types, including the provision of related technical training or assistance, to all nongovernmental entities and individuals, including the Janjaweed.*

*(5) On September 18, 2004, the United Nations Security Council passed Security Council Resolution 1564, determining that the Government of Sudan had failed to meet its obligations under Security Council Resolution 1556, calling for a military flight ban in and over the Darfur region, demanding the names of Janjaweed militiamen disarmed and arrested for verification, establishing an International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur to investigate violations of international humanitarian and human rights laws, and threatening sanctions should the Government of Sudan fail to fully comply with Security Council Resolutions 1556 and 1564, including such actions as to affect Sudan's petroleum sector or individual members of the Government of Sudan.*

*(6) The Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur, submitted to the United Nations Secretary-General on January 25, 2005, established that the ''Government of the Sudan and the Janjaweed are responsible for serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law amounting to crimes under international law,'' that ''these acts were conducted on a widespread and systematic basis, and therefore may amount to crimes against humanity,'' and that Sudanese officials and other individuals may have acted with ''genocidal intent''.*

*(7) The Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur further notes that, pursuant to its mandate and in the course of its work, the Commission had collected information relating to individual perpetrators of acts constituting ''violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law, including crimes against humanity and war crimes'' and that a sealed file containing the names of those individual perpetrators had been delivered to the United Nations Secretary-General.*

*(8) On March 24, 2005, the United Nations Security Council passed Security Council Resolution 1590, establishing the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS), consisting of up to 10,000 military personnel and 715 civilian police tasked with supporting implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan and ''closely and continuously liais[ing] and coordinat[ing] at all levels with the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) with a view towards expeditiously reinforcing the effort to foster peace in Darfur''.*

*(9) On March 29, 2005, the United Nations Security Council passed Security Council Resolution 1591, extending the military embargo established by Security Council Resolution 1556 to all the parties to the N'djamena Ceasefire Agreement of April 8, 2004, and any other belligerents in the states of North Darfur, South Darfur, and West Darfur, calling for an asset freeze and travel ban against those individuals who impede the peace process, constitute a threat to stability in Darfur and the region, commit violations of international humanitarian or human rights law or other atrocities, are responsible for offensive military overflights, or violate the military embargo, and establishing a Committee of the Security Council and a Panel of Experts to assist in monitoring compliance with Security Council Resolutions 1556 and 1591.*

*(10) On March 31, 2005, the United Nations Security Council passed Security Council Resolution 1593, referring the situation in Darfur since July 1, 2002, to the prosecutor of the International Criminal Court and calling on the Government of Sudan and all parties to the conflict to cooperate fully with the Court.*

*(11) In remarks before the G–8 Summit on June 30, 2005, President Bush reconfirmed that ''the violence in Darfur is clearly genocide'' and ''the human cost is beyond calculation''.*

*(12) On July 30, 2005, Dr. John Garang de Mabior, the newly appointed Vice President of Sudan and the leader of the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) for the past 21 years, was killed in a tragic helicopter crash in southern Sudan, sparking riots in Khartoum and challenging the commitment of all Sudanese to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan.*

*(13) Since 1993, the Secretary of State has determined that the Republic of Sudan is a country which has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism and, pursuant to section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, and section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, designated Sudan as a State Sponsor of Terrorism, thereby restricting United States assistance, defense exports and sales, and financial and other transactions with the Government of Sudan.*

***SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.***

*It is the sense of Congress that—*

*(1) the genocide unfolding in the Darfur region of Sudan is characterized by acts of terrorism and atrocities directed against civilians, including mass murder, rape, and sexual violence committed by the Janjaweed and associated militias with the complicity and support of the National Congress Party-led faction of the Government of Sudan;*

*(2) the Secretary of State should designate the Janjaweed militia as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act;*

*(3) all parties to the conflict in the Darfur region have continued to violate the N'djamena*

*Ceasefire Agreement of April 8, 2004, and the Abuja Protocols of November 9, 2004, and violence against civilians, humanitarian aid workers, and personnel of the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) is increasing;*

*(4) the African Union should rapidly expand the size and amend the mandate of the African Union Mission in Sudan to authorize such action as may be necessary to protect civilians and humanitarian operations, and deter violence in the Darfur region without delay;*

*(5) the international community, including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the European Union, and the United States, should immediately act to mobilize sufficient political, military, and financial resources to support the expansion of the African Union Mission in Sudan so that it achieves the size, strength, and capacity necessary for protecting civilians and humanitarian operations, and ending the continued violence in the Darfur region;*

*(6) if an expanded and reinforced African Union Mission in Sudan fails to stop genocide in the Darfur region, the international community should take additional, dispositive measures to prevent and suppress acts of genocide in the Darfur region;*

*(7) acting under Article 5 of the Charter of the United Nations, the United Nations Security Council should call for suspension of the Government of Sudan's rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly until such time as the Government of Sudan has honored pledges to cease attacks upon civilians, demobilize and demilitarize the Janjaweed and associated militias, and grant free and unfettered access for deliveries of humanitarian assistance in the Darfur region;*

*(8) the President should use all necessary and appropriate diplomatic means to ensure the full discharge of the responsibilities of the Committee of the United Nations Security Council and the Panel of Experts established pursuant to section 3(a) of Security Council Resolution 1591 (March 29, 2005);*

*(9) the United States should not provide assistance to the Government of Sudan, other than assistance necessary for the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan, the support of the regional Government of Southern Sudan and marginalized areas in northern Sudan (including the Nuba Mountains, Southern Blue Nile, Abyei, Eastern Sudan (Beja), Darfur, and Nubia), as well as marginalized peoples in and around Khartoum, or for humanitarian purposes in Sudan, until such time as the Government of Sudan has honored pledges to cease attacks upon civilians, demobilize and demilitarize the Janjaweed and associated militias, grant free and unfettered access for deliveries of humanitarian assistance in the Darfur region, and allow for the safe and voluntary return of refugees and internally displaced persons;*

*(10) the President should seek to assist members of the Sudanese diaspora in the United States by establishing a student loan forgiveness program for those individuals who commit to return to southern Sudan for a period of not less than five years for the purpose of contributing professional skills needed for the reconstruction of southern Sudan;*

*(11) the President should appoint a Presidential Envoy for Sudan with appropriate resources and a clear mandate to provide stewardship of efforts to implement the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan, seek ways to bring stability and peace to the Darfur region, address instability elsewhere in Sudan and northern Uganda, and pursue a truly comprehensive peace throughout the region;*

*(12) to achieve the goals specified in paragraph (10) and to further promote human rights and civil liberties, build democracy, and strengthen civil society, the Presidential Envoy for Sudan should be empowered to promote and encourage the exchange of individuals pursuant to educational and cultural programs, including programs funded by the Government of the United States;*

*(13) the international community should strongly condemn attacks against humanitarian workers and demand that all armed groups in the Darfur region, including the forces of the Government of Sudan, the Janjaweed, associated militias, the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A), the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM), and all other armed groups refrain from such attacks;*

*(14) the United States should fully support the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan and urge rapid implementation of its terms; and*

*(15) the new leadership of the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) should—*

*(A) seek to transform the SPLM into an inclusive, transparent, and democratic body;*

*(B) reaffirm the commitment of the SPLM to bringing peace not only to southern Sudan, but also to the Darfur region, eastern Sudan, and northern Uganda; and*

*(C) remain united in the face of efforts to undermine the SPLM.*

***SEC. 5. SANCTIONS IN SUPPORT OF PEACE IN DARFUR.***

*(a) BLOCKING OF ASSETS AND RESTRICTION ON VISAS.—Section 6 of the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–497; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—*

*(1) in the heading of subsection (b), by inserting ''OF APPROPRIATE SENIOR OFFICIALS OF THE SUDANESE GOVERNMENT'' after ''ASSETS'';*

*(2) by redesignating subsections (c) through (e) as subsections (d) through (f), respectively; and*

*(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:*

*''(c) BLOCKING OF ASSETS AND RESTRICTION ON VISAS OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS IDENTIFIED BY THE PRESIDENT.—*

*''(1) BLOCKING OF ASSETS.—Beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006, and in the interest of contributing to peace in Sudan, the President shall, consistent with the authorities granted in the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block the assets of any individual who the President determines is complicit in, or responsible for, acts of genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity in Darfur, including the family members or any associates of such individual to whom assets or property of such individual was transferred on or after July 1, 2002.*

*''(2) RESTRICTION ON VISAS.—Beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006, and in the interest of contributing to peace in Sudan, the President shall deny visas and entry to any individual who the President determines is complicit in, or responsible for, acts of genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity in Darfur, including the family members or any associates of such individual to whom assets or property of such individual was transferred on or after July 1, 2002.''.*

*(b) WAIVER.—Section 6(d) of the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004 (as redesignated by subsection (a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The President may waive the application of paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c) with respect to an individual if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States and, prior to exercising the waiver, transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a notification which includes the name of the individual and the reasons for the waiver.''.*

*(c) SANCTIONS AGAINST CERTAIN JANJAWEED COMMANDERS AND COORDINATORS.—The President should immediately consider imposing the sanctions described in section 6(c) of the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004 (as added by subsection (a)) against the Janjaweed commanders and coordinators identified by the former United States Ambassador-at-Large for War Crimes before the Subcommittee on Africa of the House International Relations Committee on June 24, 2004.*

***SEC. 6. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES TO DETER AND SUPPRESS GENOCIDE IN DARFUR.***

*(a) UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT AMIS.—Section 7 of the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–497; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—*

*(1) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting ''(a) GENERAL ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding''; and*

*(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:*

*''(b) ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT AMIS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized to provide assistance, on such terms and conditions as the President may determine and in consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, to reinforce the deployment and operations of an expanded African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) with the mandate, size, strength, and capacity to protect civilians and humanitarian operations, stabilize the Darfur region of Sudan and dissuade and deter air attacks directed against civilians and humanitarian workers, including but not limited to providing assistance in the areas of logistics, transport, communications, materiel support, technical assistance, training, command and control, aerial surveillance, and intelligence.''.*

*(b) NATO ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT AMIS.—The President should instruct the United States Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at NATO to advocate NATO reinforcement of the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS), upon the request of the African Union, including but not limited to the provision of assets to dissuade and deter offensive air strikes directed against civilians and humanitarian workers in the Darfur region of Sudan and other logistical, transportation, communications, training, technical assistance, command and control, aerial surveillance, and intelligence support.*

*(c) DENIAL OF ENTRY AT UNITED STATES PORTS TO CERTAIN CARGO SHIPS OR OIL TANKERS.—*

*(1) IN GENERAL.—The President should take all necessary and appropriate steps to deny the Government of Sudan access to oil revenues, including by prohibiting entry at United States ports to cargo ships or oil tankers engaged in business or trade activities in the oil sector of Sudan or involved in the shipment of goods for use by the armed forces of Sudan until such time as the Government of Sudan has honored its commitments to cease attacks on civilians, demobilize and demilitarize the Janjaweed and associated militias, grant free and unfettered access for deliveries of humanitarian assistance, and allow for the safe and voluntary return of refugees and internally displaced persons.*

*(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to cargo ships or oil tankers involved in an internationally-recognized demobilization program or the shipment of non-lethal assistance necessary to carry out elements of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan.*

*(d) PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES IN VIOLATION OF UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS 1556 AND 1591.—*

*(1) PROHIBITION.—Amounts made available to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) may not be used to provide assistance (other than humanitarian assistance) to the government of a country that is in violation of the embargo on military assistance with respect to Sudan imposed pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1556 (July 30, 2004) and 1591 (March 29, 2005).*

*(2) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of paragraph (1) if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.*

***SEC. 7. MULTILATERAL EFFORTS.***

*The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice and vote of the United States to urge the adoption of a resolution by the United Nations Security Council that—*

*(1) supports the expansion of the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) so that it achieves the mandate, size, strength, and capacity needed to protect civilians and humanitarian operations, and dissuade and deter fighting and violence in the Darfur region of Sudan, and urges Member States of the United Nations to accelerate political, material, financial, and other assistance to the African Union toward this end;*

*(2) reinforces efforts of the African Union to negotiate peace talks between the Government of Sudan, the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A), the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM), and associated armed groups in the Darfur region, calls on the Government of Sudan, the SLM/A, and the JEM to abide by their obligations under the N'Djamena Ceasefire Agreement of April 8, 2004 and subsequent agreements, urges all parties to engage in peace talks without preconditions and seek to resolve the conflict, and strongly condemns all attacks against humanitarian workers and African Union personnel in the Darfur region;*

*(3) imposes sanctions against the Government of Sudan, including sanctions against individual members of the Government of Sudan, and entities controlled or owned by officials of the Government of Sudan or the National Congress Party in Sudan until such time as the Government of Sudan has honored its commitments to cease attacks on civilians, demobilize and demilitarize the Janjaweed and associated militias, grant free and unfettered access for deliveries of humanitarian assistance, and allow for the safe and voluntary return of refugees and internally displaced persons;*

*(4) extends the military embargo established by United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1556 (July 30, 2004) and 1591 (March 29, 2005) to include a total prohibition on the sale or supply of offensive military equipment to the Government of Sudan, except for use in an internationally-recognized demobilization program or for non-lethal assistance necessary to carry out elements of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan; and*

*(5) calls upon those Member States of the United Nations that continue to undermine efforts to foster peace in Sudan by providing military assistance and equipment to the Government of Sudan, the SLM/A, the JEM, and associated armed groups in the Darfur region in violation of the embargo on such assistance and equipment, as called for in United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1556 and 1591, to immediately cease and desist.*

***SEC. 8. CONTINUATION OF RESTRICTIONS.***

*(a) CONTINUATION OF RESTRICTIONS.—Restrictions against the Government of Sudan that were imposed pursuant to Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997 (62 Federal Register 59989), title III and sections 508, 512, 527, and 569 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006, or any other similar provision of law, shall remain in effect and shall not be lifted pursuant to such provisions of law until the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the Government of Sudan is acting in good faith to—*

*(1) peacefully resolve the crisis in the Darfur region of Sudan;*

*(2) disarm, demobilize, and demilitarize the Janjaweed and all government-allied militias;*

*(3) adhere to United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1556 (2004), 1564 (2004), 1591 (2005), and 1593 (2005);*

*(4) negotiate a peaceful resolution to the crisis in eastern Sudan;*

*(5) fully cooperate with efforts to disarm, demobilize, and deny safe haven to members of the Lords Resistance Army; and*

*(6) fully implement the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan without manipulation or delay, including by—*

*(A) implementing the recommendations of the Abyei Commission Report;*

*(B) establishing other appropriate commissions and implementing and adhering to the recommendations of such commissions consistent with the terms of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan;*

*(C) adhering to the terms of the Wealth Sharing Agreement; and*

*(D) withdrawing government forces from southern Sudan consistent with the terms of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan.*

*(b) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of subsection (a) if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.*

***SEC. 9. ASSISTANCE EFFORTS IN SUDAN.***

*(a) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.—Section 501(a) of the Assistance for International Malaria Control Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—*

*(1) by striking ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law'' and inserting the following:*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law'';*

*(2) by inserting ''civil administrations,'' after ''indigenous groups,'';*

*(3) by striking ''areas outside of control of the Government of Sudan'' and inserting ''southern Sudan, southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, and Abyei'';*

*(4) by inserting at the end before the period the following: '', including the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan''; and*

*(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:*

*''(2) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—Assistance may not be obligated under this subsection until 15 days after the date on which the President has provided notice thereof to the congressional committees specified in section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394–1) in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under such section.*

*''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The notification requirement of subparagraph (A) shall not apply in the case of assistance subject to notification in accordance with section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 pursuant to any provision of an Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs.''.*

*(b) EXCEPTION TO PROHIBITIONS IN EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 13067.—Section 501(b) of the Assistance for International Malaria Control Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—*

*(1) in the heading, by striking ''EXPORT PROHIBITIONS'' and inserting ''PROHIBITIONS IN EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 13067'';*

*(2) by striking ''any export from an area in Sudan outside of control of the Government of Sudan, or to any necessary transaction directly related to that export'' and inserting ''activities or related transactions with respect to southern Sudan, southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, or Abyei''; and*

*(3) by striking ''the export or related transaction'' and all that follows and inserting ''such activities or related transactions would directly benefit the economic recovery and development of those areas and people.''.*

***SEC. 10. REPORTS.***

*(a) REPORT ON AFRICAN UNION MISSION IN SUDAN (AMIS).—Section 8 of the Sudan Peace Act (Public Law 107–245; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—*

*(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and*

*(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:*

*''(c) REPORT ON AFRICAN UNION MISSION IN SUDAN (AMIS).—In conjunction with reports required under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report, to be prepared in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, on—*

*''(1) efforts to fully deploy the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) with the size, strength, and capacity necessary to stabilize the Darfur region of Sudan and protect civilians and humanitarian operations;*

*''(2) the needs of AMIS to ensure success, including in the areas of housing, transport, communications, equipment, technical assistance, training, command and control, intelligence, and such assistance as is necessary to dissuade and deter attacks, including by air, directed against civilians and humanitarian operations;*

*''(3) the current level of United States assistance and other assistance provided to AMIS, and a request for additional United States assistance, if necessary;*

*''(4) the status of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) plans and assistance to support AMIS; and*

*''(5) the performance of AMIS in carrying out its mission in the Darfur region.''.*

*(b) REPORT ON SANCTIONS IN SUPPORT OF PEACE IN DARFUR.—Section 8 of the Sudan Peace Act (Public Law 107–245; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—*

*(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and*

*(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:*

*''(d) REPORT ON SANCTIONS IN SUPPORT OF PEACE IN DARFUR.—In conjunction with reports required under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report regarding sanctions imposed under subsections (a) through (d) of section 6 of the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004, including—*

*''(1) a description of each sanction imposed under such provisions of law; and*

*''(2) the name of the individual or entity subject to the sanction, if applicable.''.*

***SEC. 11. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.***

*Nothing in this Act (or any amendment made by this Act) or any other provision of law shall be construed to preempt any State law that prohibits investment of State funds, including State pension funds, in or relating to the Republic of the Sudan.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, and I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) of the International Relations Committee for drafting a bill that has the best chance of becoming law and dealing with the genocidal situation in Sudan. Despite sometimes difficult and complex efforts needed to move this legislation, Mr. HYDE has remained steadfast in moving forward and that is why I have continued to support his efforts throughout this process.

Madam Speaker, no single country in Africa has been subject to greater partisan and bipartisan attention and deliberation by the United States Congress than the Republic of Sudan. Over

the past 3 years, at least nine major bills and resolutions regarding Sudan have been passed by this body, including an historic declaration that genocide was occurring in the Darfur region of western Sudan in September of 2004.

For its own part, the administration of President Bush has led both humanitarian and diplomatic efforts to address the crisis in Darfur. The United States has provided more than $617 million in assistance to help ease the suffering of those most affected by the conflict, and more than $150 million to support the African Union mission in Darfur.

I would say parenthetically, last August Greg Simpkins, our expert on the subcommittee, and I went to Darfur. We spent several days in Khartoum and then made our way up to Mukjar and Kalma camp. Mukjar is a very remote camp, where we saw the beneficiaries of that aid, men and women and children, who have suffered so much, lost so many of their loved ones to this genocide. But it was reassuring and quite gratifying, to be blunt, to see American aid providing them with healthy and nutritious meals as well as the medicines and at least some of the security that they so desperately need.

We also knew, especially with Mukjar, that if you traveled just a kilometer outside camp, the Janjaweed and other killers were waiting to continue their genocidal deeds. It was very sobering to know the risks and the security fright that they face each and every day knowing that they cannot go past the perimeters of the refugee camps.

We also met in Khartoum with not only Salva Kiir, the Vice President, who is doing an extraordinarily good job to try to bring peace to the region, but we also met with President al-Bashir. He and his junta continue to be largely responsible for many of the crimes committed both in Darfur and earlier in the south of Sudan.

Let me finally point out to my colleagues that at the direction of the President, President Bush, the United States Ambassador to NATO has pressed for NATO reinforcement of the African Union mission. We all know they do not have enough people to do the job. The mission was designed and configured in a way that almost doomed it to failure despite herculean efforts on their part. We are now pressing for reinforcement of those AU troops.

The U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, John Bolton, continues to seek authorization to incorporate the African Union Mission into a larger, more robust U.N. peacekeeping mission. As Mr. LANTOS knows when we traveled to New York just a week ago and met with Kofi Annan and others, that was one of the key topics we talked about: How do we get this AU mission blue helmeted so they can grow the mission, as well as boots on the ground to try to mitigate this misery.

The United States also continues to play a significant role in facilitating peace talks in Abuja, Nigeria, between the Government of Sudan and the rebels of Darfur.

Notwithstanding the multiple legislative initiatives and the best efforts of this administration and many of our friends in Europe, and despite the conclusion of a peace agreement for southern Sudan, the passage of six U.N. Security Council resolutions and the deployment of nearly 7,000 African Union peacekeepers in Darfur and the conduct of seven rounds of peace talks, the crisis in Darfur continues with catastrophic consequences. This conflict is real. It is ongoing, it is every day, and it demands our resolute attention.

Madam Speaker, as many as 400,000 people have died and more than 2 million people have been forced from their homes. Entire villages have been looted and destroyed, and countless men, women and children have been abducted, murdered, abused and raped. Weapons continue to flow into the region unabated despite the existence of an arms embargo, and attacks against civilians, humanitarian convoys, and African Union peacekeepers increase almost daily as peace talks in Nigeria flounder.

Despite 14,000 aid workers that make up some 82 NGOs, 13 U.N. agencies and the International Committee for the Red Cross, a lack of security and reliable transportation means that food aid and other humanitarian assistance is becoming increasingly more difficult to deliver. While it is clear that something must be done, it is also clear that we cannot legislate an end to the atrocities and no number of forces from the African Union, NATO, U.N. or even the U.S. can impose a permanent peace without the commitment of the Sudanese themselves to lay down their arms.

Still, as humanitarians we cannot stand by idly as the Sudanese government officials and rebel commanders jockey for power while tragedy continues to unfold in Darfur and threatens to return to the rest of Sudan.

According to a recent International Crisis Group report, Sudan's ruling National Congress Party lacks the will to implement the North-South peace agreement and has frustrated the Darfur peace process by ''facilitating increased chaos on the ground and promoting divisions within the rebels.''

We are all aware of the complexity of the situation in Sudan and must respond accordingly to all of its facets and manifestations. This legislation, I believe, attempts a comprehensive effort to deal with the tragedy of that country. The committee amendment before you, which is the result of 8 months of bipartisan collaboration, contains the following measures:

One, while it does not authorize the use of United States Armed Forces in Darfur, it confers upon the President the authority to provide assistance to reinforce the deployment and operations of an expanded AU mission with the mandate, size, strength and capacity to protect civilians and humanitarian operations.

Two, it encourages the imposition of targeted sanctions against the Janjaweed commanders and coordinators.

Three, it calls for the extension of the military embargo established pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolutions 1556 and 1591 to include the government of Sudan.

Four, it amends the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004 to impose an asset freeze and travel ban against individual perpetrators of genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity in Darfur.

Next, it asserts that existing restrictions imposed against Sudan shall not be lifted until the President certifies to the Congress that the government of Sudan is acting in good faith to:

One, peacefully resolve the crisis in Darfur;

Two, disarm, demobilize and demilitarize the Janjaweed;

Three, adhere to U.N. Security Council resolutions;

Four, negotiate a peaceful resolution to the crisis in eastern Sudan;

Five, cooperate with efforts to disarm and deny safe havens to the Lord's Resistance Army; and

Six, fully implement the terms of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement.

The legislation also amends the International Malaria Control Act to enable the United States Government to continue providing assistance to southern Sudan and other marginalized areas and lift restrictions on imports and exports for those same areas.

It also adds a section regarding the preemption of State laws that prohibit investment of State pension funds in Sudan.

Madam Speaker, Sudan is a very sensitive and emotional issue for Members of this body. While Sudan may be providing the United States with valuable information relevant to the global war on terror, or so it says, it is still on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list. It is a country where the government has unleashed campaigns of terror and genocide against its own citizens.

It is a country where slavery still exists. Back in 1996, I chaired the first hearing ever on the continuing use of chattel slavery in Sudan, something that we thought was abolished in the 1860s.

For many, the National Congress Party-led faction of the Sudanese government represents pure evil. Although we may differ on our views on how best to confront the regime in Khartoum, the need to promote peace and accountability throughout Sudan is not a partisan issue. Members, such as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), have been tenacious on this. Of course the ranking member, Mr. LANTOS, and all of us have worked on both sides of the aisle to try

to ensure that this body remains focused on Sudan in a meaningful and constructive way. Their leadership has been inspiring, and I want to thank them all.

That being said, the bill that lies before you today is the result of 8 months of inclusive consultations and intense negotiations, and represents a truly bipartisan compromise on the efforts to address genocide in Darfur while supporting the consolidation of peace in southern Sudan.

□ 1100

And while it represents a compromise, don't be mistaken. This is a strong bill. It is an important bill. It is an urgent bill. The people of Darfur cannot afford to wait while we continue discussions on how best to confront Khartoum. They need our help now.

I would also like to thank our esteemed ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the chairman and ranking member, Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CONYERS, for acting so quickly to allow us to get this measure to the floor without further delay.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader who is in the forefront of every single fight globally on behalf of human rights and who has just returned a few weeks ago from a visit to Darfur, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much, Mr. LANTOS, our distinguished ranking member on the International Relations Committee, also a cochair of the Human Rights Caucus. Thank you for your great leadership on fighting for human rights throughout the world. You have a long history of that. You have personal experience in terms of being the only Member of Congress who escaped the Holocaust, and you have brought that conviction, your ideas, your courage to this fight once again in helping the people of Darfur.

And I want to commend Mr. CHRIS SMITH. He and FRANK WOLF have been such leaders on this issue for so very many years, and all of us who are concerned about Sudan, in particular now, Darfur are deeply in your debt.

I join the gentleman in commending HENRY HYDE, as well as Mr. LANTOS and DONALD PAYNE, our colleague, who have brought this issue to the forefront in the Congress of the United States. I thank you for authorizing this legislation, for your steadfast leadership in calling attention to the crisis in Darfur.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the floor a picture of the children, a picture of the children of Darfur. All of us on our trip that Mr. LANTOS mentioned, who visited Darfur, 11 members of a bipartisan delegation, all of us wanted to take these children home with us, but that wasn't possible. There were so many of them. And it wouldn't be right anyway, because they wanted to go home. They wanted to go home to their homes which no longer existed.

When we were there, we visited with them. And after a day in the refugee camp, our bipartisan delegation traveled to Khartoum to meet with Vice President Taha. He asked us, he said, ''The Sudanese people want to know, why are you so interested in Sudanese domestic affairs? I know the American people are free-thinking people, but maybe your free-thinking does not create a clear understanding of the facts in my country.''

Vice President Taha was denying what we had seen with our very own eyes that day, refugee children struggling in the heat without shade, without adequate clothing and sleeping in make-shift tents that were made, some of them, from USAID food bags stitched together.

The Darfuris are forced to walk miles outside the camps for firewood and water, with the constant fear that they may be attacked.

As Vice President Taha was denying all of this, we could not help recalling the stories of villages torched, women raped, children kidnapped and men tortured and killed. But even in the horror of all of that, we saw hope in the bright and playful eyes of the toddlers. That hope, however, was diminished in the eyes of the older children. They had really seen too much. They had seen too much.

The camps we visited were homes to over 100,000 people. That was just what we saw when we were there. There are many more. That is just a fraction of the staggering toll of the violence in Darfur. But you can see these camps, and you can see that some of them are made out of USAID food bags.

According to the United Nations, 3 million people are in need of assistance. Two million Darfuris have been displaced, pushed out of their homes and their villages, and nearly 200,000 people have been killed thus far, and that is a conservative estimate.

Furthermore, the full human toll is yet to be exacted. Concentrated in camps with deplorable conditions, when the rainy season comes, Darfuris are now vulnerable to further death from disease. Sicknesses like cholera and dysentery could take tens of thousands more lives.

We have seen variations on this ''problem from hell,'' most recently in Rwanda. And at that time, that short time ago, we promised never again. We have heard never again over and over again.

The humanitarian disaster in Darfur challenges the conscience of the world. It is the systemic destruction of a people. It is genocide.

While we were in the Sudan, back home President Bush reaffirmed that this is, indeed, genocide. When some of us, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JOE WILSON and Mr. CLYBURN and I met with the President at the White House to thank him for his leadership and report on our trip, we also asked him to appoint a special envoy, special U.S. envoy for the Sudan. This envoy would signal that bringing peace and stability to the Sudan is a priority of the United States, and it is a part of this legislation that is on the floor today. This envoy, U.S. special envoy, is necessary because it will help stop the violence, bring the parties to the negotiating table, and get humanitarian relief to the people who need it.

Essential to stopping the violence is stopping the Janjaweed. I heard Congressman SMITH talking about the Janjaweed in his remarks, and after persistent questioning in our meeting with Vice President Taha, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, in a very diplomatic but persistent way, questioned him about the Sudanese government's support of the Janjaweed, which he first denied but later admitted that they had supported the Janjaweed in the past. This was the first admission that we had seen.

Before we went into Darfur, the U.S. military briefed us that the Janjaweed is an extension of the Sudanese military, and they are engaged in state sponsored violence. This must end.

The African Union is to be commended for its efforts to protect Darfur. We saw the AU's camps there where people were getting at least something to eat and perhaps some medical attention for the first time. But so much more needs to be done.

So that is why this legislation on the floor today is so important, because I don't even know if these children are even alive 1 month after we came home, these beautiful children.

Many people in our country have been actively involved in the effort to get more support and humanitarian assistance on the ground. The United Nations dollars for Darfur were running out in March.

Humanitarian workers in Sudan are harassed, their convoys diverted and attacked, and some of these workers have been kidnapped. Humanitarian workers bring no political agenda or no destabilizing intentions to the Sudan. They carry with them hope and sometimes health. They must be protected. Their supplies must not be diverted, and their volunteers must not be detained.

So that is why I am very pleased that we were able to pass, in the supplemental, the President's request for $439 million, and that Mr. CAPUANO's initiative to add $50 million for assistance was accepted by the House. We hope it will be considered in the Senate.

So this legislation, as was spelled out by Mr. LANTOS and Mr. SMITH, so I won't go into it again, contains very, very important initiatives to help make matters better. Stop the violence, bring the parties to the table, get the humanitarian assistance to the people.

This brings us back to Vice President Taha's question, why is the United

States so interested in Sudan? The answer is that genocide is not the domestic affair of any nation. It concerns the world. And as our colleague, JOE WILSON, said to him, Americans care about people. Our care is reflected in the working done for the people of Darfur here in this Congress, in State legislatures, in corporate board rooms, on college campuses, even on high school campuses and yes, indeed, even in the White House.

This care was spurred by our religious communities which have taken the lead in our efforts. I salute many of the religious leaders who have taken the lead on this. And on April 30, many people will converge, thousands will converge on Washington, and there will be events around the country put together by the Save Darfur Coalition.

Each day that the genocide continues, and each day that we wait, the hope we saw in the eyes of the youngest children can disintegrate into disease, despair and death.

Again, on April 30, Americans of conscience will come to Washington to echo the call, never again. These citizens will demonstrate on behalf of the children of Darfur and demonstrate that, not only is America great, but America is good. And this legislation on the floor today is a reflection of that goodness. I support it, and salute the bipartisan cooperation that wrote it and brought it to floor.

Again, I thank Mr. LANTOS for his exceptional leadership on human rights throughout the world and in the Sudan, and Mr. SMITH, Mr. PAYNE and Mr. FRANK WOLF for their exceptional leadership as well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my good friend and colleague from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. I commend Chairman HYDE and Chairman SMITH for their work in moving this important legislation forward.

Defending the basic human rights of the world's most vulnerable populations should be a priority for all of us. Sudan, the largest country in Africa, has been ravaged by civil war intermittently for four decades. An estimated 2 million people have died due to war-related causes and famine, and millions more have been displaced from their homes. This ongoing crisis in the Darfur region in Western Sudan has led to a major humanitarian disaster.

Estimates are that up to 300,000 people have been killed in the Darfur region over the past 24 months alone. In 2004, the House, the Senate and the White House declared the atrocities taking place in Darfur as genocide.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation to impose sanctions against individuals responsible for genocide, support humanitarian operations and promote peace efforts in the region. This is not only an issue of religion or politics. This is a matter of mercy and humanity.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3127.

I want to thank Chairman SMITH, again, for this great bipartisan legislation.

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

I first would like to thank my colleagues, Chairman HENRY HYDE and Chairman CHRIS SMITH and the ranking member, my good friend from New Jersey, DONALD PAYNE, for keeping this House focused on the grave atrocities unfolding every single day in Darfur.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress determined some 2 years ago that the atrocities in Darfur are genocide. We don't use that term lightly. I certainly don't. But it was my privilege to lead the debate on the Democratic side designating what is unfolding in Darfur a genocide. President Bush later addressed the U.N. General Assembly and reaffirmed that our government also designates what is happening in Darfur a genocide.

The United Nations Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs yesterday reported that the government of Sudan is preventing him from visiting Darfur as an eyewitness to the most recent wave of war crimes taking place there. In the past few months, marauding Arab militia, backed by Khartoum, have killed an estimated 10,000 children and women and men.

□ 1115

These Arab militias attacked 60 villages, sending thousands of people fleeing into the desert. As we speak, Mr. Speaker, Khartoum's Arab surrogates continue to disrupt U.N. humanitarian services, kill and displace civilians, and destabilize the entire security situation in Darfur.

While the government of Sudan grudgingly acceded to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, so-called, it continues to block every effort to protect civilians, stop the genocide, and bring peace to Darfur.

The numbers of individuals killed, raped, tortured, and displaced is staggering. Genocide has destroyed well over 60 percent of the villages in Darfur. It has displaced over 2 million human beings and killed an estimated 400,000 and driven additional hundreds of thousands into refugee camps in neighboring Chad.

Meanwhile, the escalating violence on the Chad-Sudan border between Chadian rebels and the Chadian military is threatening thousands in refugee camps and making humanitarian assistance almost impossible. Refugee men and boys are forced into recruitment into the rebel militia. Rather than getting better, the situation for Darfur refugees is becoming all the more precarious with every passing day.

The President has proposed to our allies that the United Nations have a concrete plan to stop the violence in Darfur, deploy NATO staff and resources to the region immediately to aid the embattled African Union peacekeepers, and within 6 months establish a formal United Nations peacekeeping mission in Darfur. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this plan.

And yesterday I had the occasion to talk to the distinguished Foreign Minister of Germany, and I am pleased to state that Germany and the United States will stand together as members of NATO in Darfur.

In a cynical move, the government of Sudan is putting up every possible roadblock to prevent this from happening. The regime even threatened to pull out of the African Union if it endorsed a U.N. handover.

The government of Sudan opposes a U.N. peacekeeping force for one simple reason: it wants to complete the genocide. Working with the African Union, the United Nations, and our NATO allies, we have a moral obligation to foil this plan by actively bolstering African Union forces already there before a U.N. force can finally be deployed.

The African Union has an urgent need for underground NATO advisers and mentors in the areas of command and control, use of intelligence, enhanced communications, and for NATO to continue its current assistance such as strategic airlift for troop protection and training at African Union headquarters.

As the most powerful countries in the world, all of the governments of NATO have a responsibility to contribute in whatever way we can to stopping this genocide. It is not a matter of means, Mr. Speaker. It is a matter of political will.

To this end my distinguished colleague Congressman JOE PITTS and I have introduced House Resolution 723 that calls on the African Union, the United Nations, and NATO to work closely together to strengthen the African Union's capacity to deter the ongoing violence until the U.N. peacekeepers are fully deployed.

Recently, the other body passed a similar resolution sponsored by my friends and colleagues JOE BIDEN and SAM BROWNBACK. This effort to bridge between the current African Union mission and the fully implemented U.N. peacekeeping operation will save tens of thousands of lives and allow uninterrupted humanitarian access to the vast numbers today in camps in Chad and in Darfur. I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor H. Res. 723, the Lantos-Pitts resolution.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3127, under consideration today, demands accountability on the part of the government of Sudan and those most responsible for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity in Darfur. Our bill imposes sanctions against the perpetrators who either directly or indirectly are causing such large-scale human suffering and devastation.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this important bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and respect for his work on this subject that I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who has been our conscience on the issue of the Darfur genocide.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in absolute strong support of H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. I thank Mr. LANTOS, our ranking member of the International Relations Committee, for his continued leadership on issues of importance to the committee, a person who can speak of genocide, being the only Member in Congress who is a Holocaust survivor. So this is very personal, as it is with all of us.

I would like to thank Chairman HYDE for the work that he and his staff did for being open to negotiations with me and my staff and other Members as well as those of other members of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations, chaired by Representative SMITH, my friend from New Jersey, who has done an outstanding job chairing the subcommittee.

I would also like to thank Congressman WOLF for his continued work, who for many, many years has been involved in Sudan; and Congressman TANCREDO, who went to Southern Sudan on his first CODEL a number of years ago with Senator BROWNBACK and myself; and to MELVIN WATT of the Congressional Black Caucus and BARBARA LEE and others who have stood shoulder to shoulder opposing this horrendous genocide.

It was nearly 2 years ago on June 24 in 2004 where I stood with the Congressional Black Caucus, Leader PELOSI, and TOM TANCREDO and introduced H. Con. Res. 467, declaring that genocide was occurring in Darfur, Sudan and that the government of Sudan was responsible. This is the government which harbored Osama bin Laden for 5 years in his country and aided and abetted him and assisted him.

Tragically and to our own shame, the genocide continues today, almost 2 years later, unabated. Many people were surprised when the Congress approved the genocide resolution. And then the next night Senator FRIST, with unanimous consent in the Senate, had the genocide resolution passed in the Senate and the President indicated at the United Nations that genocide was going on after Colin Powell declared it for the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, I have walked through the camps of the Darfur people who were violently forced by government troops and the Janjaweed mercenaries to run for their lives. I have seen the faces in the pictures that Leader PELOSI showed and to hear the horror stories.

Try to imagine what it is like to run away from everything you have known in an instance at gunpoint, to look back at your home, at your village, to see them engulfed in flames. Imagine the cries of scores of men and women, young and old, being brutally killed, terrorized, raped, beaten.

What continues to go on in Darfur today is the ultimate form of terrorism. An estimated 400,000 have already died from murder, starvation, diarrhea, and preventable diseases. Nearly 3 million were forced from their homes into other parts of the region or into Chad. Now the security nightmare has spilled over because the Janjaweed has gone into Chad. And this is the same government that for 20 years had a North-South war where 4 million people were displaced and 2 million people died. So this is a government responsible for 6 million displaced people, 2½ million people dead. This government does not deserve to even be called a government.

Truthfully, it is difficult to imagine. We are half a world away, safe. That is why we bear even a greater responsibility.

What can we do? We must call on President Bush to immediately push the National Congress Party to disarm the Janjaweed, to give the command to the government troops to stop killing innocent people, stop raping, to send those responsible for atrocities in Darfur to appropriate international authorities as called for in Security Council Resolution 1593, and to comply with Security Council Resolutions 1564, 1591, and 1556.

Whether they are government officials such as Security and Intelligence Chief Salah Gosh or Vice President Taha, who leads the Janjaweed, as alleged, we must make sure that this ends.

I would like to just conclude by saying even in my district on Sunday, April 9, the End the Genocide-Save Darfur will be having a rally with the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish World Service, the United Jewish Communities of MetroWest, Help Darfur Now. So everyone is coming together.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend and distinguished colleague from California, an indefatigable fighter for human rights, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank our ranking member for yielding, and also for your leadership and for making sure that wherever genocide is occurring, you take action to stop it, Mr. LANTOS. Thank you so much.

I want to thank also Chairman HYDE and Chairman SMITH for their leadership and for making sure that as we move forward in addressing this atrocity that we work together in a bipartisan fashion. It is so important that the world see Democrats, Republicans, Independents, all of us coming together on this issue.

And to Mr. PAYNE, let me just thank you again for your leadership, for being oftentimes the lone voice in the wilderness and for staying there and plugging along and making sure that this House and the other body puts this as a priority because you knew early on what was taking place when many did not. So thank you for your leadership.

And let me also thank Mr. ROYCE and all of those who have been working and in the forefront of this effort because all of us understand now that we can no longer stand by as millions of innocent people are being displaced and hundreds of thousands are being murdered.

I visited Chad and Sudan last year with Chairman ROYCE and the Academy Award nominee Don Cheadle, and let me tell you we visited those refugee camps on the Chadian-Sudanese border.

□ 1130

Children drew pictures of airplanes flying with bombs dropping. Then they had the helicopters going underneath the airplanes. Then the militia, the Janjaweed on the horses, coming in burning and raping women and kidnapping people. These pictures were vivid that the children painted. It convinced me that the Khartoum government was clearly responsible for this slaughter.

We visited also just recently with our great minority leader, NANCY PELOSI, El Fasher and the refugee camps around the AU headquarters. Quite frankly, it has gotten worse. I want to thank Congresswoman PELOSI for her leadership, because we were able once again, and you heard her earlier, to visit the refugee camps and talk to people and see and learn what we must do in order to stop this slaughter.

This is an important bill. It addresses not only the immediate needs of the Darfurian people, but also the long-term goals of a political settlement. First of all, it also asks the Secretary of State to declare the Janjaweed a terrorist organization, because that is what it is, and we need to be very clear on that. The AU is currently doing a remarkable job, and this legislation helps us to help the AU in a better way in terms of providing for more support. They need more troops.

This legislation also blocks assets and restricts travel of any individual the President determines is responsible for acts of genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity in the Darfur region.

It also supports the International Criminal Court's efforts to prosecute those responsible for acts of genocide in Darfur.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that my provision for capital market sanctions, which our subcommittee approved unanimously, did not stay in the bill as it moved forward, but my provision to support state-sponsored divestment campaigns throughout our Nation is in there.

I want to thank our Chairs for making sure that that is there, because efforts to divest from companies that support the Khartoum regime should be applauded and the growing divestment movement must be supported.

The University of California is getting ready to divest, Harvard University has divested, Stanford has divested, as well as the States of Illinois, New Jersey and Oregon. These provisions with regard to divestment are very important.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes sure that we step up to the plate now and put some teeth into our declaration of genocide. We cannot have another Rwanda, Mr. Speaker. One million people died, and all we could do there was go there later and apologize. Sometimes you see some of us wearing ''Not on Our Watch, Save Darfur,'' because we do not intend to have on our watch another genocide of that magnitude. 200,000 people is too many already. One person is too many.

So this bill will help us address the growing humanitarian crisis, and also the security crisis. In the long run, of course, we know that we must have a political solution and a peace accord.

I want to thank all of you, again, for making sure this remained a bipartisan effort.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and distinguished colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. LANTOS on his outstanding leadership on this issue, as well as Chairman HYDE and Chairman SMITH on this all-important issue. I commend their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006. I also want to express my deep concern as well as the concern of an overwhelming number of my constituents over the situation in Sudan.

The ongoing violence and humanitarian disaster in Sudan has led to as many as 400,000 villagers killed by militias and left more than 2 million Sudanese in refugee camps. This dire situation has also strained the resources of countries bordering Sudan.

In the past, I have supported measures that call on the President to improve the security in Darfur and increase funding for peacekeeping forces and humanitarian assistance. Today, I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 3127, which directs President Bush to impose sanctions on the government of Sudan as well as freeze the assets of anyone responsible for acts of genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity in Sudan. This measure also calls on NATO to send a civilian protection force to assist the African Union mission in Sudan, which has been expanded.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of the people in Darfur resonates with all of us, and we should all be ashamed that the atrocities that have taken place and that are taking place right now are happening in our time. Where is the world's outrage? Why have we not learned from the mistakes of the past, the Holocaust, Armenia, Cambodia, Rwanda?

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to act. It is our duty to end this humanitarian suffering, and I will remain steadfast in my commitment to stopping this conflict and promoting peace in Sudan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 20 minutes of debate time be made available, equally divided between the two sides.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Massachusetts, our distinguished colleague, MICHAEL CAPUANO.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to add my voice to congratulate the leadership of the International Relations Committee and to this House for bringing this bill to the floor. I will be honest, I had some doubts that this bill would ever get to the floor, and the fact that it is here I think is something that deserves recognition.

I think everybody here and everybody who is listening who cares about this issue already knows what is going on in the Sudan.

I just wanted to rise today to express my opinion that this bill coming to this floor at this time is representative of what America can be in the world. It is representative of what America is. It is the best of America. I am not so sure that this bill or anything we can do here will actually stop the genocide in Sudan, but we need to do what we can do, and that is what this bill does.

This bill represents the hopes and dreams of the world, for all the people who care, honestly care, about human rights, basic human rights. I am not talking about the kinds of things we talk about here in America which are the extra-human rights we would all like to see. These are basic: life and death; enslavement and freedom; torture and no torture.

This bill addresses those issues to the best of our ability, and I think just for a moment, every American who cares about this issue should take a second and congratulate themselves and to feel good about their country and their representatives here in the House who have taken action today that we don't need to take. I don't think any of us will get a single vote at home because of this action. But it is the morally correct thing to do if America wants to continue to be the beacon of hope for the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said before. I congratulate the leadership of this House, and thank them for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my fellow Californian and good friend, who is a fighter for human rights in Africa and everywhere, Ms. MAXINE WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. I would like to commend the bipartisan effort of the International Relations Committee, and thank you for the work that you have done on this most important issue.

I was just part of a bipartisan delegation led by minority leader NANCY PELOSI to the Sudan. Genocide is taking place as we stand here today. We met with Vice President Taha. He was unapologetic, he was arrogant and he was uncompromising on their position in Darfur. They don't like the use of the word ''genocide,'' but he admitted that they had funded the Janjaweed because they retaliated against the rebels of the south who were resisting the Sudanese government.

We are on the right track. This Congress has been good in helping to identify that, number one, genocide is indeed taking place. Over 200,000 people have died.

We watched what happened in Rwanda. We have noted over and over again the atrocities of the Holocaust. Yet we can't seem to get the U.N. and others to move fast enough to stop this genocide that is taking place in Darfur.

I support this resolution today, this Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006 today, because this will impose sanctions on the government of Sudan and it will block the assets of and restrict travel for individuals who are responsible for acts of genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity in the Darfur region of Sudan. It is long past due. We should be tough about it. The sanctions movement is growing. We need to squeeze them. We need to make sure that we have the kinds of actions that will be felt.

I was up in the camps. As far as the eyes can see, millions of displaced persons who have been driven from their homes, driven from their camps, living literally on the ground with little tarps just covering them. It is unconscionable that this should continue.

Again, I thank the International Relations Committee.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to our distinguished colleague and my good friend from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me again applaud the International Relations Committee, Chairman HYDE and the ranking member for never stepping away from a very difficult challenge on the international arena.

Mr. SMITH, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, let me again acknowledge your ongoing stand against the brutalization of peoples who are disenfranchised around this world and taking the responsibility that this moral Congress has, the one entity that is looked upon around the world for that extended helping hand.

I, too, traveled to Chad and to Sudan and looked at this whole complex situation. On the one hand, the Sudanese government in a certain sense having a mea culpa, ''not me, not I.'' The African Union being somewhat helpless to the extent that the charge they are given is only to watch and to see. And then in Chad, a country that is now being in essence not destroyed, but certainly charged and challenged with responsibilities that they cannot handle, thousands upon thousands of displaced persons, many of them women and children.

I visited in the heat of the spring and saw no water for the children to go to school, women being raped as they were leaving the camps to find survival, the Chad economy not being able to survive because of this enormous influx of new human beings. Yet, the Sudanese government continues, continues, to deny.

Might I say that in the course of this work, Mr. LANTOS, you know that I have worked very hard to be, as many Members of Congress, a bridge builder between nations in the Mideast. But it is important for our friends, our Arab friends and our friends in China, to understand that they are participants, that they are doing all that is good; if they become implementers or affirmers of the genocide, that this excellent legislation that has the handprint of the outstanding gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, who consistently has been on the battlefield, along with, of course, the excellent leadership of Leader PELOSI, who passionately went to the Sudan just a couple of months ago with members of the Congressional Black Caucus and others, who symbolize the concern of this Congress, that if they don't understand our allies, China being an emerging ally, certainly the work we are trying to do in the Mideast, that they are affirming this disaster.

□ 1145

Then they are not reading the tea leaves. So I come to this floor acknowledging the excellence of H.R. 3127, asking for the other body to immediately move forward. This is not a can-do piece of legislation. This is an emergency piece of legislation. And the President, who should have listened to Secretary Powell over a year ago, who declared after we pressed as Members of Congress, members of the congressional black caucus in particular, that genocide was going on, that it was crucial that the genocide that is going on, that Americans, Americans in every corner of this particular nation would be empathetic and sympathetic to say stop this massive killing. And when I say that, it is like horses going into your suburban neighborhoods, men and women or men on horses and attacking your homes and sending you out of your homes and burning your homes. That is what is going on in Sudan.

So let me join in the sanctions of this particular legislation, but let me say to the gentleman on this floor, I do think it is time to re-energize the movement that expressed to the Sudanese government by way of the embassy, to be very honest with you, that people be at the embassy to again express our disappointment with their lack of sensitivity. And then I must say that what I intend to do is to begin a movement of divestiture. I want to see the investment houses of America divest of any investment in the Sudan, and we will begin this as others have done in their States, and Texas needs to hear my call. Get your money out of Sudan. They are not listening. And the only way that they can be heard or we can be heard is the same way that apartheid was destroyed in South Africa, was to isolate them and to determine that they cannot any longer murder and pillage without impunity in this particular country.

I thank the distinguished gentleman, but I hope that we will be able to wage an effort, a bipartisan effort of divestiture, which ultimately brought South Africa to its recognition, that of separation of black and white and the brutality that occurred had to stop, and look at South Africa today. Sudan can be the kind of nation we all can be proud of.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their powerful and impassioned statements. This is a legislation of conscience. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, in closing, how grateful I am to Members on both sides of the aisle for working so steadfastly on this legislation. There were some glitches, there were some areas where there was broad agreement as well as disagreement. We worked out those differences, and I want to thank the Members, but also the staff. Joan Condon has done an incredibly good job in walking us through this legislation and writing many parts of it. Greg Simpkins, our Africa specialist on the subcommittee, who also worked on this legislation, as I said earlier, accompanied me to Darfur last August. We saw firsthand the devastating impact of this horrific genocide on men, women, and children in that beleaguered land. Pearl-Alice Marsh is always a great friend of the Africa Subcommittee, who provides very good insights. I want to thank her, as well as Noelle Lusane, DON PAYNE's lead staffer who works very well with us, and Ted Dagne. Together we were able to work through these differences.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, legislation aimed at stopping the ongoing genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan.

As a longtime cosponsor of this critical legislation, I'm pleased that this bill has been brought before us today for a vote. With as many as 400,000 killed by the orchestrated violence in Darfur, it's imperative that the U.S. act quickly and decisively to put an end to the crisis.

H.R. 3127 goes after the individuals both inside and outside the Sudanese government who are responsible for the ongoing bloodshed by directing the President to seize the assets of and refuse future visas to any individual (or their family members) responsible for acts of genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity in Sudan. It also forbids any U.S. port from accepting any goods or cargo from Sudanese ships should the Sudanese government continue to fail to take steps to resolve the crisis. Furthermore, in order to give military protection for victims on the ground, H.R. 3127 authorizes the President to provide assistance for an expanded peacekeeping force in Sudan; the African Union Mission in Sudan, AMIS, and directs the President to seek NATO reinforcement of AMIS, upon the request of the African Union.

Last month I voted for and the House passed the Capuano Amendment to the FY2006 Supplemental Appropriations Bill for Iraq and Other International Activities, which added $50 million in funding to expand the African Union's peacekeeping operations in Darfur. This critical funding will help the African Union forces provide humanitarian relief and protection until further assistance arrives from the U.S. and the international community.

For the past three years I have voted for and cosponsored legislation condemning the atrocities in Darfur and appropriately labeling them ''genocide.'' Both Houses of Congress have concurred with this assessment, but little has been effective in stopping the killings and displacement. We need to do more, and we need to come up with new methods to target those perpetuating the violence. The provisions within the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act will give us a fresh set of tools to apply to the situation and deliver assistance to those who need it. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3127.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, for three years the Sudanese government and its armed militia have been engaged in a violent conflict against two major rebel groups in Sudan. This struggle has evolved into an ongoing campaign of government-backed violence and ethnic cleansing, but the international community has failed to take sufficient action to put an end to these atrocities. Congress and the Bush Administration have recognized the slaughter in Darfur as genocide, but it is time to also hold the government in Khartoum accountable for the horrendous actions against civilians and provide international assistance to the victims in Darfur.

To date, more than two million people in Darfur have been driven from their homes and hundreds of thousands have been brutally murdered. Many who have been fortunate enough to escape the violence in Darfur have sought sanctuary in the neighboring country of Chad, but now acts of violence and genocide are following them over the border. The New York Times reported on February 28 that Chadians are now becoming the target of cross-border attacks by Sudanese militia. These assaults are sending civilians from Chad over the border to Sudan, directly into the heart of the violence and bloodshed.

The African Union Mission in Sudan, AMIS, is charged with monitoring an ineffective

ceasefire that has been consistently ignored by both sides of the conflict. But the African Union does not have the resources, training or mandate to provide real protection for the people of Darfur. The African Union needs support from the international community, and H.R. 3127 is the first step in this process. This legislation directs the President to instruct the U.S. representative to NATO to advocate for NATO reinforcement of AMIS and to urge the Security Council to adopt a resolution supporting the expansion of AMIS.

Today I offer my support for the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, and I hope that Congress, the Bush Administration and the International Community can work together to put an end to crisis in Darfur.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, and urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on this important piece of legislation. I commend Chairman HYDE and my fellow New Jerseyans, African Subcommittee Chairman CHRIS SMITH and Ranking Member DONALD PAYNE for bringing this bill to the floor and helping keep our focus on the terrible crisis in Darfur and humanitarian needs in Sudan.

Three years ago, the people of Sudan began a bloody civil war, with two rebel groups in the South rising up against the government in Khartoum. The response from the Sudanese government was swift and brutal, and its aerial bombardment and support of the criminal militia known as the Janjaweed continues today throughout the country. But what has been done in the Southern region of Darfur is beyond anything we have seen in many years.

Mr. Speaker, it was not lightly that Congress declared the situation in Darfur a genocide on July 22, 2004. The government and its Janjaweed allies have killed hundreds of thousands of its non-Arab citizens in the region, and this genocide continues unabated today. More than two million civilians have been displaced from their homes, over 100,000 fleeing to neighboring Chad, and these refugees live in the most difficult situations, still surrounded by Janjaweed abusers and fearful for their safety. Rape has been widespread, and as the Janjaweed move across the region they leave a path of destruction that makes living nearly impossible for the few survivors left behind.

The military of the African Union, now 7,000 strong in Sudan, is doing valiant work but has never received adequate support. The recent discussions with NATO and the United Nations to bring additional forces and military material to the peacekeeping and stabilization mission are promising, but are not enough. The bill under consideration today would authorize much needed assistance to the African Union Mission in Sudan, and direct the President to support the expansion of this force to strengthen their work to bring peace to the region.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, which lends significant support to ongoing efforts to end the crisis in Darfur. The bill supports the use of sanctions on the government of Sudan to pressure it to end its support for the Janjaweed and return to the negotiating table. Only through strong U.S. involvement will there be an end to the violence in Darfur, and this bill provides the backing the administration needs to take further action.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the American people are in firm support of the U.S. taking action on Darfur, and are strongly moved by this tragedy, which some have likened to the Holocaust. In my own district, a wide range of faith communities have joined together in the South Jersey Interfaith Coalition to Save Darfur. I am proud to be an honorary co-chair of this group which brings together people from southern New Jersey to take action on this issue. I am also proud of the students of Voorhees Middle School, who, with the help of their teacher Joyce Laurella, organized ''Project: Save Darfur,'' which has raised awareness of the crisis as well as money for UNICEF activities in Sudan. Individual action can make a difference, and the U.S. government should join its citizens in mobilizing on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence in this matter, which grows more dire every day. We cannot stand idly by, as we did in the face of the genocide in Rwanda and in the early stages of the Nazi holocaust, and then report sadly from the gravesites of those who died. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, and support these steps to end the genocide.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I join today with many of my colleagues in strongly supporting H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006. As a co-sponsor of this measure since July 2005, I am extremely pleased this measure is finally being considered by the full House.

I traveled to Sudan in 1989. I did not know much about the Horn of Africa at the time. But I knew this: 280,000 people starved to death the year before and it was not because there was not enough food. There was a tremendous outpouring of support from people all over the world, and I am proud to say that it came primarily from the United States of America. But that food did not get through to the innocent civilian populations because of this civil war.

I went to Sudan with the late Mickey Leland and the late Bill Emerson and my colleague GARY ACKERMAN. I watched in awe as Mickey Leland negotiated with tyrant Sadiq al-Mahdi and with the leader of the SPLA John Garang, and even that unsavory character next door President Mengistu of Ethiopia to create'' corridors for peace.'' He was successful that year. And in the following year, deaths due to starvation dropped dramatically.

But in the time since then, we have focused our attention elsewhere. We have looked away from this tragedy, and the situation today continues to deteriorate.

Over 2 million people have already died over the past two decades due to war-related causes and famine in Sudan and millions more are internally displaced—more than any other nation on the face of the Earth. And we continue to look the other way.

As we approach the 91st anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, we must also recognize that what has been happening in the Darfur region of Sudan is also genocide. On July 22, 2004, the House of Representatives declared that the atrocities occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan are genocide. This bill, H.R. 3127, also includes this declaration.

We need to get our priorities straight. Let's stop this war and end this human suffering. We can start by passing and implementing the provisions of this important measure, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am offering my support for H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. This bill would be an important step in ending the crisis that continues to plague the Darfur region of Sudan.

Since civil unrest erupted in Sudan in February 2003, roughly 400,000 people have died and an astounding 2.5 million have become displaced as a result of policies by the government of Sudan and attacks by government troops and government-backed militias. The human inhabitants of that beautiful land suffer daily from unimaginable torments including rape, hunger, looting, and indiscriminate killing.

The U.S. government has officially acknowledged that what is happening in Darfur is genocide. Now, it is imperative that the U.S. and the global community act in defense of those in Sudan who are suffering at the hands of their government. If we do not do all that we can to bring stability to this humanitarian crisis, then we are essentially participating in the problem.

H.R. 3127 aims to end this deplorable violence through a variety of means including increasing asset and travel sanctions, urging the expansion and a stronger mandate for the African Union Mission, AMIS, bringing perpetrators of genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity in Darfur to justice through the International Criminal Court, and urging the President to apply additional methods of diplomatic pressure.

As a member of the Congressional Sudan Caucus, I have had the opportunity to express my commitment to developing a solution that will put an end to this continuing genocide. Furthermore, I intend to do what I can in my capacity as a Member of Congress to demonstrate this august body's dedication to supporting human rights around the world. I am optimistic that, by working with advocates and the international community, peace will return to Sudan.

I support the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. I also urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this important legislation.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. This legislation is a much needed step towards ending the unprecedented tragedy taking place in Sudan, and its consideration today is long overdue.

Over the past 3 years, the world has watched as the situation in Darfur has escalated into an unprecedented humanitarian and human rights crisis. Since February 2003, civilians in the impoverished Darfur region of Sudan have been subject to indiscriminate killings, abductions, torture and rape at the hands of the Janjaweed—a lawless militia that has the alleged support of the Sudanese government. It is clear that the government of Sudan has offered their tacit approval for these attacks, and in many instances has engaged in air and ground strikes to augment the Janjaweed assaults on the people of Darfur.

The scope of this ongoing tragedy is hard to imagine. The numbers, unfortunately, speak for themselves. An estimated 3.5 million people are starving and some 2 million have been displaced from their homes, including hundreds of thousands who have fled to Chad for refuge. When then Secretary of State Colin Powell called the crisis in Darfur ''genocide'' in September 2004, an estimated 50,000 people had been killed. That number may now reach

as high as 400,000 today, with 180,000 of these deaths occurring in the past 18 months alone according to the United Nations. These numbers continue to grow everyday; however we may never fully appreciate the enormous human toll these atrocities have taken on Sudan, the continent of Africa, and the world.

The atrocities taking place are nothing less than a human tragedy, a world wide cause that we cannot ignore—and yet the international community remains essentially paralyzed and unable to stop it. To date, there have been 8 rounds of peace talks, the deployment of 6,000 African Union troops, 6 U.N. Security Council resolutions and declarations of genocide by the administration and this Congress. Despite this pressure, the Sudanese government has steadfastly refused to take any constructive steps towards ending this humanitarian crisis.

As the leader of the free world and a role model for human rights and democracy, we must live up to our own example. To this end, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act takes several important steps toward increasing pressure on the government of Sudan to end the current crisis. Among its many provisions, this legislation strengthens sanctions on individuals and governments responsible for, or connected to, the atrocities in Darfur. It also provides strong support for the expansion of humanitarian and peacekeeping efforts in the region, and calls for the suspension of Sudan's membership in the United Nations. While this legislation alone will not end the atrocities in Darfur, it will send a strong message to Sudan and the world community that the U.S. is serious about bringing an end to the violence.

Many grassroots groups around the country, such as the Connecticut Coalition to Save Darfur, have been working to educate policymakers and the public on the urgent need for action in this troubled region of the world. Their efforts have ensured that the crisis in Darfur stays in the public mind and today's consideration of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act is a testament to their tireless work. I am proud to support this legislation, and strongly urge its quick approval in conference so that we can get this important bill to the President's desk without delay.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3128, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006.

Three years ago, the United Nations Security Council declared its grave concern at the widespread human rights violations in Darfur and expressed its determination to do everything possible to halt a humanitarian catastrophe. Since then, at least 300,000 people are estimated to have died in Darfur. Currently, more than 3.5 million Darfurians depend on international aid for survival and another 2 million have been driven from their homes.

In 2004, pressure from Congress and American citizens prompted the Bush administration to become the first government to recognize the mass killing in Darfur as a genocide. Since then, the U.S. has played an important role by pressing for an international response to the crisis in Darfur at the U.N. supporting the deployment and expansion of the African Union Mission In Sudan (AMIS), and providing critical humanitarian aid. Unfortunately, the U.S. and the international community have yet to muster the will or cooperative action necessary to adequately protect civilians, end the killing, and broker lasting peace.

Last week the U.N. Security Council issued a resolution reaffirming that the situation in the Sudan continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security. In Darfur large scale attacks on villages have been replaced by rampant banditry, a campaign of sexual violence, and the practical entrapment of civilians in camps. Government backed militias have not been reined in and rebel groups are contributing to violence on the ground. Civilians continue to be attacked, women and girls raped, humanitarian workers harassed, and critical aid supplies disrupted. For people of Darfur, the situation remains one of daily violence and insecurity, desperate living conditions, and the persistent threat of hunger and disease.

Sixty years ago, in the wake of the Holocaust, the international community vowed, ''Never again.'' Ten years ago, confronted with the death toll of the Rwandan genocide, leaders of the same nations again declared, ''Never again.'' Today, tens of thousands of women, men, and children have been murdered and hundreds of thousands continue to suffer in Darfur. The Darfur Peace and Accountability Act reminds the administration and the international community that the genocide in Darfur demands urgent attention and action, and calls upon the President to use both economic and political leverage to elicit cooperation from the Sudanese government.

Passing the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act is a small, but important demonstration of this nation's commitment to human rights. I hope that passage of this important legislation will spur more concerted national and international efforts to bring security and stability to the people of Darfur.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support and as a co-sponsor of H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006.

Since February 2003, the Sudanese government—through its proxy, the Janjaweed Arab militia—has carried out a campaign to loot and burn African villages in the Darfur region of western Sudan. Hundreds of thousands of people have been killed, and over 2 million people have been displaced. This systematic pattern of attacks against civilians includes arbitrary killings, abductions, looting, torture, and rape, and such attacks are supported by air and land strikes by Sudanese government forces. Congress declared in the summer of 2004 that genocide was occurring in Darfur, and the administration followed suit in the fall of 2004.

This bill strengthens the Sudan Peace Act of 2004 by expanding sanctions, authorizing funding for humanitarian and peacekeeping efforts, and by taking additional steps to bring international attention to this conflict.

First, this bill specifically targets individuals in the government as opposed to punishing the coalition government as a whole. It holds Sudanese government officials and Janjaweed officers accountable for genocidal acts. The bill also targets oil revenues of the Sudanese government by denying access to U.S. ports to any ships involved in the Sudanese arms or oil industries. It is important that we force those responsible for the violence to account for their actions and that we prevent the Sudanese government from continuing to profit while thousands are being killed.

Second, the bill increases humanitarian aid to southern Sudan and other marginalized areas, which are currently under the control of the Sudanese government and thus sanctioned. With this provision, our aid will more efficiently reach those in need, even if they live under the coalition government. In this way, we can hope to protect those who have lost their homes and their livelihoods to the violence of the region.

Third, the bill reinforces the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) in order to protect civilians and carry out humanitarian operations. Currently, the African Union Mission in Sudan consists of only a few thousand troops, and AMIS will require a significant number of supplies and additional troops to effectively carry out its mission. The United Nations Security Council should also consider authorizing a separate, more robust peacekeeping force under U.N. auspices.

I was pleased that the House appropriated $500 million last month in emergency assistance to southern Sudan and Darfur. I urge the House to adopt this legislation today, which takes important steps to stop the ongoing genocide in Darfur.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006. I wish to thank my good friends and colleagues on the House International Relations Committee, in particular Chairman HENRY HYDE and Ranking Member TOM LANTOS. I would also like to thank the honorable gentleman from New Jersey, Representative DONALD PAYNE, for his leadership on Darfur and peace in Sudan, as well as my Massachusetts colleague, and Co-Chair of the Sudan Caucus, Representative MICHAEL CAPUANO.

Mr. Speaker, the genocide in Darfur is an affront to the world, and a challenge to the moral and political leadership of the U.S., the European Union, the NATO Alliance, the African Union, and the international community and its representative body, the United Nations. To date, we have failed, individually and collectively, to rise and meet this challenge.

Every day, the carnage continues.

Every day, villages are destroyed.

Every day, women and girls are raped.

Every day, children are held in servitude.

Every day, the Sudanese government in Khartoum and its terrorist allies, the Janjaweed militias, sit fat and happy, secure in their knowledge that the world is all bark, and no bite—and they continue their pillage and their terror and their violent acts with impunity.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, attempts to hold the Government of Sudan, its leadership and its militia allies accountable for their acts and their crimes.

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, but it takes important steps to strengthen current sanctions, increase the pressure on Khartoum, demand greater support for the African Union peacekeeping mission (AMIS), and require greater action by the international community, including the U.S., to put an end to the slaughter.

I wish the bill would have required the establishment and enforcement of a no-fly zone over Darfur, but at least it includes a sense of Congress provision in support of the no-fly zone. But I warn you, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of controlling the skies over Darfur, government planes and helicopters will continue to support and protect the terrorist militias as they carry out genocidal acts against the defenseless population.

Mr. Speaker, everyone talks about Darfur. For the past 3 years the world has called what is happening in Darfur genocide. And yet the situation continues, the crisis worsens, the blood continues to flow, smoke still rises over the few remaining villages, refugees from the region pour into overcrowded camps, hunger and famine stalk the refugees, and the conflict spills over into neighboring countries.

We cannot continue to talk about Darfur, yet turn our eyes away.

We cannot continue to talk about Darfur, yet take no actions to stop the killing.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, the peace of the dead.

This is not an African problem, this is a crime against humanity—all humanity—our humanity.

I support H.R. 3127; it is a good step in the right direction; but it is not enough.

We in this Congress; we in this Nation; we in this world have failed to meet the test of Darfur—and we will continue to fail until the killing stops, peace is achieved, and the murderers—and all those who aid and abet them—are held accountable and brought to justice.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3127.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Chairman HYDE, Ranking Member LANTOS, Africa Subcommittee Chairman SMITH and my good friend and long time collaborator on Sudan related legislation and issues, DONALD PAYNE of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the numbers: the genocide in Darfur has claimed 400,000 lives and displaced over 2.5 million people. More than 100 people continue to die each day; 5,000 die every month.

Led and supported by their puppet masters in Khartoum, the Janjaweed militia have raped, pillaged, killed and according to this Congress, have committed acts of genocide against Darfur's innocent inhabitants.

Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of this Congress and the numerous governmental and non-governmental organizations who are active on the ground in Darfur, the situation continues to deteriorate: atrocity crimes are continuing and people are still dying in large numbers from malnutrition and disease.

The humanitarian situation remains catastrophic, due to layers of aid obstruction, the lack of an overall humanitarian strategic plan, and the weakened state of displaced Sudanese. Refugees and internally displaced civilians (IDPs), a disproportionate number of them women, are in terribly weakened states, subject to sexual abuse and without adequate shelter. The numbers of at-risk civilians continue to increase. And as need far outstrips the ability of agencies to deliver aid, localized famine is feared.

To be perfectly frank, I find it reprehensible, Mr. Speaker; simply reprehensible that the international community has failed to act on the promises made after the Holocaust that never again would genocide occur on this planet.

While I stand here today as a Member of Congress and applaud my colleagues for their efforts, I also stand here outraged that the United Nations and NATO have allowed despicable war criminals in Khartoum, the same criminals that once provided safe harbor to Osama Bin Laden and as of Monday, have denied a senior U.N. official from entering Darfur, to dictate the method by which the international community may respond to acts of genocide.

Despite my sadness Mr. Speaker, despite my outrage, I come to the floor today slightly uplifted over the fact that later today this body will vote on and hopefully pass H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act.

As I have stated repeatedly during the various markups of this legislation, the final version of this bill is certainly not what I had hoped for; despite the best efforts of my staff and others, there is no authorization of force language; the sanctions could have been stronger; there was no mention of a no fly zone; the list goes on.

Despite these shortcomings, Chairman HYDE's legislation provides the President with the necessary authorization authority to help alleviate the suffering of the people of Darfur;

It denies entry to U.S. ports to certain cargo ships if the Government of Sudan fails to take specified peace measures in Darfur; prohibits, with waiver authority, U.S. assistance to a country that violates U.N. Security Council Resolutions that prohibit military sales to Sudan; and while the bill provides the President with the authority to direct our Ambassadors to NATO and the U.N. to take various action to stop the genocide in Darfur; and while those Ambassadors have acted accordingly; as I mentioned earlier, both of those organizations have been sluggish and as of now ineffective in taking proactive action to prevent further atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how stringent this piece of legislation could have been, it would not have ended the killing, the rape and the pillaging that continues to occur in Darfur.

While the President has taken some action to alleviate the suffering of innocent Darfurians, some is simply not enough when a genocide is occurring on our watch.

As I conclude, it is my hope that this piece of legislation sends a signal to Khartoum that this Congress will not stand by idly while the innocent are slaughtered; in addition, I hope the President will increase his pressure on the international community to take decisive action to end the genocide and bring those responsible to justice.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3127, The Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006. As the entire world already knows and our Government has already recognized, genocide is today occurring in the Sudanese region of Darfur. Hundreds of thousands of civilians have died and almost 1.5 million displaced by Sudanese government backed militias. It is a shame that much of the world has stood idly by while the slaughter continues and Sudan's vulnerable neighbors are left to cope with the tragedy. Additionally, the perpetrators have not been held to account.

I commend my 162 bi-partisan colleagues who have co-sponsored this important bill. It includes additional targeted economic and diplomatic sanctions against the Sudanese regime and increases support for the African Union Mission in Sudan, AMIS, by offering assistance from NATO.

As privileged citizens of the free world we must be ever vigilant toward those who commit barbaric acts in our world. Unfortunately, our country has a poor record in this respect. Therefore, we must work to ensure that the future generations will not bear this same guilt by acting decisively now. As a cosponsor of The Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, I will continue to work with my colleagues to see that the genocide in Darfur is finally halted and urge the House to pass this important legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, H.R. 3127.

This important bill would block the assets and deny visas and entry to any individual (and family member) responsible for acts of genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity in Sudan. H.R. 3127 authorizes support for the African Union peacekeeping mission in Darfur. It prohibits U.S. assistance to a country in violation of U.N. Security Council embargo on military assistance to Sudan. It also urges a Security Council resolution supporting expanding the African Union peacekeeping mission.

For too long the world community turned its back to the ongoing genocide in the Sudan. But the actions of students, religious leaders, and concerned citizens in the United States and around the globe raised awareness about the horrors occurring in Darfur. I want to thank all who shared with me their concern about Darfur in town hall meetings, letters, phone calls, and e-mails over the last three years.

Today the Congress is answering their calls for action. Passing this bill is an all important step to ending the genocide and beginning to hold those who are guilty accountable.

Yet, today there is great suffering in Darfur. The murders continue. The brutal violence still occurs. The rapes persist. People still live in fear. Since 2003, over 200,000 innocent civilians have been slaughtered. More than two million Sudanese civilians are displaced and many live in temporary refugee camps. More disturbing, over three million Sudanese are in need of humanitarian assistance.

The images are stark. The stories are horrifying and sickening. But each one is the picture or story of a single person: a fellow human. We need to remember that we are all bound together in a common existence and a member of the global community. Those who have been slaughtered and those who are suffering in Darfur are family. They are our brothers, they are our sisters. They share the same earth we do and we share a commitment to their safety and wellbeing. My faith, and the faith of many others, says that it is immoral to sit idly by.

Our commitment to end this conflict and to the people of the region must not begin and end today. We must remain focused and dedicated to ending the genocide and healing the wounds of a prolonged civil war. Justice must be served on those who perpetrated these heinous immoral crimes and we must help rebuild and restore the lives of the people who, through the grace of God, survive this hellish civil war.

We, here in Congress, have worked to end this civil war before. We went on record in September of 2004, declaring Darfur a genocide. Just recently, the House approved over $550 million to pay for additional peacekeepers, increased humanitarian assistance and resettlement of refugees. This money is essential to maintaining the current peacekeeping mission and ease the suffering of those who are displaced.

It is long past time for the United Nations to become involved in Sudan. The UN needs to deploy a robust and sizable international mission to end the genocide and then work to bring peace to the Sudan.

After the systematic genocide of the Holocaust, we said never again. After the horrors of Rwanda and the Kosovo we committed ourselves to preventing genocide before it surfaced elsewhere. Sadly, we are close to adding Darfur to this list.

I call on the President to continue to push this issue with world leaders and push in the United Nations to end the genocide in Darfur and to internationalize the response. I pray that the suffering will soon end, but that we will not soon forget our brothers and sisters in Africa.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has identified the situation in Darfur, Sudan, as the worst current humanitarian and human rights statement of crisis in the world. And, the United States has labeled the killings in Darfur as genocide.

History is littered with examples of the international community recognizing the existence of genocide, while at the same time failing to put an end to the murder, rape and dislocation of innocent men, women and children.

Sadly, the case of Sudan is yet another sorry demonstration of the international community's collective lack of will to confront those would commit such horrific acts of cowardice.

The nations of the world must stop turning a blind eye to the suffering of innocents.

I am pleased that we are considering legislation to provide further assistance to the African Union Mission in Sudan, and to strengthen the arms embargo against the Janjaweed militia.

But we must not delude ourselves: the resolution before us today will not by itself solve the crisis or put an end to the suffering in Sudan.

As recognized in this legislation, the mission of the African Union peacekeepers must be expanded to allow them to intervene when acts of violence are being committed against innocent Sudanese.

How can we not have learned the lessons of Bosnia, Kosovo and Rwanda, where we watched in horror as troops in blue helmets stood by and witnessed the rape, murder and displacement of thousands?

The humanitarian crisis currently taking place in Sudan is among the most grave the world has seen in the past decade, and at its heart is the genocidal campaign being waged by the Khartoum government.

The most important, immediate step the world can take to stem the violence is to empower the forces already in place to actually protect the people of Darfur.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. And, I urge the U.S. Representatives at the United Nations to carry out their mission as directed in this bill to provide to African Union peacekeepers the authority to stop this genocide.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act passed the House today, Wednesday April 5, 2006. This Act calls for action. The specific intent and purpose of this Act must be implemented immediately by the Administration. It is too late for more words on the horrors of Darfur no matter how strong the words. As Nicholas Kristoff in his persistent, piercing Times columns has pointed out that for years, we have said ''Never Again, Again.'' And yet, the slow genocide continues in Darfur. Babies die of hunger and thirst, women suffer a deliberate policy of rape; men are castrated and shot in the head. The starvation, the deaths, the burning of villages, the poisoning of wells, the slaughter of domestic animals on which people depend, the brutal killing of children in front of their mothers continues while the world watches. ''Uncover Your Eyes'' Mr. Kristoff tells us. ''Uncover Your Eyes.'' (Nicholas D. Kristoff, June 7, 2005).

The killing in Darfur is the first Genocide of the 21st Century. There is only one approach to a genocide: It must be stopped using all necessary means; and those that perpetuate it must be held accountable. There is no excuse for failing to hold accountable those who arm, condone and assist in genocide; most especially the excuse for a failure to hold a government accountable must not be ''the war on terror.'' Those who arm and support the Janjaweed militia as the government in Khartoum continues to do are terrorists. If you doubt it, then uncover your eyes: the Janjaweed seized nine boys from a village called Saleya, stripped them naked, tied them up, cut off their noses and ears, gouged out their eyes and shot them to death before leaving them near a public well. Nearby villagers got the message and fled. Currently rapes take place when women collect firewood. If the men collect the firewood, they are castrated and then shot in the head.

The United States has given a great deal of humanitarian aid to the refuge camps where thousands of people of Darfur live. They cannot go back to their villages. The representatives from the State Department say the starvation and malnutrition rates for these people have slowed since 2004. However, they are unable to feed themselves; if they go back to their villages and try to restore their dwellings and grow crops; they will be killed. There is nothing to indicate the genocide has been called off. The non-Arab tribes from the Darfur region of Sudan are marked for death because of their tribal membership and the fact that they are non-Arab Africans.

We know what needs to be done. We have the time to do what needs to be done. We have the means, the influence, and the power. What we need is the will and the leadership. First the United States must recognize that if the genocide is to be stopped, the United States will have to stop it. This is a most wonderful opportunity never before presented to a leader or a country. President Bush on behalf of all the compassionate citizens of this country must seize this opportunity.

Second, the State Department with the leadership of the President must recognize that neither the mandate nor the troop strength of the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) is adequate to protect civilians in Darfur. Third, although the United Nations Security Council has taken steps toward establishing a United Nations peacekeeping mission for Darfur, it could take up to a year for such a mission to deploy fully and the people of Darfur cannot wait that long. Therefore, the African Union must request assistance not only from the United Nations but also from NATO. NATO is needed immediately; Pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations a peacekeeping force for Darfur must be approved. It must be well trained and equipped and have adequate troop strength to protect the people of Darfur and stop the deaths of helpless, unarmed civilians many of whom are under the age of five.

In order to achieve this, President Bush must propose that NATO consider how to implement and enforce a declared no-fly zone in Darfur and deploy troops to Darfur to support to the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) until a United Nations peacekeeping force is fully deployed in the region. President Bush must also approve supplemental funding to support a NATO mission in Darfur and the African Union Mission in Sudan and called upon NATO allies led by the Untied States to support such a mission and to call upon NATO headquarters staff to begin planning for such a mission.

President Bush has the opportunity that comes once in a presidency and perhaps once in a lifetime. He can save an entire people, their elders, their parents, their children. He can stop the rapes, the maiming of children and women, the acts of barbarism we have shut our eyes to because they are unbearable to look at. I implore President Bush on behalf of his fellow Americans, uncover your eyes and open your heart. Stop the genocide in Darfur.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006.

Nearly 2 years ago, I joined my colleagues in Congress to declare the atrocities in Darfur ''genocide.'' Despite this declaration, hundreds of thousands are dead, millions remain displaced and peacekeepers continue to lack needed support. It is clear that additional action is needed and I am pleased to join my colleagues today in supporting passage of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006.

The Khartoum government must be held accountable. It is my hope that with this legislation President Bush will exercise the influence of the United States at the United Nations to

garner greater support from the world community to end the crisis in Darfur and bring peace to the Sudanese people.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the passage of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. This bill reflects the United States' continued commitment to see that the violence ends and a lasting peace is achieved in Darfur.

Darfur has already been acknowledged as the worst human rights tragedy since the 1994 Rwandan genocide. Nowhere else have we recently seen such a massive attack on innocent civilians who are left to suffer in complete isolation, cut off from the rest of the world.

Nearly 400,000 people have already died in Darfur and over two million people continue to live as refugees and internally displaced persons. Thousands of women have been raped and sexually abused and children are left to die from malnutrition, dysentery and infectious diseases.

Mr. Speaker, last month's approval by the House of funding for Sudan is a solid commitment that brings us closer to resolving the crisis in Darfur and helping those in need. But it is not enough. Congress must continue and hold steadfast to the basic principles of freedom and human rights that we stand for and press on until justice is brought to the Darfurians.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate my grave concern about the situation in Darfur and to express my support for H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006. International efforts to end the genocide now occurring in Darfur have been lackluster. We should be doing more to intervene on behalf of the thousands of innocent men, women and children in that region. I am hopeful that this legislation will give added momentum to ending that genocide. Authorizing the President to provide assistance to the African Union Mission on the ground through NATO is just one of the ways that we can fight to bring an end to the violence.

In addition to supporting H.R. 3127, there are several other measures that send a message to the Sudanese that the United States cannot accept the current state situation such as supporting H. Res. 675, a resolution expressing disapproval of the Arab League's decision to hold its 2006 summit in Khartoum, Sudan. The resolution calls on the Arab League, the government of Sudan, the Sudanese rebels, and the world community to do all they can to end acts of genocide in the Darfur Region of Sudan.

One of the most effective tools in sending a message to the Sudanese government is divestment. I, along with many colleagues, have requested that the University of California Office of the President develop a plan of divestment from Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, the Sudanese government is in complete denial of their role in supporting genocide and we must act now to send a message that the U.S. will not tolerate this situation—we must pass H.R. 3127.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3128, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006.

Three years ago, the United Nations Security Council declared ''its grave concern at the widespread human rights violations'' in Darfur and ''expressed its determination to do everything possible to halt a humanitarian catastrophe.'' Since then, at least 300,000 people are estimated to have died in Darfur. Currently, more than 3.5 million Darfurians depend on international aid for survival and another 2 million have been driven from their homes.

In 2004, pressure from Congress and American citizens prompted the Bush Administration to become the first government to recognize the mass killing in Darfur as a genocide. Since then, the U.S. has played an important role by pressing for an international response to the crisis in Darfur at the UN, supporting the deployment and expansion of the African Union Mission In Sudan (AMIS), and providing critical humanitarian aid. Unfortunately, the U.S. and the international community have yet to muster the will or cooperative action necessary to adequately protect civilians, end the killing, and broker lasting peace.

Last week the UN Security Council issued a resolution reaffirming ''that the situation in the Sudan continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security.'' In Darfur large scale attacks on villages have been replaced by rampant banditry, a campaign of sexual violence, and the practical entrapment of civilians in camps. Government backed militias have not been reined in and rebel groups are contributing to violence on the ground. Civilians continue to be attacked, women and girls raped, humanitarian workers harassed, and critical aid supplies disrupted. For people of Darfur, the situation remains one of daily violence and insecurity, desperate living conditions, and the persistent threat of hunger and disease.

Sixty years ago, in the wake of the Holocaust, the international community vowed, ''Never again.'' Ten years ago, confronted with the death toll of the Rwandan genocide, leaders of the same nations again declared, ''Never again.'' Today, tens of thousands of women, men, and children have been murdered and hundreds of thousands continue to suffer in Darfur. The Darfur Peace and Accountability Act reminds the Administration and the international community that the genocide in Darfur demands urgent attention and action, and calls upon the President to use both economic and political leverage to elicit cooperation from the Sudanese government.

Passing the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act is a small, but important demonstration of this nation's commitment to human rights. I hope that passage of this important legislation will spur more concerted national and international efforts to bring security and stability to the people of Darfur.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act and urge my colleagues to vote for it. This important bill takes critical steps towards ending the genocide in Darfur by authorizing the President to provide assistance to expand the African Union Mission in Sudan while also strengthening sanctions on countries that provide military assistance to Sudan.

The crisis in Darfur, Sudan began in February 2003 when two rebel groups emerged to challenge the National Islamic Front government in Darfur. Since then, over 300,000 people have died and nearly 2 million have been displaced from their homes. It is unfortunate that it took the United States until July of 2004 to recognize that these events in Darfur constituted genocide and it has taken until April of 2006 for the House of Representatives to consider this bill. We have seen far too many times the consequences of ignoring genocide or failing to get involved quickly.

The fact is that while we take a crucial step today, more remains to be accomplished to ensure a lasting peace in the Darfur region of Sudan. Yesterday, in the New York Times, Jan Egeland, the U.N. under-secretary-general for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief, stated, ''Many believe the problems are over in Darfur. They are getting worse.'' The United States government must continue to work in conjunction with the United Nations and other allies to put pressure on the Sudanese government to allow U.N. peacekeeping forces into the country.

I have introduced legislation expressing disapproval of the Arab League's decision to hold its 2006 summit in Khartoum, Sudan. The world community needs to join us as one in condemning the tragedy in Darfur and pressing the Sudanese government to end it.

Mr. Speaker, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act is a crucial step towards ending the violence. We need to remember, however, that we have more to do to end this humanitarian crisis. With nearly two million people displaced from their homes and hundreds of thousands dead, resolving this conflict should be a priority for Congress and the Administration. We cannot allow a tragedy of this magnitude to occur in today's world.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since February 2003, it is estimated that the government-sanctioned violence in Darfur has displaced 2 million people, forced 200,000 people into exile and led to the murder of 300,000 civilians. In July 2004, the United States Congress declared the atrocities in Darfur genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I have a deep and personal understanding of the horrors of genocide. My mother, Renee Perl, was forced to flee Austria—alone—at the age of 14 to escape the Holocaust, leaving behind her family and friends.

As my mother fled the Nazis, the world stood by as Hitler sent Jews to their deaths at Auschwitz, Dachau and Treblinka. Six million deaths later, the world pledged ''Never Again''.

Yet, only years after the Nazi-era, millions were sent to their deaths in places such as Cambodia, Bosnia and Rwanda, and the world once again took too long to act. And today, millions of innocent Darfurian men, women and children are being persecuted by the Sudanese government and government-backed militias. To date, however, the perpetrators of these atrocities have faced little to no punishment for their actions and the genocide continues.

The 20th century taught us how far unbridled evil can and will go when the world fails to confront it. It is time that we heed the lessons of the 20th century and stand up to these murderers. It is time that we end genocide in the 21st century.

The bill we are considering today is an important step in this direction. By imposing direct penalties on those responsible for crimes in Darfur, we are sending a strong message to the Sudanese government. But, more must be done.

The serious crimes by the Sudanese government and the government-supported militias must be met with serious consequences. We must work for tough international economic sanctions on the Sudanese government. We must continue to support efforts to

bring those responsible for crimes against humanity before the International Criminal Court. And, most importantly, we must continue pressing for a strong, international military engagement with a robust mandate to protect civilians in Darfur.

All across America, millions of Americans are demanding that we take action. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and I urge the administration to do all it can to end this genocide.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. Passage of this bill, which is long overdue, will help fulfill the U.S.'s role in ending the genocide in Sudan.

More than a year and a half ago, Congress voted unanimously to condemn the genocide in Darfur. Then-Secretary of State Colin Powell declared the atrocities in Darfur to be genocide, a statement that was hailed as significant and meaningful coming from the highest echelons of the U.S. government. Despite these clear pronouncements, however, more people die every day and the slow genocide in Darfur persists unabated.

It is beyond imagination that the collective might and concerted will of the nations of the world cannot find a way to end this daily toll of human misery. I hope and pray that Sudan will allow the proposed UN peacekeeping mission to move forward so that we can end this devastation. While we wait, however, we must find ways to make the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) stronger, and to bolster these efforts with a NATO support.

We must also send the message to those who perpetrate genocide that there will be consequences. The Darfur Peace and Accountability Act would impose harsh sanctions against those who are complicit in or responsible for acts of genocide, freezing their assets and restricting their ability to travel, and would block the Government of Sudan's access to the oil revenues used to fund the ongoing genocide.

The bill also properly recognizes that ending the genocide in Darfur is not a challenge to be solved by the United States alone. It provides clear support for efforts to establish a U.N. peacekeeping presence in Darfur and other multilateral initiatives to pressure the Sudanese government to end the genocide.

My colleagues, ''Never Again'' is a phrase we have all heard before. We have all said it before. It is one of the most powerful expressions of the natural human inclination to stop suffering, to end the death and destruction that stems from senseless hatred and indifference to human life.

Never Again will we let 6,000,000 Jews perish under the noses of the civilized world. Never Again will we let Rwandans be rounded up and indiscriminately killed because of their tribal affiliation. Never Again will we allow ethnic cleansing in the Balkans.

The problem with the phrase ''Never Again,'' however, is that it is usually uttered after the violence is over, as a rallying cry against history repeating itself. We have seen, time and time again, that history does repeat itself, and it is simply not enough to say that we will prevent it next time. We must end the genocide in Darfur now.

The Darfur genocide is not a Sudanese problem or an African problem. It is a human tragedy, and it is ours to solve. If we are serious about ''Never Again,'' let passage of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act today be just one step along this long and arduous road.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3127, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3127.

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

There was no objection.

## CONCERNING THE GOVERNMENT OF ROMANIA'S BAN ON INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTIONS AND THE WELFARE OF ORPHANED OR ABANDONED CHILDREN IN ROMANIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 578) concerning the Government of Romania's ban on intercountry adoptions and the welfare of orphaned or abandoned children in Romania.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 578

Whereas following the execution of Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu in 1989, it was discovered that more than 100,000 underfed, neglected children throughout Romania were living in hundreds of squalid and inhumane institutions;

Whereas United States citizens responded to the dire situation of these children with an outpouring of compassion and assistance to improve conditions in those institutions and to provide for the needs of abandoned children in Romania;

Whereas, between 1990 and 2004, United States citizens adopted more than 8,200 Romanian children, with a similar response from Western Europe;

Whereas the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) reported in March 2005 that more than 9,000 children a year are abandoned in Romania's maternity wards or pediatric hospitals and that child abandonment in Romania in ''2003 and 2004 was no different from that occurring 10, 20, or 30 years ago'';

Whereas there are approximately 37,000 orphaned or abandoned children in Romania today living in state institutions, an additional 49,000 living in temporary arrangements, such as foster care, and an unknown number of children living on the streets and in maternity and pediatric hospitals;

Whereas, on December 28, 1994, Romania ratified the Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption which recognizes that ''intercountry adoption may offer the advantage of a permanent family to a child for whom a suitable family cannot be found in his or her State of origin'';

Whereas intercountry adoption offers the hope of a permanent family for children who are orphaned or abandoned by their biological parents;

Whereas UNICEF's official position on intercountry adoption, in pertinent part, states: ''For children who cannot be raised by their own families, an appropriate alternative family environment should be sought in preference to institutional care, which should be used only as a last resort and as a temporary measure. Inter-country adoption is one of a range of care options which may be open to children, and for individual children who cannot be placed in a permanent family setting in their countries of origin, it may indeed be the best solution. In each case, the best interests of the individual child must be the guiding principle in making a decision regarding adoption.'';

Whereas unsubstantiated allegations have been made about the fate of children adopted from Romania and the qualifications and motives of those who adopt internationally;

Whereas in June 2001, the Romanian Adoption Committee imposed a moratorium on intercountry adoption, but continued to accept new intercountry adoption applications and allowed many such applications to be processed under an exception for extraordinary circumstances;

Whereas on June 21, 2004, the Parliament of Romania enacted Law 272/2004 on ''the protection and promotion of the rights of the child,'' which creates new requirements for declaring a child legally available for adoption;

Whereas on June 21, 2004, the Parliament of Romania enacted Law 273/2004 on adoption, which prohibits intercountry adoption except by a child's biological grandparent or grandparents;

Whereas there is no European Union law or regulation restricting intercountry adoptions to biological grandparents or requiring that restrictive laws be passed as a prerequisite for accession to the European Union;

Whereas the number of Romanian children adopted domestically is far less than the number abandoned and has declined further since enactment of Law 272/2004 and 273/2004 due to new, overly burdensome requirements for adoption;

Whereas prior to enactment of Law 273/2004, 211 intercountry adoption cases were pending with the Government of Romania in which children had been matched with adoptive parents in the United States, and approximately 1,500 cases were pending in which children had been matched with prospective parents in Western Europe; and

Whereas Romanian children, and all children, deserve to be raised in permanent families: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the desire of the Government of Romania to improve the standard of care and well-being of children in Romania;

(2) urges the Government of Romania to complete the processing of the intercountry adoption cases which were pending when Law 273/2004 was enacted;

(3) urges the Government of Romania to amend its child welfare and adoption laws to decrease barriers to adoption, both domestically and intercountry, including by allowing intercountry adoption by persons other than biological grandparents;

(4) urges the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to work collaboratively with the Government of Romania to achieve these ends; and

(5) requests that the European Union and its member States not impede the Government of Romania's efforts to place orphaned or abandoned children in permanent homes in a manner that is consistent with Romania's obligations under the Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 578 expresses deep disappointment that the Romanian government has instituted a virtual ban on intercountry adoptions with serious implications for the well-being of orphaned and abandoned children in Romania.

Immediately after the December 1989 revolution, Mr. Speaker, which ousted the much-hated dictator Nicholae Ceausescu, the world learned that tens of thousands of underfed, neglected children were living in institutions, called orphanages, throughout Romania. A month after the fall of Ceausescu, Dorothy Taft, who is our deputy chief of staff at the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and I traveled to Bucharest and visited those orphanages. We also met with government officials and spoke about the hope for democracy in that country. But one of the most lasting impressions that I have from that trip is being in an orphanage in Bucharest, where dozens of children were lined up with no one to turn them, to change their diapers and, in some cases, even to feed them with the frequency that their little bodies required. It left a lasting impression upon me.

Sadly, all these years later, Mr. Speaker, Romania's child abandonment rate that we witnessed firsthand on that trip has not changed significantly over those years. As of December 2005, 76,509 children are currently in the child protection system.

While the Romanian government deserves at least some credit for reducing the number of children living in institutions from 100,000 to 28,000, this is only part of the picture. The government statistics do not include the abandoned infants living for years in maternity and pediatric hospitals, where donations from charities and individuals keep the children alive; and more than 40,000 of the children moved out of the institutions are living in nonpermanent settings or foster care, or with maternal assistance, paid by the government or with a distant relative who do not intend to adopt them, but do accept them for a stipend.

In the context of Romania's ascension to the European Union, unsubstantiated allegations have been made about the qualifications and motives for those who adopt internationally and the fate of those adopted children.

Intercountry adoption, Mr. Speaker, was falsely equated with child trafficking, and Romania faced relentless pressure to prohibit intercountry adoptions. Sadly, rather than focusing on the best interest of the children, Romanian policymakers acquiesced to the European Union's pressure, especially its rapporteur, Lady Emma Nicholson, by enacting a law in 2004 that banned intercountry adoption, except by biological grandparents. By foreclosing foreign adoptions, the laws codified the misguided proposition that a foster family, or even an institution, is preferable to an adoptive family outside of the child's country of birth.

Between 1990 and 2004, I would note, more than 8,000 Romanian children found permanent families in the United States and thousands more joined families in Western Europe and elsewhere. This possibility is now gone. Some Romanians and Europeans argue that this law, this misguided law, is somehow consistent with Hague Convention on the Intercountry Adoptions and the Rights of the Child Convention. They also allege that ''there is little scope, if any, for international adoptions in Romania because there are so few children who are legally adoptable.''

Mr. Speaker, the low numbers declared ''legally adoptable'' is not something to be proud of. It is a contrivance. Indeed, it is a denunciation of the child welfare system, which now places such an unrealistic priority on unification with blood relatives that it is nearly impossible to determine any child is adoptable, no matter how old and how long they have been in state care without contact with the blood relatives.

If more children were made available for adoption, there would be a great need for intercountry adoption. Barely a thousand children have ever been domestically adopted in Romania in any given year. As a result of the new laws, only 333 children were entrusted for domestic adoption last year.

For thousands of children abandoned annually in Romania, domestic or intercountry adoption offered the hope of a life outside of foster care or an institution. That hope has now been dashed and destroyed.

Last September, Mr. Speaker, I chaired a hearing of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe at which Maura Harty, the Deputy Under Secretary of State, rebutted the argument that the adoption ban is somehow consistent with Romania's intercountry international treaty obligations. Likewise, our witnesses, including Dr. Dana Johnson, Director of the International Adoption Clinic and Neonatology Division at the University of Minnesota's Children's Hospital, testified that Romania's concentration on reunification of an abandoned child with his or her biological family is only superficially consistent with the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child.

He also talked about the deleterious effect of such waiting, being held in foster care and especially in institutions, has on a child's mental, as well as their physical health.

When Romania enacted its intercountry adoption ban, there were 211 pending cases in which children have been matched with adoptive parents in the United States. Approximately a thousand more have been matched with parents in Western Europe, Israel and Australia. In the past few weeks there have been unofficial reports that pending applications are being rejected across the board and the dossiers returned to the adoptive parents.

A document from the Romanian Office for Adoption acknowledged that fewer than 300 of these children have been placed in permanent situations, either returned to biological parents or adopted within Romania. The vast majority remain in limbo. This cannot be the last word of what we often call ''the pipeline cases.''

The Romanian government repeatedly promised to analyze each pending case thoroughly, but the review that has supposedly been done was not transparent, was not done on a case-by-case basis, and was not conducted according to clear and valid criteria that is in the best interest of each individual child. These cases involve prospective families who have proven their good faith, by waiting for years for these children. Many cases involve children who will not be domestically adopted due to their special needs, medical or societal prejudices.

In at least three cases, Mr. Speaker, children are already living in the United States with their prospective adoptive parents while receiving life-saving medical treatment, including a child with spina bifida. These children were legally adoptable until Romania's new law took effect.

Let me say that when I introduced this resolution in November, I asked the question, who in the European Union will stand with Members of our Congress, to protect these defenseless children?

Today I am happy to say, members of the European Parliament are challenging the anti-adoption monopoly over this issue and that is encouraging. On December 15, the European Parliament urged Romania to act in the pending cases with the goal of allowing intercountry adoptions to take place where justified and appropriate. In March, the European Parliament's rapporteur for Romania's EU accession, Mr. Pierre Moscovici, reported that he notably differs on the issue of international adoption of Romanian

children from the previous rapporteur, Baroness Emma Nicholson, whose virulent anti-adoption views that hurt the children of Romania are now very, very well known.

I applaud the European Parliament and I am glad that our parliament, this Congress, is poised to go on record very strongly in trying to resolve these pipeline cases.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable that more than 15 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall we are still dealing with the vestiges of failed experiments in totalitarian social engineering.

□ 1200

One of these cases is the shocking situation of children in Romania in orphanages. For many years, the dictator of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, had a policy of encouraging population growth to enhance the country's international importance. He encouraged parents to have large numbers of children, but the economic and social conditions in Romania made it impossible to support large families. As a result, many parents were forced to abandon their children to state-run institutions that were grossly underfunded and understaffed.

My wife, Annette, and I visited a large number of these Romanian orphanages, and what we saw was worse than pathetic. Many children spent long periods of time in miserable conditions that stunted their development and left them detached from the society at large.

Upon the discovery of the large number of Romanian orphans, people from around the world, particularly in the United States, opened up their hearts and proceeded to try to adopt Romanian orphans. In 1990, 121 Romanian children were adopted by American parents. A decade later, the number had increased tenfold.

Because of a new Romanian law, Mr. Speaker, last year this number shrank to zero, and the hundreds of U.S. couples who had already been approved for international adoption were caught up in the change of law that did not allow those adoptions already in the pipeline to go forward. Their dream of having children and creating a family has been devastated.

No one doubts that there have been serious problems regarding the international adoption situation in Romania since the earlier 1990s. Exorbitant fees and false medical information, in some cases, have blazed across the media, and the Romanian moratorium on international adoptions that was instituted in 2001 may well have been a wise move, although children in mid-process were caused needless suffering.

Rather than creating a pause and developing a new system, Romania has instituted a new law that virtually prohibits international adoptions. Clearly, we all support children remaining in their home countries, being integrated into their own societies. However, where there are not enough willing parents, international adoption is one way to address the best needs of the orphan child.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that our Department of State has taken a strong interest in this matter and that they are pushing the Romanians, at a minimum, to deal with American citizens whose petitions were in mid-process. I also support their efforts to clarify the European Union's role in this new law, since the Romanian government has suggested that the new approach is based on accession talks with the European Union.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that in the next year the United States will become a party to The Hague Convention on Inter-Country Adoptions. This will work to ensure that all countries avoid the abuses that led Romania to close their adoptions in the first place.

I urge all of my colleagues to support our carefully crafted resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), who has several cases in his own district that he has been advocating for.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first start out by congratulating my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), as well as the bipartisan support from Mr. LANTOS on this effort, and certainly their leadership in trying to resolve this issue. While it only affects a couple of hundred American families right now, for those families that it does affect, it is a profound issue in their lives.

As I think Mr. LANTOS has very eloquently summarized, as has Mr. SMITH, the large implications of the cases, I would like to bring it down to what it means to an individual family, that family in New Hampshire being Allison and Mike Schaaf of Stratham.

They have adopted a Romanian child. They have provided that child with a loving home, a home that would not have been possible for that young man, Hunter, to have been able to have had in Romania, where there were some 100,000 orphans living in orphanages, and the Schaafs and a number of other people in my district have done that.

As a result of the success that they had and the ability to be able to bring this child to the United States and provide him a loving home, they wanted to have a second Romanian baby that they adopted, and in the course of going through the paperwork and getting the final approval, all of which were in place, the Romanian government changed their laws, which is understandable given the fact that they wanted to become a member of the European Union.

What we are advocating and what this resolution would help us do is, once again, remind the Romanian government that for those cases that were previously approved and for everything, except actually releasing the orphans to their American parents when this law changed, that in fact the Romanian government should follow through on that commitment for those 200 or so American families that have gotten all of their paperwork approved and the cases all but resolved except for this law.

It is my hope that the European Union and the leaders of the European Union are going to recognize the legitimacy of the claims of the 200 or so American families and perhaps as many as 2,000 other European families and resolve these cases that have been previously approved for the benefit of families in this country, like Allison and Mike Schaaf, who provided such loving, kind and warm homes.

I once again thank the bipartisan sponsors, Mr. LANTOS and Mr. SMITH, for their continued advocacy on this and look forward to continuing to work with you to try to resolve this situation, and I thank you again.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much and his work on behalf of his constituents.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

In closing, I want again to thank Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS for their tremendous support for this resolution and the underlying issue of trying to encourage intercountry adoption in a country, Romania, that has now, in a misguided fashion, turned their back on those children who could find loving, durable homes with the adoption option.

Let me also thank so many other people who were a part of this, but especially Maureen Walsh, who is our General Counsel for the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, for her extraordinary expertise and work on the issue and this resolution. We have had an ongoing process, contacting the highest levels of the government of Romania, from the President on down. It has been ongoing. It has been frequent.

Our hearing that BEN CARDIN and I put on last year I think brought all of these issues to the fore in a way that were very persuasive on the part of the pipeline families, as well as the issue itself. The intercountry adoption is a

loving, compassionate option, and certainly is far better than languishing in an orphanage somewhere where the child is warehoused.

Mr. Speaker, so we call upon the Romanian government again to reverse its position, to cease its mucking under Lady Nicholson's pressure, which is now going into reverse. The European Union, as I said before, is showing clear signs that it concludes it has made a profound mistake.

I want to thank Mr. CARDIN, who is our ranking member on the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, who has been working on these issues side by side.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 578 encouraging the nation of Romania to complete the processing of intercountry adoption cases that have already begun, and to amend its laws to decrease this and other barriers to adoption.

The statistics regarding abandoned children in Romania are shocking: 9,000 children are abandoned by Romania's maternity wards and pediatric hospitals every year; 37,000 remain in adoption institutions; and 49,000 more live in foster care or with their extended families. These children deserve every possible opportunity to be raised in loving, permanent families, and many such opportunities are available outside of their home nation. Romania's current laws are detrimental not only to these children, but to the American families that are ready and willing to welcome them into their homes.

Since June 2004, one of these children, Otilia Rotaru, has lived in Falls Church, Virginia with Scott and Lisa Lampman, two of my constituents. Otilia was born with a form of cerebral palsy known as Spastic Diplegia, preventing her from walking independently and causing her significant visual impairment in her right eye. She was abandoned by her biological parents soon after her birth in 1996, and was placed with a foster family who abandoned her in 2003.

Otilia received permission to come to the United States in 2004 for medical treatment, and after surgery and rehabilitation, she can now walk with the assistance of a walker. The Lampmans continue to provide love, physical care and financial support for Otilia, who attends 3rd grade at the local elementary school, has joined the local Brownie Troop, and is taking swimming lessons at the local pool.

Despite living in a loving, well adjusted home, the Lampmans' petition to adopt Otilia was rejected by the Romanian Government because their petition was filed after the appropriate deadline for international adoption. If returned to Romania, Otilia would be returned to an institution, with no family and no access to the medical treatment that will one day allow her to walk independently for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, we must give Otilia and the thousands of children like her the opportunity to grow up in a loving, caring, stable home, whether that home is in Romania or here in the United States. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H. Res. 578 and ask the Romanian Government to open their adoption laws and provide such opportunities to these children.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the thousands of children currently overflowing Romania's orphanages and hospitals, hopefully awaiting the chance to find a permanent home. Today there are over 1,000 pending adoption cases that have been left in limbo as a result of Romania's ban on inter-country adoptions. Right now, parents in the U.S. and EU are separated from their children, left wondering if they will ever be able to bring them home.

I have to admit I find it difficult to understand the rationale behind Romania's ban on inter-country adoptions. No one denies the importance and significant advantage permanency brings to a child's life. In fact, in its interpretation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in January 2004, UNICEF clarified the importance of permanent placement for children and its support for intercountry adoption. Yet, permanency for children is precisely what the Romanian government has taken away.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting this important and timely resolution. The United States stands with Romania's children. I hope our colleagues in the European Union will also assert their support for the welfare of Romanian children, and that the Romanian government will reconsider this oppressive ban and expedite the pending adoption cases.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have time to waste. These families should not have to wait any longer. I urge my colleagues to let the Romanian children know we stand with them, and pass H. Res. 578.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 578 concerning the Government of Romania's ban on intercountry adoptions and the welfare of orphaned or abandoned children in Romania and throughout the world. I would like to thank the Co-Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission), Representative CHRIS SMITH, for continuing to raise this issue of adoption as part of the Commission's human rights portfolio.

As the case in Romania has shown us, the barriers to adoption for children and families continue to be great. These barriers are cultural, political and often have deep roots in a community. While some of these barriers will continue to be difficult to cross, I believe others can be overcome succinctly as part of a continuing dialogue on child welfare between the United States and the European Union (EU) and nations such as Romania. In this particular case, I am saddened that one Member of the European Parliament can hold so much sway over a country on important child welfare issues and successfully play on the fears of a nation that is trying to become a participant in the enormous social and economic opportunities offered by the EU.

For signatories of the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption, including the United States, Romania and current Members of the EU, there is supposed to be a formal international and intergovernmental recognition of intercountry adoption. Intercountry adoption, as defined and treated by the Convention, is a means of offering the advantage of a permanent family to a child for whom a suitable family has not been found in the child's country of origin.

However, Romania turned from its obligations under the treaty when they enacted a law in 2004 effectively banning intercountry adoption and limiting any domestic adoption. Of course, it is in Romania's authority to enact such laws. But as Members of the United States Congress, acting in the best interests of our own children and as a Nation committed to fighting for all human dignity, we shall continue to advocate for the placement of children in permanent homes. Furthermore, as long as there are thousands of families in the U.S. wishing to adopt and to give a child a loving home that would otherwise not have one, I will continue to take every opportunity to explain to our counterparts abroad why this is such an important cause—for our children and for the health of our nations. There is simply no greater gift than a home and no greater support network than a family.

Meanwhile, there are currently 37,000 children in orphanages in Romania and an estimated 49,000 living in temporary arrangements, such as foster care. These numbers are staggering. This is an entire generation of young people who will not have the support of a parent to excel in school, the comfort of a family when sick or in need, and more fundamentally, the love and care essential to the development of a child.

It is not just Americans that advocate for lowering barriers to adoption. Citizens of several European countries and Israel had a number of pipeline adoption cases that were pending when the moratorium was instilled in 2001. The U.S. is also a sender country of American orphans, something that people often forget. Last December, the European Parliament voted unanimously on an amendment to their Report on the Extent of Romania 's Readiness for Accession to the European Union in favor of the completion of all the pending international adoption cases in Romania. Additionally, according to UNICEF:

> For children who cannot be raised by their own families, an appropriate alternative family environment should be sought in preference to institutional care which should be used only as a last resort and as a temporary measure, until the child can return to the family environment.

I am disheartened by the actions so far of Romania in failing to complete the pipeline adoption cases which would have resulted in placing over 1,000 orphans with permanent, loving homes abroad. I hope that as we face more of these challenges and political barriers down the road which directly impact children, we will work together to get past those barriers which are artificial.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by respectfully requesting that this body continue to engage in a dialogue with our allies and colleagues abroad on the importance of adoption, both domestic and international, as a preferable alternative to institutional care.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 578.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## CALLING ON VIETNAM TO IMMEDIATELY AND UNCONDITIONALLY RELEASE DR. PHAM HONG SON AND OTHER POLITICAL PRISONERS AND PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 320) calling on the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to immediately and unconditionally release Dr. Pham Hong Son and other political prisoners and prisoners of conscience, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 320

Whereas in March 2002, Dr. Pham Hong Son was arrested after he had translated an article entitled ''What is Democracy?'' from the Web site of the United States Embassy in Vietnam and sent it to both friends and senior party officials;

Whereas Dr. Son has written and published on the Internet articles entitled ''The Promotion of Democracy: A Key Focus in a New World Order'', ''Sovereignty and Human Rights: The Search for Reconciliation'', and ''Hopeful Signs for Democracy in Viet Nam'';

Whereas in none of his activities did Dr. Son advocate violence in his opposition to the Vietnamese Government or its policies;

Whereas Dr. Son has been arrested for the peaceful exercise of his fundamental rights to freedom of expression and association in violation of Article 69 of the Vietnamese Constitution which states: ''The citizen shall enjoy freedom of opinion and speech, freedom of the press, the right to be informed and the right to assemble, form associations and hold demonstrations in accordance with the provisions of the law'';

Whereas Dr. Son has been arrested, tried, convicted, and imprisoned in contravention of the rights enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) to which Vietnam is a state party, specifically Article 19 (freedom of expression) and Article 22 (freedom of association);

Whereas Dr. Son did not have a trial that would be considered fair and that met even the most basic standards of internationally accepted justice, in contravention of Article 14 (right to a fair trial) of the ICCPR;

Whereas Dr. Son was sentenced in June 2003, after a half-day closed trial in Hanoi, to 13 years of imprisonment and three years of house arrest on spurious espionage charges;

Whereas such spurious charges are routinely used to suppress peaceful democracy activists, as in the notorious cases of Father Thadeus Nguyen Van Ly, his two nephews and niece, and in the cases of Pham Que Duong, Tran Khue, and Tran Dung Tien;

Whereas Dr. Son's appeal was held on August 26, 2003, in a closed trial before Vietnam's Supreme Court, from which international observers and Western journalists were barred, although diplomats from more than eight countries gathered outside the courthouse during the trial to register their concern;

Whereas, although the Vietnamese Supreme Court upheld Dr. Son's sentence, it reduced the sentence of imprisonment from 13 to five years;

Whereas Dr. Son remains imprisoned in harsh conditions, including imprisonment for more than a year in solitary confinement, which have endangered his health;

Whereas Vietnam has imprisoned, detained, placed under house arrest, or otherwise restricted numerous other peaceful democratic and religious activists for reasons related to their political or religious views, such as Do Van My, Mai Thi Dung, Nguyen Thanh Phong, Nguyen Thi Ha, Nguyen Van Dien, Nguyen Vu Binh, Phan Van Ban, To Van Manh, Vo Van Buu, Vo Van Thanh Liem (Nam Liem), Bui Thien Hue, Nguyen Lap Ma, Nguyen Nhat Thong, Nguyen Van Ly, Phan Van Loi, Thich Dong Tho, Thich Huyen Quang, Thich Nguyen Ly, Thich Nguyen Vuong, Thich Phuoc An, Thich Quang Do, Thich Tam Lien, Thich Thai Hoa, Thich Thanh Huyen, Thich Tien Hanh, Thich Tue Sy, Thich Vien Dinh, Ngo Van Ninh, Le Van Chuong, Le Van Tinh, Phuong Van Kiem, Nguyen Van Si, Tran Van Thien, Thich Thien Tam, Hoang Chinh Minh, and Do Nam Hai (Phuong Nam);

Whereas Dr. Son and other political prisoners and prisoners of conscience have been deprived of their basic human rights by being denied their ability to exercise freedom of opinion and expression;

Whereas the arbitrary imprisonment and the violation of the human rights of citizens of Vietnam are sources of continuing, grave concern to Congress;

Whereas Vietnam continues to restrict access to Western diplomats, journalists, and humanitarian organizations to the Central Highlands and the Northwest Highlands, where there are credible reports that ethnic minorities suffer serious violations of their human and civil rights, including property rights, and ongoing restrictions on religious activities, including forced conversions;

Whereas there are continuing and well-founded concerns about forcibly repatriated Montagnard refugees, access to whom is restricted;

Whereas on December 1, 2005, the European Parliament adopted a resolution calling on the Vietnamese authorities, among other measures, to undertake political and institutional reforms leading to democracy and the rule of law, starting by allowing a multiparty system and guaranteeing the right of all currents of opinion to express their views;

Whereas the resolution further calls on Vietnamese authorities to end all forms of repression against members of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam and officially recognize its existence and that of other nonrecognized Churches in the country;

Whereas the resolution further calls on Vietnamese authorities to release all Vietnamese political prisoners and prisoners of conscience detained for having legitimately and peacefully exercised their rights to freedom of opinion, expression, the press, and religion;

Whereas the resolution further calls on Vietnamese authorities to guarantee full enjoyment of the fundamental rights enshrined in the Vietnamese Constitution and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in particular by allowing the creation of a genuinely free press; and

Whereas the resolution further calls on Vietnamese authorities to ensure the safe repatriation, under the Cambodia-Vietnam-UNHCR Agreement, of the Montagnards who fled Vietnam, and allow proper monitoring of the situation of the returnees by the UNHCR and international nongovernmental organizations: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) Congress—

(A) condemns and deplores the arbitrary detention of Dr. Pham Hong Son by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and calls for his immediate and unconditional release, and for the immediate and unconditional release of all other political prisoners;

(B) condemns and deplores the violations of freedom of speech, religion, movement, association, and the lack of due process afforded to individuals in Vietnam;

(C) strongly urges the Government of Vietnam to consider the implications of its actions for the broader relationship between the United States and Vietnam;

(D) urges the Government of Vietnam to allow unfettered access to the Central Highlands and to the Northwest Highlands by foreign diplomats, the international press, and nongovernmental organizations; and

(E) applauds the European Parliament for its resolution of December 1, 2005, regarding human rights in Vietnam, and urges the Government of Vietnam to comply with the terms of the resolution; and

(2) it is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(A) make the immediate release of Dr. Pham Hong Son a top concern;

(B) continue to urge the Government of Vietnam to comply with internationally recognized standards for basic freedoms and human rights;

(C) make clear to the Government of Vietnam that it must adhere to the rule of law and respect the freedom of the press in order to broaden its relations with the United States;

(D) make clear to the Government of Vietnam that the detention of Dr. Son and other persons and the infliction of human rights violations on these individuals are not in the interest of Vietnam because they create obstacles to improved bilateral relations and cooperation with the United States; and

(E) reiterate the deep concern of the United States regarding the continued imprisonment of Dr. Son and other persons whose human rights are being violated and discuss the legal status and immediate humanitarian needs of such individuals with the Government of Vietnam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present this bill to my colleagues today in defense of a man who has fought for democracy in Vietnam at great personal cost. There has been a tremendous amount of publicity lately about Internet dissidents in China. As a matter of fact, we had a day-long hearing on this use of the Internet to capture and to really decapitate the dissidents and religious freedom movements in China, in Vietnam and Belarus and in other countries, but we now focus on one particular man, as well as others who have suffered because of that, in the case of Dr. Pham Hong Son of Vietnam.

In March 2002, Mr. Speaker, police arrested Dr. Son. He had translated an article from the Web site of the U.S. Embassy Hanoi that was entitled, ''What is democracy?'' and he sent it to some of his friends and senior Vietnamese officials. In addition, he had

written an open letter, published on the Internet, protesting the fact that his house had been searched illegally and his computer and documents confiscated.

Dr. Son was charged with espionage by the government, which accused him of collecting and dispatching news and documents for a foreign country to be used against the Socialist State of Vietnam. Let us not forget who that foreign country is. It is us. It is the U.S. Embassy's Web site in Hanoi, and that is where he went to download that essay, ''What is democracy?''

After a closed trial and a closed appeal, from which Western reporters and diplomats from Europe, the United States and Canada were barred, Dr. Son was sentenced to 5 years, plus an additional 3 years of house arrest.

Dr. Son's case has been highlighted repeatedly by the U.S. Department of State's Human Rights Report for Vietnam and by Human Rights Watch, Reporters without Borders, the Committee to Protect Journalists, and Amnesty International.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Vietnam last year, accompanied by Eleanor Nagy, who is our Director of Policy on the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations, and met with some 60 dissidents in the course of the better part of a week in Hanoi, Hue and in Ho Chi Minh City. We met with Dr. Son's extraordinary and courageous wife, Vu Thuy Ha, who continues to campaign for her husband's freedom despite constant surveillance and harassment, which I personally witnessed. I knew that we could not let this brave woman battle alone.

As a matter of fact, when Eleanor and I, along with some people from the embassy, sat with his wife, right across from us at a hotel were some thugs from the secret police who were taking pictures of her and trying to intimidate her, which they have been doing day in and day out.

The State Department, to its credit, put Dr. Son at the head of their list of political prisoners who need to be released during the February Human Rights Dialogue with Vietnam. As Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Barry Lowenkron told the Vietnamese, and this is his quote, ''I bluntly told them that the American people will not understand why a country that wants to have better relations with us would imprison someone for translating an article on democracy.''

On Friday March 31, Vietnam flatly rejected Lowenkron's call to release Dr. Son and 20 other religious and political prisoners, saying it only jails criminals. In Vietnam, they said, there are no prisoners of conscience, and no one has been arrested for their viewpoints or their religion.

That is unmitigated nonsense and a big lie, Mr. Speaker, and that has to be confronted by this Congress.

Less than a day after the unanimous subcommittee markup of this resolution on December 9, plainclothes officers detained two other well-known Internet writers, Do Nam Hai, whom I met with in Vietnam and who is mentioned in our resolution. They were at a public Internet cafe. The police also forced Hai to open his personal e-mail account and printed about 30 of his sent messages.

□ 1215

The two writers were interrogated for 6 hours at the cafe and later at a police station in Hanoi. Both were released from police custody that day.

And the persecution continues, Mr. Speaker. On March 12, according to Reporters Without Borders, an Internet user calling himself ''Freedom For the Country,'' joined the discussion group ''Democracy and Freedom the Only Way for Vietnam.'' He went on-line in a Hanoi cyber cafe, and he discussed politics for about half an hour with two other people in the group. During the discussion, he said he was a member of a pro-democracy working group. The entire on-line conversation was recorded by the forum administrator, police entered the cyber cafe, and they arrested him.

On the recording, someone could be heard asking the Internet user to go with them, and then someone else shouting, hit him. The administrator continued recording after the police intervention, and no one came to disconnect the computer linked to Pal Talk. Afterwards, a man's voice is heard on the microphone introducing himself as the cyber cafe's owner and confirming that one of his customers had been taken away by the police. He added that he had been fined for violating Internet law. The Vietnamese denied the arrest, and the victim's identity is unknown. He joins three other cyber dissidents who were arrested in October and whose whereabouts remain unknown.

This sort of persecution, Mr. Speaker, will obviously not go away by itself. But tyranny hates and fears public exposure, and we need to keep attention focused on Vietnam's continuing violation of the rights that it claims to grant to its people.

Vietnam is at a critical crossroads. It wants to expand its burgeoning trade relations with the United States and seeks to join the WTO. There would be no better way to convince Vietnam of the seriousness of our human rights concerns and their centrality in any relation with the U.S. It seems to me you can't trust a country on intellectual property rights and copyright infringement if they jail, incarcerate, and beat their own people because they simply espouse basic fundamental human rights.

The European Parliament, I might add, has already passed a resolution calling for Vietnam to release all of its prisoners of conscience, allowing democracy and political pluralism and ensuring the human rights for Vietnam's Montagnards. It is appropriate that we do likewise and that we do it today.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would first like to commend my very good friend and distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, for introducing this important resolution and for his unique, dogged pursuit of Vietnamese human rights issues.

None of us here today should be under any illusions about the Vietnamese government. According to the State Department's Human Rights Report, the Vietnamese government is an unrepentant authoritarian regime, and true political opposition is not allowed. Freedom of expression does not exist in Vietnam, and Vietnamese are locked in prison for simply expressing political opinions.

In the case which is the focus of this resolution, the Vietnamese government has even imprisoned someone from translating into Vietnamese an article entitled ''What is Democracy,'' from the U.S. embassy Web site in Hanoi. It boggles the mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Vietnamese government is so fearful of dissent that it won't even allow citizens to discuss, let alone implement, meaningful democracy.

The Vietnamese government also places severe restrictions on the expression of religious beliefs, particularly upon Buddhists, who do not worship as part of the official church, and upon Christians in the Vietnamese highlands.

With the approval of the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement 5 years ago, the political security and economic relationship between the United States and Vietnam has become increasingly more complex, but we must continue to send a strong signal to Hanoi that the United States continues to make it a top priority to promote internationally recognized human rights everywhere, including Vietnam.

Passage of our resolution will indicate to the administration and to the government of Vietnam that we in Congress expect to see real progress on the human rights front in Vietnam, and that we have not forgotten those Vietnamese who are being persecuted for their beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this carefully crafted resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend and distinguished colleague from California, Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a dangerous man. In Vietnam, Dr. Pham Hong Son is considered a criminal, a man who must be silenced and incarcerated for the good of society.

Is Dr. Pham a violent man, a terrorist, perhaps? Does he advocate the

violent overthrow of his government? No, absolutely not. Dr. Pham is a dangerous man not because of his dangerous actions, but because of his dangerous ideas. Dr. Pham's great crime was to translate articles on democracy into Vietnamese and to write and publish his own articles about democracy and human rights in Vietnam.

Dr. Pham's case is typical of how the government of Vietnam deals with voices of peaceful and patriotic dissent. A case in point is a personal one for me. I was scheduled next week to go to Vietnam. I was interested in talking with their government about issues of human rights and religious freedom, issues that are very important to the people of Orange County, California. Unfortunately, I was informed last night that my visa application was denied by the Vietnamese government for the third time in 2 years, despite the fact that we have welcomed their dignitaries to the United States and that I was personally invited by Madam Ninh, the Vice Chair of the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the Vietnamese National Assembly.

Some of my colleagues continue to push for closer ties with Vietnam through trade relations and military partnerships and other forms of nonhumanitarian cooperation and assistance. We, as a Congress, will be asked in the coming months to decide on issues fundamental to the nature of our relationship with Vietnam. Supporting this concurrent resolution today is an important step in the right direction, but I would also ask my colleagues to keep Dr. Pham and others like him in our minds for the future.

Vietnam's actions against its own patriots demonstrate that they are not ready yet to be full partners with the United States. The United States must live by our own professed values, our true values, and we must do everything we can do to protect the human rights of the people of Vietnam.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague, my good friend from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LANTOS. Again, I express my appreciation to Mr. SMITH, and I express my appreciation to Congresswoman SANCHEZ, who has been a strong stalwart of vocalizing the inconsistencies with the image of Vietnam, a united country, and the reality.

And let me express my personal outrage that Members of Congress extend themselves to a foreign land to be able to be a fact-finder, to find out information, to share that with their constituents; that foreign governments who are welcomed into the United States would be so arrogant as to deny a visa so that information could be written.

I have a personal story, of course, which I did not mention previously in the same way of attempting to visit the Sudan and going through the normal channels and finding that visas would not be rendered. And they have done that to Members of Congress who are there doing the work of the American people. So to the Vietnamese government, we know what you are and what you are doing.

This is an important resolution that establishes the importance of human rights and dignity in Vietnam. Although the war is behind us, we realize that the Vietnamese people in the United States love democracy. They fled the country because they love democracy, but they want democracy for the existing Vietnam.

The plight of Dr. Pham and many, many others that are now being detained is a poor story, a poor assessment of the outright rejection of human rights and freedom of expression that should be the call of this Nation that claims that it wants to be part of the world human family. So I call upon this issue to be addressed not only by this resolution, which I enthusiastically support, and I thank the authors of this bill, but also for the United Nations to get in gear and get a grip.

The Human Rights Council, Mr. LANTOS, as you well know, has been revised just recently with some difficulty and opposition from the American government because it was a little less strong, if you will, a little less in great depth than we would have wanted it to be, where we could have prevented some of the more heinous actors against human rights from even being on this council. But it is a first step.

Now is the time for the United Nations, along with this resolution, to show itself truly committed to human rights. Do something about the Sudan. Do something about Vietnam. This is not to suggest that we don't want a thriving economy. For years, I voted against the Jackson amendment that deals with trade in Vietnam. Why? Not because I am against Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, but because I want human dignity and human rights.

So I rise in support of this resolution, H. Con. Res. 320, but I am asking that as we put forward this resolution, that institutions that deal with human rights wake up and smell the coffee or the tea and begin to address these questions in a forthright way.

And let me close by simply saying that there is a whole mountain of people that are being detained and their human rights violated. Can we suffer this indignity? I ask that this resolution be supported, and I ask the United Nations to do its job.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would close by especially thanking Dennis Curry, Eleanor Nagy, and Dan Freeman, our staff who have worked so hard on this resolution. The hearing that we held recently was a very insightful hearing that focused on the ongoing and persistent violations of fundamental human rights in Vietnam. Last year, right before Prime Minister Khai came to the United States, we held another Vietnam human rights hearing, and it was very telling.

We can't reduce human rights to an asterisk or a ''see page 3'' footnote in our relationship with the government of Vietnam. I would urge every Member, when and if they travel to Vietnam, that they prepare themselves by really understanding the nature of this government. Yes, there may be some modest progress being made in the area of religious freedom, and I underscore the word ''modest,'' but they still are a country of particular concern, so designated by the Department of State because of their egregious violations of religious freedom and the persecution of people, whether they be members of the Montagnards, the Evangelical Christians, or the Unified Buddhist Church, people like the Venerable Thich Quang Do, whom I met with.

Let me say finally that I met with the Venerable Thich Quang Do in his pagoda, as he is under house arrest. When we began to leave, all of a sudden he stopped, and he said, ''I take one step beyond this and the guys across the street will have me in handcuffs.'' That is the reality of what is going on in Vietnam today. I would hope Members, before they go to Hanoi or Ho Chi Minh City, acquaint themselves very thoroughly with the human rights abuses the Vietnamese commit and raise those issues, particularly as it relates to trade.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 320, calling on the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to immediately and unconditionally release Dr. Pham Hong Son and other political prisoners and prisoners of conscience.

The Vietnamese people have endured extensive struggles for many years in their ongoing fight for basic human rights and freedom.

As a member of the Vietnam Caucus, I am dedicated to promoting awareness and policy debates among the U.S. Congress, the American public, and the international community about the greater need for fundamental human rights in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

I would like to voice my support for H. Con. Res. 320, as it calls for the immediate release of Dr. Pham Hong Son and other political prisoners of conscience.

In March 2002, Dr. Pham was arrested after he had translated an article entitled "What is Democracy?" from the Web site of the United States Embassy in Vietnam and sent it to both friends and senior party officials. On August 26, 2003, the Vietnamese Supreme Court sentenced Dr. Pham to 5 years in prison, to be followed by 6 years of house arrest.

The arrests of Dr. Pham, along with many others, demonstrate the ongoing human rights abuses and lack of religious freedom in Vietnam. We must continue to bring attention to

these issues, generate pressure on Vietnamese officials, and hold the Vietnamese government accountable.

I am hopeful H. Con. Res. 320 will serve as a small stepping-stone towards the ultimate liberation and freedom of the Vietnamese people, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 320, a resolution that calls for the release of Dr. Pham Hong Son and other political prisoners and prisoners of conscience in Vietnam.

Dr. Pham was imprisoned in 2002 for the simple act of translating a document posted on the U.S. Embassy's website entitled, ''What is Democracy?'' He has tirelessly worked in non-violent ways to promote democracy and freedom of speech, expression, and association in Vietnam.

But Dr. Pham is not alone. Thousands of peaceful activists have been harassed, imprisoned, or been placed under house arrest for calling for basic human rights in Vietnam. The State Department, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, Amnesty International, the Committee to Protect Journalists, and various Vietnamese-American groups have documented egregious violations of religious freedom, human rights, and free speech in the country.

For the past two years, the State Department has designated Vietnam a ''country of particular concern'' which means Vietnam has been engaged in systematic, ongoing, egregious violations of religious freedom. In company with Vietnam are such human rights violators as Sudan, Burma, China, Iran, and North Korea.

In its 2005 report, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom states, ''the government of Vietnam continues to commit systematic and egregious violations of religious freedom by harassing, detaining, imprisoning, and discriminating against leaders and practitioners from all of Vietnam's religious communities. Religious freedom conditions in Vietnam remain poor, and the overall human rights situation has deteriorated in the past two years.''

The Committee to Protect Journalists says, ''Press conditions in Vietnam largely stagnated in 2005, despite efforts by the country's leaders to project an image of greater openness. Three writers remained imprisoned on anti-state charges for material distributed online; print and broadcast media continued to work under the supervision of the government; and attacks on journalists were common.''

For the past year, Vietnam has sought a new relationship with the United States. Prime Minister Phan Van Khai and several other high-level members of the Vietnamese government visited the U.S. in 2005. But if the Vietnamese government expects to cultivate this new relationship, it must start by respecting basic human rights of all citizens of Vietnam.

I hope this Congress will show strong support for change in Vietnam by unanimously passing House Concurrent Resolution 320 today.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 320 which calls for the immediate and unconditional release of Dr. Pham Hong Son and other political prisoners in Vietnam. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has been holding prisoners because of their exercise of basic human rights including freedom of speech, religion, movement, and association.

Dr. Pham Hong Son was indicted and imprisoned for translating an article on the Web site of the U.S. Embassy in Vietnam entitled ''What is Democracy?'' and circulating the article among friends and senior party officials. He was subsequently sentenced to 13 years imprisonment and 3 years of house arrest on espionage charges after a half-day closed trial that deprived him of due process. The Vietnamese Constitution and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), of which Vietnam is a state party, both protect the rights to freedom of opinion and speech. The government of Vietnam should uphold their obligations under the ICCPR and honor other internationally recognized standards for basic freedoms and human rights before their accession into the World Trade Organization.

The fall of the Republic of Vietnam displaced approximately three million Vietnamese. My late husband Ricardo J. Bordallo was Governor of Guam at the time of Operation New Life. I vividly remember how the Guam community came together in solidarity with the Vietnamese people and worked hard to help comfort these brave individuals who had left all their worldly possessions behind in the name of freedom. The people of Guam empathized with the Vietnamese refugees, and we opened our hearts as well as our island to them. One of my assignments as First Lady was to organize the care for the hundreds of orphan babies that arrived in Operation Baby Lift. This was a moving experience that has remained one of my fondest memories of my husband's first term as Governor of Guam.

Of the 150,000 Vietnamese who arrived on Guam in April 1975, many decided to return to Vietnam to help rebuild their motherland. Unfortunately, those who remained in Vietnam now face a Socialist government that denies them basic human rights of freedom of speech, religion, movement, and association. They deserve the right to a fair trial and due process.

Today, Congress calls on Vietnamese authorities to end all forms of repression against small religious sects and for the release of all Vietnamese political prisoners who have legitimately and peacefully exercised their rights. I urge passage of H. Con. Res. 320.

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

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

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 320, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT SAUDI ARABIA SHOULD FULLY LIVE UP TO WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION COMMITMENTS AND END BOYCOTT ON ISRAEL

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 370) expressing the sense of the Congress that Saudi Arabia should fully live up to its World Trade Organization commitments and end all aspects of any boycott on Israel.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 370

Whereas the United States supported the accession of Saudi Arabia to the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2005;

Whereas, as part of the working party report for the accession of Saudia Arabia to the WTO, Saudi Arabia reiterated its commitment to terminate the secondary and tertiary boycotts on Israel;

Whereas Saudi Arabia also committed not to discriminate against any WTO members and specifically did not invoke the non-application provisions of the WTO Agreement, and thus has rights and obligations to all WTO members, including Israel;

Whereas, in spite of these commitments to WTO members and United States officials, press reports indicate that an official of the Government of Saudi Arabia has stated that Saudi Arabia has not committed to ending the primary boycott on Israel, which would violate Saudi Arabia's WTO obligations toward Israel;

Whereas United States Trade Represenative Portman has testified to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives that Saudi Arabia's application of the boycott is a ''big concern'' of the United States; that Saudi Arabia did not invoke non-application of WTO commitments to Israel, so that Saudi Arabia is required to provide nondiscriminatory treatment to Israel; and that the United States Trade Representative has received assurances from Saudi Arabia that it will abide by its WTO commitments; and

Whereas the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) scheduled its ''Ninth Meeting of the Liaison Officers of Islamic Regional Officers for the Boycott of Israel'' for the week of March 13, 2006, at the OIC's headquarters in Saudi Arabia: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) Saudi Arabia should maintain and fully live up to its commitments under the World Trade Organization (WTO) and end all aspects of any boycott on Israel; and

(2) the President, the United States Trade Representative, and the Secretary of State—

(A) should continue their active involvement on this issue by strongly urging the Government of Saudi Arabia to comply with its WTO obligations; and

(B) should urge Saudi Arabia to end any boycott on Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

I am delighted to introduce this resolution and support it, which has also the support of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and I believe probably is one of the best bipartisan resolutions to come before this Congress in a while.

This resolution would express the sense of the Congress that Saudi Arabia should fully live up to its World Trade Organization commitments and end all aspects of any boycott on Israel.

In 2005, the United States supported the accession of Saudi Arabia to the World Trade Organization. During this process, Saudi Arabia reiterated its commitment to terminate the secondary and tertiary boycotts on Israel.

Additionally, it committed not to discriminate against any World Trade Organization members; and specifically, it did not invoke the nonapplication provision of the World Trade Organization agreement. Because of this, Saudi Arabia has rights and obligation to all the World Trade Organization members, including Israel. Given this, we should not have to be here today debating this resolution on the floor of the House.

Instead, today Members should be able to praise Saudi Arabia for its forward thinking and its upcoming expanded role in the global economy. Unfortunately, though, many of my colleagues and I have read press reports that an official of the government of Saudi Arabia has stated that Saudi Arabia has not committed to ending the primary boycott on Israel. This would be a clear violation of its World Trade Organization commitments to Israel.

I am pleased that when United States Trade Representative Rob Portman testified before the Ways and Means Committee he stated that Saudi Arabia's application of the boycott is a big concern of the United States. He also reiterated that Saudi Arabia is required to provide nondiscriminatory treatment to Israel. I appreciate Ambassador Portman's efforts in this area.

This resolution would provide further support for the stated position of the USTR by establishing that it is the sense of the Congress that Saudi Arabia should maintain and fully live up to its commitments under the World Trade Organization and end all aspects of any boycott on Israel. It also urges the President, the U.S. Trade Representative and the Secretary of State to continue their efforts to ensure that this is exactly what happens. I ask my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) in introducing this resolution we are considering today. As Mr. SHAW pointed out, last year the United States negotiated a bilateral trade agreement with Saudi Arabia which paved its admission into the WTO in December.

A key commitment as part of the United States' agreement with the Saudis was that they would not have any further boycott with Israel, either primary or secondary. It was also clear that they would not invoke the nonapplication provision of the WTO agreement, meaning that it agreed it would treat all WTO members, including Israel, equally.

Yes, the primary responsibility was to eliminate the secondary boycott; but in not invoking the nonapplication provision, it agreed to treat all WTO countries equally, including Israel. This was a key commitment for the United States' approval of an agreement that paved the way for the Saudis entering the WTO.

Unfortunately, the Saudis' action in recent months appears to fly in the face of that commitment. In December, Saudi officials were quoted in the press as insisting that Saudi Arabia would continue its participation in the primary boycott against Israel which prohibits imports of Israeli goods. Saudi Arabia's continued participation in the boycott conflicts directly with the country's commitment as a WTO member to treat all nations in a nondiscriminatory manner.

What is even more disturbing is that Saudi Arabia has not only continued to participate in the boycott, but Saudi Arabia has helped to promote it. In March, Saudi Arabia hosted a meeting of the Organization of Islamic Conference, an international organization with 57 member countries. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss strengthening the Arab League boycott against Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the United States must not stand silently while the Saudis disregard the commitments that it made to us and the WTO to treat all countries equally. We must insist that the Saudis live up to their commitments.

I urge President Bush, the U.S. Trade Representative and all members of the administration to call upon the Saudis to adhere to the commitments that they made to us, that they made to the WTO. It is time for them to end their boycott against Israel, not just the secondary but the primary boycott. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Saudi Arabia should end its economic boycott of Israel. I want to personally thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and my very good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), for introducing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, no one is born knowing how to hate. Hate needs to be taught. The Saudi Kingdom, our so-called partner in peace and ally in the fight against terrorism, has turned teaching hatred into a perverted science and a twisted art form.

Last year the Bush administration supported Saudi Arabia's accession to the World Trade Organization. As a condition of joining the WTO, the Saudis agreed to end all boycotts of Israel. Their Foreign Minister repeated this pledge to our Secretary of State. Israel is our strongest ally in the Middle East. This boycott has hurt Israel's economy since its founding in 1948. The Israeli Chamber of Commerce estimates that Israeli exports are 10 percent less than they would be without the boycott; investment in Israel, 10 percent lower.

It is no surprise to me that the Saudis have not honored their commitment to end the boycott. The reasons to me are painfully apparent: anti-Semitism and a hatred for Israel. Saudi Arabia continues to be one of the few nations to participate in the boycott when many of its neighbors have given up. In 1990, Egypt was the first nation to abandon the boycott. Jordan followed in 1995. The Palestinian Authority dropped the boycott in 1995 as well. In 1994, several of the gulf states abandoned their secondary and tertiary boycotts. In 2005, just last year, Bahrain announced it was completely withdrawing from the boycott.

The Saudi government has repeatedly said that Saudi Arabia is not anti-Semitic. Oh, really, Mr. Speaker. These are the same Saudis that support terrorism, export terrorism, finance terrorism, the same Saudis that spew racist and anti-Semitic hatred, and the same Saudis that have the worst record on the planet when it comes to religious intolerance and discrimination.

The Saudis say they share our values. Exactly what values do they think they share with the United States? They do not value a hate-free education for their children. Saudi schoolbooks paint an ugly, distorted portrait of a world in which Israel does not exist. The 9/11 attacks were perpetrated by so-called Zionist conspiracies, and the anti-Semitic and fictitious ''Protocols of the Elders of Zion'' is taught as actual history. These schoolbooks are the official publications of the education ministry.

They do not value religious freedom and pluralism. Saudi Arabia bans all religions except Islam. Saudi Arabia's religious beliefs have even gone so far as banning the Barbie doll, calling them Jewish toys that are offensive to Islam.

They couldn't value honesty because last year the Saudi Crown Prince told Saudi television that ''Zionists'' were behind the attack at the oil facility in Yanbu. The Crown Prince also is

quoted as saying, ''Our country is targeted. You know who is behind all of this. It is Zionism.'' That is dishonest. That is a lie, Mr. Speaker.

The United States Congress, by voting for this resolution, can take a strong stand against this type of religious and racial intolerance. Congress can take a strong stand on behalf of a fellow democracy and our most reliable ally in the Middle East. And Congress can take a strong stand to demand that the Saudis live up to their obligations and promises, the ones they made in order to get into the WTO with American support.

I urge the Saudis to fulfill their international obligations and promises by ending the Israeli boycott. I urge immediate passage of this resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 370 expressing the sense of Congress that Saudi Arabia should fully live up to its World Trade Organization commitments and end all aspects of any boycott on Israel.

I take this position because I believe that as we continue to move towards resolution of problems and towards peaceful resolution of difficulty, we have to begin someplace. I am often reminded of something that John Kennedy supposedly said, and that is that peace is not found only in treaties, covenants and charters, but in the hearts of men, and I imagine if he was around today he would say men and women.

I think that resolution of this boycott would move positively in the direction of peace in the Middle East, and so I strongly support this resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just say that this is an important resolution because I think all of us believe that for peace in the Middle East it is important to open up economic opportunity within the entire region. This administration has put a priority on moving forward with free trade agreements in the Middle East with the support of both Democrats and Republicans. Because we do believe in commerce, there is an opportunity for better understanding in that region of the world.

We have concluded free trade agreements with other countries and we have made it clear that the boycott against Israel must be eliminated. Not only eliminated, but the country must reach out so there is full participation among all of the countries of the region so they all can benefit economically from commerce within that region.

Saudi Arabia is a major country in the Middle East. They need to exercise leadership in the Middle East. And in doing that, they must join us in our fight against terror and our fight against terrorism. They also must join us in making it clear that all countries in the Middle East need to be included in economics and commerce. They need to eliminate their boycott against Israel.

We thought we had an understanding when we entered into an agreement that led to their accession into the WTO. Clearly the Saudis are not living up to that commitment. I think it is extremely important that this country make it clear that we cannot tolerate that type of conduct by the Saudis. It is time for them to end their boycott against Israel and exercise leadership in the Middle East so we can move forward with peace in the Middle East. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

□ 1245

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is important beyond just the pages of the resolution itself. It is important as to the future of world trade. Are we as a member of the World Trade Organization, are we going to support the values, the obligations that we have and that other nations have to other nations within the World Trade Organization?

We pride ourselves as being a government of laws. This means that we have to adhere to our own laws. And also it goes beyond that. We have to adhere to our obligations. And our trading partners should also be required to do so.

But this particular one, pinpointing this boycott of Israel, is particularly important because through free trade comes understanding. It comes the free flow of goods. It also brings about the free flow of ideas which brings about understanding, which brings about world peace. This is the pathway to world peace, and there is no place it is needed more than it is in the Middle East. And our good friend Israel needs help with regard to getting along with its neighbors. And this is a good step forward.

So I would ask all Members to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I commend my good friends Mr. SHAW and Mr. CARDIN for introducing this timely and very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, after a years-long quest, Saudi Arabia finally acceded to membership in the World Trade Organization late last year.

Unfortunately, the Saudis acceded in letter only—and in a spirit utterly contrary to the principles of free trade embodied by that organization. Moreover, it now appears that Saudi Arabia, having gained accession, has absolutely no intention of implementing even the letter of WTO rules.

As Saudi Arabia has now made clear in the aftermath of its accession, it has absolutely no intention of ending its boycott of trade with Israel. This is a direct violation of Saudi Arabia's WTO obligations to Israel.

Earlier this month, as if to underscore its disregard for the WTO rules to which it is formally committed, Saudi Arabia hosted a conference called ''Ninth Meeting of the Liaison Officers of Islamic Regional Officers for the Boycott of Israel.''

Mr. Speaker, there is indeed a mechanism by which a WTO member-state can invoke an exception regarding its commitments to another member-state, but Saudi Arabia did not invoke that exception regarding Israel. And it doesn't take a genius to figure out why: The ruling royals no doubt thought that, if they invoked that exception, the U.S. Congress would persuade the Administration to veto their accession to the WTO.

So they deceitfully and cynically deceived us into thinking that they had taken a dramatic decision to open trade ties with Israel, all the while planning to continue their boycott unabated.

Clearly, USTR thought they had an agreement for an end to the boycott. After signing off on Saudi accession in September last year, USTR boasted that Saudi membership in the WTO meant that—and I quote from a USTR press release—''Saudi Arabia is legally obligated to provide most-favored nation treatment to all WTO members, including Israel. Any government sanctioned activity on the Boycott would be a violation of Saudi Arabia's obligations and subject to dispute settlement. This legal obligation cannot be changed.''

So the Saudis not only deceived the U.S. Congress; they have embarrassed the U.S. Trade Representative and left themselves open to dispute settlement mechanisms.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. helped shepherd Saudi Arabia into the WTO. We have a right to expect the Saudis to obey its rules. Most of all, we have a right to expect them to honor their commitments to us.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has many issues of concern regarding Saudi Arabia—including lack of human rights, a benighted educational system, and ongoing support for extremist madrasas around the world. Nevertheless, this body has every right to expect that the Administration will place an extremely high priority on persuading the Saudis to fulfill their pledges as WTO members, particularly regarding trade with Israel.

The Saudis, we now see, entered the WTO under false premises. They must put this situation aright once and for all. They must end their boycott of Israel without delay, and the Administration should not let Saudi rulers have a moment's rest until they comply.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, after 12 years of difficult negotiation, Saudi Arabia joined the World Trade Organization last November. This was good news—the Saudi government has the potential to further join the world community as a responsible actor on the world stage, and the Saudi economy is a large one that will benefit from international trade, as will the U.S. in turn from increased commerce with the Arab nation. However, the Saudis are yet again missing a unique opportunity to reform, blinded by an irrational hatred of their neighbor, Israel.

This is part of a larger fabric of unacceptable behavior on the part of Saudi Arabia, which seeks greater ties with the West while maintaining its autocratic and anti-democratic policies. State-sponsored Saudi TV regularly broadcasts not just anti-Israeli diatribes, but

anti-American propaganda as well, further encouraging the attitudes that lead to terrorism. The fact that Saudi nationals continue to significantly fund international terrorism, as reported this week by the U.S. Treasury Department, means that Saudis have a long way to go to match their anti-terror rhetoric with their actions. As I have in the past, I once again call on Saudi leader Prince Faisal to take responsibility for his government's actions which promote hatred and the repercussions it has on Saudi Arabia's relations with other countries.

As President Carter said in 1977, the Israeli boycott "goes to the heart of free trade among nations," and is clearly unacceptable from a member of the World Trade Organization. This boycott, in place since the founding of Israel in 1945, has no place in the modern, globalized world. Recognizing this, several Gulf States are withdrawing from the boycott, and gaining both political and economic benefits. In the face of these events, Saudi Arabia's recalcitrance is all the more puzzling.

Mr. Speaker, Saudi Arabia has reportedly agreed to end the secondary and tertiary aspects of the anti-Israeli boycott, but is stopping short of allowing direct trade with its neighbor. Such half-measures are clearly not acceptable. All World Trade Organization members must treat all other members equally. According to diplomats, Saudi Arabia affirmed this principle with respect to Israel before being admitted to the WTO. Today's resolution expresses the sense of Congress that Saudi Arabia must live up to its commitments as a member of the World Trade Organization and end its boycott against Israel. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 370, a resolution that calls on Saudi Arabia to end its boycott of Israel.

In 2005, Saudi Arabia pledged to the United States that it would end its boycott of Israel as part of its accession to the World Trade Organization. Foreign Minister Saud al-Faisal assured Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice that Saudi Arabia would follow all WTO rules, including the anti-boycott provisions and specifically pledged to dismantle the secondary and tertiary elements of the boycott against Israel during negotiations for WTO accession. However, shortly after joining the WTO in December, a Saudi official stated unequivocally that the boycott would be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, this blatant disregard for the terms of agreement must be addressed. We must force an end to the Saudi boycott on Israel which has been going on far too long.

I have been fighting the Israel boycott since I came to Congress. In 1993, I introduced H.R. 1407, the Arab Boycott Arm Sales Prohibition Act, a version of which was signed into law in September 1993. Thirteen years ago we talked about the harm the Arab boycott was causing—that it is a blatantly discriminatory practice which is contrary to free trade. It is now 2006 and we are still trying to end the boycott.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Administration to continue to take a strong position against the Saudi boycott on Israel. It undermines our efforts in the Middle East to bring peace, stability and prosperity and it runs contrary to the obligations of membership in the WTO.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 370.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MAYOR JOHN THOMPSON "TOM" GARRISON MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4688) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Boyden Street in Badin, North Carolina, as the "Mayor John Thompson 'Tom' Garrison Memorial Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4688

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

**SECTION 1. MAYOR JOHN THOMPSON "TOM" GARRISON MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Boyden Street in Badin, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "Mayor John Thompson 'Tom' Garrison Memorial Post Office".

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4688 offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES). This bill would designate the postal facility in Badin, North Carolina, as the "Mayor John Thompson 'Tom' Garrison Memorial Post Office."

Tom Garrison was born on May 25, 1925. He was educated at Badin High School and completed his postgraduate work at Staunton Military Academy. In September of 1943, Mr. Garrison entered the Army and played an active role in the European Theater of Operations for 22 months. He received a battlefield commission and was decorated with the Silver Star and other honors.

After returning home, Mr. Garrison married and graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He also served stateside in the Korean conflict and retired after 20 years with the North Carolina National Guard. With the conclusion of his military career, Tom Garrison became an active member in his community of Badin, serving as the town's mayor for over 10 years. He was also a member of the First Baptist Church, in which he served in many capacities, as well as being involved in the Rotary Club, the Troop Committee of Boy Scout Troop 82, and a member of the board of the Badin Museum and the Better Badin Committee.

I urge all members to come together to honor a man that promoted excellence in government and community by passing H.R. 4688.

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, as a member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 4688, legislation naming a postal facility in Badin, North Carolina after the late John Thompson Garrison. This measure, which was introduced by Representative ROBIN HAYES on February 1, 2006 and unanimously reported by our committee on March 9, 2006, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire North Carolina delegation.

Tom Garrison was born and raised in Badin. He served in the U.S. Army in World War II and returned to his hometown to settle into the insurance and real estate business. Active in his church, community and numerous local civic organizations, Tom served as mayor of Badin from 1990 until his death last year at the age of 80.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to recognize Mayor Tom Garrison and honor his memory in this manner.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) for yielding the time. And I want to thank my good friend, DANNY DAVIS, for his kind and most appropriate words about this outstanding and honorable gentleman, Mr. John T. Garrison, Sr.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4688 honors Mayor John T. Garrison, Sr., a good friend and wonderful leader known to his friends and family as simply Tom. Tom served as mayor of Badin from the town's incorporation in 1990 until his passing last October. Tom's 15 years of honorable service as mayor of Badin represented merely a small fraction of his career in public service.

Whether it was in the European theater in the Army during World War II where he distinguished himself among his peers earning a battlefield commission and numerous commendations including a Silver Star, or working with volunteer organizations in Stanley County, including among others, an active member of the Committee of Boy Scout Troop 82, serving as president of his local Rotary Chapter in Albemarle, or serving on the Badin Museum and Better Badin Committee, Tom never hesitated to selflessly give his time and talents to causes that bettered his community.

We can all look at these accomplishments and know he had lived a full and complete life. In addition to Tom's impressive record of public service, he was a successful professional in real estate and insurance.

Most important in Tom's life was his family. He was married to his wife, Anne, until her passing, and together they raised three children, Ellen, John, Jr., and Lenora.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Garrison embodies the great American pride and spirit we all desire. He worked tirelessly with his twin brother, Jim, who was very active in State and local politics in efforts to create hope, opportunity and prosperity for the people in the region, the State and the country.

I am proud to call Tom a friend and am grateful I had the opportunity to have him also as a neighbor. Tom, like many other champions around the Nation, did not seek public accolades for his efforts. He simply wanted to make the lives of the people in his community the best they could be. The current mayor of Badin, Jim Harrison, put it well when he said, ''Tom was one who could build you up, and no matter how small the task or responsibility, he would make you feel very good about yourself and your importance to the Badin community. It was one of this life's many blessings to have known Tom Garrison.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in saluting this dedicated and honorable man by passing H.R. 4688.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4688. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4688.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 737) supporting the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 737

Whereas personal financial literacy is essential to ensure that individuals are prepared to manage money, credit, and debt, and become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens;

Whereas a 2004 survey completed by the National Council on Economic Education found that the number of States that include personal finance in education standards for students in kindergarten through high school has improved since 2002 but still falls below 2000 levels;

Whereas a study completed in 2004 by the Jump$tart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy found that high school seniors know less about principles of basic personal finance than did high school seniors 7 years earlier;

Whereas 55 percent of college students acquire their first credit card during their first year in college, and 92 percent of college students acquire at least 1 credit card by their second year in college, yet only 26 percent of people between the ages of 13 and 21 reported that their parents actively taught them how to manage money;

Whereas studies show that as many as 10 million households in the United States are ''unbanked'' or are without access to mainstream bank products and services;

Whereas personal savings as a percentage of personal income decreased from 7.5 percent in the early 1980s to –0.2 percent in the last quarter of 2005;

Whereas, although more than 42 million people in the United States participate in qualified cash or deferred arrangements described in section 401(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (commonly referred to as ''401(k) plans''), a Retirement Confidence Survey conducted in 2004 found that only 42 percent of workers surveyed have calculated how much money they will need to save for retirement and 37 percent of workers say that they are not currently saving for retirement;

Whereas personal financial management skills and lifelong habits develop during childhood;

Whereas financial literacy has been linked to lower delinquency rates for mortgage borrowers, higher participation and contribution rates in retirement plans, improved spending and saving habits, higher net worth, and positive knowledge, attitude, and behavior changes;

Whereas expanding access to the mainstream financial system provides individuals with lower-cost and safer options for managing finances and building wealth and is likely to lead to increased economic activity and growth;

Whereas a credit report and credit score can impact an individual's ability to, for example, obtain a job, insurance, or housing, and a March 2005, report by the Comptroller General entitled ''Credit Reporting Literacy'' found that ''educational efforts could potentially increase consumers' understanding of the credit reporting process'' and those ''efforts should target those areas in which consumers' knowledge was weakest and those subpopulations that did not score as well on GAO's survey,'' including those with ''less education, lower incomes, and less experience obtaining credit'';

Whereas public, consumer, community-based, and private sector organizations throughout the United States are working to increase financial literacy rates for Americans of all ages and walks of life through a range of outreach efforts, including media campaigns, websites, and one-on-one counseling for individuals;

Whereas Congress sought to implement a national strategy for coordination of Federal financial literacy efforts through the establishment of the Financial Literacy and Education Commission (FLEC) in 2003, the designation of the Office of Financial Education of the Department of the Treasury to provide support for the Commission, and requirements that the Commission's materials, website, toll-free hotline, annual report, and national multimedia campaign be multilingual;

Whereas Members of the United States House of Representatives established the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus (FELC) in February 2005 to (1) provide a forum for interested Members of Congress to work in collaboration with the Financial Literacy and Education Commission, (2) highlight public and private sector best-practices, and (3) organize and promote financial literacy legislation, seminars, and events, such as Financial Literacy Month in April 2006 and the annual Financial Literacy Day fair on April 25, 2006; and

Whereas the National Council on Economic Education, its State Councils and Centers for Economic Education, the Jump$tart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy, its State affiliates, and its partner organizations, and Junior Achievement have designated April as Financial Literacy Month to educate the public about the need for increased financial literacy for youth and adults in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month, including raising public awareness about the importance of financial education in the United States and the serious consequences that may result from a lack of understanding about personal finances; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities with the goal of increasing financial literacy rates for individuals of all ages and walks of life.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that always 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 gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 737 offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT). This resolution would support the goals and ideals of a Financial Literacy Month.

According to the Associated Press, personal bankruptcies have nearly doubled in the past decade, even though modern technological advances have made it easier and more convenient for us to manage our money through online services at most banks and credit unions. Every day, people of all ages face choices that will affect their financial future. It is important that we raise awareness about how these choices will affect financial health. These decisions we make today will affect how we buy houses, finance education, start businesses, save for retirement and meet our everyday needs in the future.

More than 42 million people in the United States currently participate in qualified cash or deferred arrangements known as 401(k) plans. A Retirement Confidence Survey conducted in 2002 found that only 32 percent of workers surveyed have calculated how much money they will need to save for retirement, and 25 percent of those workers have not started planning for their retirement at all. The goal of this resolution is to increase the awareness of the significance of thoughtful and well-planned personal financial management so that retirement can be an enjoyable time. It can be an overwhelming time for people of any age to manage money, but learning simple financial principles can help protect you against any financial pitfall that might occur.

I ask all Members to join me in supporting House Resolution 737 in the hopes that we can educate young and old about the importance of financial literacy.

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 principal cosponsor of this resolution, Representative RUBÉN HINOJOSA.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 737 that the gentlewoman from Illinois, Congresswoman BIGGERT, and I introduced earlier this year. The legislation supports the ideals and goals of Financial Literacy Month, which falls in April of each year.

Before I proceed, I want to take this opportunity to thank my good friend and colleague, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, the ranking member on the Government Reform Federal Workforce Subcommittee, and especially Tania Shand of the minority staff for helping expedite committee consideration of our bill.

I also want to thank Congressman WESTMORELAND for managing time on this bill.

My colleague and friend from Illinois, Congressman DAVIS, has always been a strong supporter of economic education and financial literacy, and I want to thank him for managing the bill today for our side of the aisle.

Mrs. BIGGERT and I have also worked closely on financial literacy issues with House Rules Chairman DAVID DREIER over the years. I think all of us owe him and Vince Erse, on his staff, a great deal of gratitude for being one of the first Members of Congress to bring attention to the need to improve financial literacy rates here in the United States.

□ 1300

Every day consumers deal with money, from balancing a checking account to shopping for a mortgage or auto loan, researching ways to pay for a college education, checking credit card statements, saving money for retirement, understanding a credit report, or simply deciding whether to pay cash or charge a purchase. The list goes on and on. But many consumers do not really understand their finances.

In 2004 reports from Jump$tart and the National Counsel on Economic Education, the Schwab Foundation and others indicated that almost 66 percent of high school students failed a basic financial literacy exam. The numbers are not much better for adults. High bankruptcy rates, increased credit card debt, data security breaches, and identity theft make it imperative that all of us take an active role in providing financial and economic education during all stages of one's life.

On February 15, 2005, I co-founded, and currently co-chair, the Congressional Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus with Congresswoman BIGGERT. The caucus seeks to address these issues head on by increasing public awareness of poor financial literacy rates and will work to improve those rates. The caucus has provided a forum for my colleagues to promote policies that advance financial literacy and economic education.

It is my hope that through the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus we can continue to further educate Americans about financial and economic topics ranging from the importance of saving, reducing credit card debt, obtaining a free annual credit report, and taking care of your finances to lead you down the path to the American dream of homeownership.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD letters in support of this resolution. They include a letter from the Financial Planning Association, the Independent Bankers Association of Texas, the Credit Union National Association, from MasterCard, from the Networks Financial Institute, as well as from the North American Securities Administrators Association. And then it includes a press release from the Independent Community Bankers of America.

NORTH AMERICAN SECURITIES ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
*Washington, DC, April 5, 2006.*

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BIGGERT AND CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: On behalf of NASAA I thank you for introducing H. Res. 737, which supports the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month. As the Resolution details, the need for financial education in the United States has never been greater. With a majority of Americans investing in our capital markets, there is a growing obligation to ensure our citizens are equipped with a basic understanding of the principles of savings and investing and the ability to recognize and avoid financial fraud.

State securities regulators have a long tradition of protecting investors through education, and many have established an investor education department within their regulatory agency. Several years ago, recognizing the importance of financial literacy to the prevention of fraud and abuse, the NASAA Board of Directors created an Investor Education Section to develop and support financial literacy and education programs to be delivered at the state level.

As part of the effort to educate our nation's youth, in April, state securities division staffs will join in celebrating ''Financial Literacy Month'' by visiting schools throughout their state to teach students about personal finance, the capital markets, investment choices and fraud.

Reaching out to our young citizens is just one component of the ongoing financial education effort undertaken by state securities regulators. We are dedicated to improving financial literacy for our constituents of all ages, recognizing that financial education has a direct impact on the economic health of our families, communities, states and this country overall.

We commend you for your continued efforts to draw attention to the importance of financial literacy programs. Please contact Daphne Smith, Tennessee Securities Commissioner and Chair of NASAA's Investor Education Section, or Deborah House in NASAA's corporate office if we may be of further assistance to you. We look forward to continuing our work with you and your offices on this particular issue.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA D. STRUCK,
*NASAA President,*
*Wisconsin Securities Administrator.*

---

NETWORKS FINANCIAL INSTITUTE AT INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
*Terre Haute, IN, April 4, 2006.*

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
*House of Representatives, Co-Founder and Co-Chair, Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, Washington, DC.*

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*House of Representatives, Co-Founder and Co-Chair, Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES BIGGERT AND HINOJOSA: We are writing to express our support for H. Res. 737, ''Supporting the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month.'' The resolution is an important step in raising awareness among individuals, policymakers, and institutions about the need for

a more competent, financially literate country.

A lack of basic money-management skills is widespread among Americans. Over a quarter of our population have not received adequate financial literacy education in order to manage household finances. Personal bankruptcies increased 19% in 2002 over 2001, and increased by over 10% in 2003 with young adults between 20 and 24 representing the fastest growing segment of bankruptcy filings. In 2004, America's teenagers scored a failing grade in basic financial literacy knowledge, and more people filed for bankruptcy than graduated from college. Now more than ever, there is a critical need for research-based financial literacy educational programs to reach individuals at all age and socioeconomic levels, particularly in the early years. Our nation's educational systems are an effective conduit through the use of quality programming with a common set of educational standards, pre- and post-education assessment tools, effective training programs for educators, and materials which appropriately serve various segments of adult and child populations. The goal of these efforts is to develop an adult population of consumers that have adequate skills and confidence for making day-to-day financial decisions, and planning for their financial futures.

Thank you again for introducing H. Res. 737. Your continued leadership and commitment to financial literacy is essential to raise awareness of the need to implement a national strategy, and improve the money, credit, and debt management skills of all individuals.

Sincerely,

LIZ COIT,
*Executive Director.*

---

LAW DEPARTMENT,
MASTERCARD INTERNATIONAL,
*Purchase, NY, April 4, 2006.*

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BIGGERT AND CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: I am writing to communicate MasterCard's dedication and commitment to increasing financial literacy rates, and we commend the efforts of you and your colleagues on H.R. 737. This bill is yet another example of your admirable devotion to this critical issue.

MasterCard International will continue consumer education during Financial Literacy Month by hosting activities across the country that help Americans successfully manage their personal finances. Events include the launch of the Spanish language version of our Debt Know How web site (www.debtknowhow.com), activities with policymakers on Capitol Hill that showcase MasterCard's consumer education programs, and a debt training seminar at the 2006 California Summit on Financial Literacy.

Please let us know if we can ever be of assistance to you or your staff.

Sincerely,

JOSHUA PEIREZ,
*Senior Vice President &*
*Associate General Counsel.*

---

ICBA APPLAUDS RESOLUTION DECLARING APRIL FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH

WASHINGTON, D.C. (April 5, 2006).—The Independent Community Bankers of America (ICBA) strongly supports the bi-partisan resolution passed by the U.S. House of Representatives today designating April as ''Financial Literacy Month.''

''Managing money wisely is critical to success in life,'' said Terry J. Jorde, ICBA chairman and president and CEO of CountryBank USA in Cando, N.D. ''Too many Americans lack the skill and knowledge to make appropriate financial decisions. The more consumers know, the better they are at managing their finances and the better they manage their finances the more likely they are to enjoy a secure financial future.''

ICBA has an on-going commitment to financial literacy programs, encouraging community banks to provide programs within their communities, as well as forging government, nonprofit and private-sector partnerships such as the FDIC Money Smart program.

''We commend Reps. Judy Biggert (R–Ill.) and Ruben Hinojosa (D–Tex.) for introducing a resolution that calls for the federal, state and local government, as well as schools, businesses and other groups to observe Financial Literacy Month,'' said Camden R. Fine, ICBA president and CEO ''Financial education is important for today's consumers to understand and make decisions when faced with the complex array of financial products and services available.''

For more information, visit the consumer education and resources section of www.icba.org.

---

CREDIT UNION
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, DC, April 3, 2006.*

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*Rayburn House Office Building,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HINOJOSA: On behalf of the Credit Union National Association (CUNA), which represents 87 million credit union members, I would like to thank you for your introduction of H. Res. 737, which supports the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month.

CUNA strongly supports H. Res. 737 which supports financial literacy initiatives by calling on schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, government entities on the federal, state, and local levels, and citizens to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

To aid in this endeavor, CUNA establishes a yearly National Credit Union Youth Week, this year scheduled to take place April 23rd—29th. To date, 278 credit unions have committed to participating in CUNA's Youth Savings Challenge for that week, and are estimating to tally 50,000 youth deposits valued at $3.6 million.

CUNA provides financial literacy resources to credit unions year-round to assist young people and help them manage their own money wisely, and has partnered with the National Endowment for Financial Education (NEFE) and the Cooperative Extension Service to provide schools with free workbooks on financial literacy that can easily fit into an existing curriculum. Many credit unions have volunteered their time to teach the materials to better prepare students for college, covering issues such as credit cards, interest, minimum payments, and checking accounts. Additionally, CUNA recently developed a program called ''Thrive by Five'' which offers free materials on our website for parents to work with pre-school aged children on basic financial concepts such as spending and saving.

Again, CUNA and its member credit unions strongly support H. Res. 737, as well as your leadership with the Congressional Caucus on Financial and Economic Literacy. We look forward to working with you and greatly appreciate your efforts to bring financial literacy to students nationwide.

Sincerely,

DANIEL A. MICA,
*President & CEO.*

---

INDEPENDENT BANKERS
ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS,
*Austin, TX, April 3, 2006.*

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: I am pleased that House Resolution 737, which strongly supports the important and admirable goal of financial literacy for our citizens, is scheduled for a vote on the House floor this week.

As you are aware, The Independent Bankers Association of Texas (IBAT) is committed to improving and enhancing the financial well-being of all Americans, and strongly believes that financial literacy initiatives targeting all age and socio-economic groups is a key component for success. Indeed, our association, through our Main Street Foundation, has worked with a number of partners to further this important cause, and we and our member banks will continue to focus on this vital issue.

We applaud you for your leadership in this area, and appreciate all the good work you and your fine staff have done to heighten the awareness of financial literacy.

All of us at IBAT look forward to working with you and your colleagues on this important issue.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER L. WILLISTON,
*President and CEO.*

---

THE FINANCIAL
PLANNING ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, DC, April 4, 2006.*

Re H.R. 737.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

MR. HINOJOSA: The Financial Planning Association (FPA) would like to voice its support for House Resolution 737, which you are co-sponsoring and which was introduced on March 28, 2006, in support of the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month.

Our 28,000 members are well situated to understand the vital importance of personal financial education for all Americans. We believe that qualitative individual financial security must be built on a foundation of education and financial literacy.

In the context of rising personal debt and lower individual savings, there has seldom been a time of greater need for financial literacy. It is against that backdrop that we heartily support the introduction of H.R. 737, and hope your congressional colleagues and the President will share your enthusiastic support of financial literacy for all people.

Sincerely,

DANIEL B. MOISAND,
*FPA President.*

Mr. Speaker, financial literacy means empowerment, power to manage money, credit, and debt, and become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, and leaders. It means banking the unbanked and bringing them into the mainstream financial system to protect them from abusive, predatory, or deceptive credit offers and financial products. At present several of these financial literacy programs are operating in my district.

The Security Industry Association's Stock Market Game is one of such programs. I am proud that my district was chosen again this year to participate in the SIA's second annual ''Capitol Hill Challenge'' Stock Market Game. This year the game is being played by many

more districts across the United States so that the competition amongst the students is daunting.

To meet the challenge, I selected La Feria High School, located in Cameron County, to participate in this program. I wish them well and want to let them know that I am rooting for them.

Numerous programs exist to improve financial literacy. Recently, I reviewed Jump$tart's Web site and found more than 500 financial literacy programs. While this means that many groups and individuals are working towards the goal of improving financial literacy rates, it also means that more coordination and collaboration amongst the programs and the groups are needed.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Financial Literacy Economic Commission released its National Strategy for Financial Literacy. While they were behind schedule, the report contains some good ideas, especially public service announcements and a public media campaign. Although it is a good start, much remains to be done. Other actions need to be taken and different venues need to be employed to achieve our goal. I remain committed to convince our appropriators that they should provide at least $3.5 million for the multimedia campaign.

With our savings rate currently at a negative .2 percent, or two-tenths of 1 percent, I believe that $3.5 million is a paltry sum if we are to improve financial literacy rates in this country. The funds are also needed to afford the multimedia campaign the ability to educate our constituents who remain subject to predatory lenders, potential identity theft from increasing data breaches, and much more.

Mr. Speaker, last month the House Financial Services Committee agreed to hold a hearing on the National Strategy on Financial Literacy as required by title V of the FACT Act. This is a crucial step towards reaching our goals.

I want to take this opportunity to again thank my friend Congresswoman BIGGERT and her staff, Nicole Austin and Brian Colgan, for working with us on today's legislation. I look forward to continuing my collaboration with Mrs. BIGGERT on any and all efforts that will increase public awareness of the need to improve financial literacy, to promote programs that increase financial literacy for all during all stages of life, and significantly improve financial literacy rates across the country. We are already moving forward on this, and we will host our annual Financial Literacy Day Fair April 25 with Jump$tart, with Junior Achievement, and the National Council on Economic Education and together with Senator DANIEL AKAKA. The fair is open to the public and will be held from noon to 5 p.m. in the Senate Hart building. I have learned that more than 40 vendors will be sharing their financial literacy products with those who attend the event, and I encourage all my colleagues and all of their staffs and the public to attend the event.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), the author of the bill.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 737 to designate April as Financial Literacy Month. This is the third year that I have introduced this resolution with my colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) to raise public awareness about the importance of financial education in the United States.

The state of financial literacy among our citizens may not garner much in the way of headlines, but it is an issue that should command our attention. It is a problem that is serious and urgent but is one that could be solved through education, and that is why I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

In 2003 I worked with my colleagues and again Mr. HINOJOSA to establish within the Fair and Accurate Credit Transaction Act, or the FACTA, the Financial Literacy and Education Commission. We tasked the commission with establishing a Web site, a toll-free hotline, and a national financial literacy strategy. I am happy to say that the commission immediately launched www.mymoney.gov and 1–888–MYMONEY, and just yesterday it unveiled the national strategy report.

It is called ''Taking Ownership of the Future: The National Strategy for Financial Literacy.'' And it highlights best practices and outlines outreach and education goals for the public and private sectors. I would urge my colleagues to go to mymoney.gov and take a look at the report. It is a great roadmap for how Americans can improve their understanding of issues such as credit management, savings, and homeownership. It is my hope that this national strategy can serve as a focal point for the hundreds of groups out there who are stepping up to the plate on financial literacy. There are so many issues and so many groups of individuals who need help and want to help.

Since my colleague Mr. HINOJOSA and I founded the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, which now has 68 Members of Congress, literally hundreds, if not a thousand, not-for-profit groups and private sector organizations have called us to offer their help or tell us about their financial literacy programs.

And I would like to take a moment to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters of support for these resolutions from four such organizations.

NETWORKS FINANCIAL INSTITUTE
AT INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
*Terre Haute, IN, April 4, 2006.*

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
*House of Representatives, Co-Founder and Co-Chair, Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, Washington, DC.*

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*House of Representatives, Co-Founder and Co-Chair, Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES BIGGERT AND HINOJOSA: We are writing to express our support for H. Res. 737, ''Supporting the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month.'' The resolution is an important step in raising awareness among individuals, policymakers, and institutions about the need for a more competent, financially literate country.

A lack of basic money-management skills is widespread among Americans. Over a quarter of our population have not received adequate financial literacy education in order to manage household finances. Personal bankruptcies increased 19% in 2002 over 2001, and increased by over 10% in 2003 with young adults between 20 and 24 representing the fastest growing segment of bankruptcy filings. In 2004, America's teenagers scored a failing grade in basic financial literacy knowledge, and more people filed for bankruptcy than graduated from college. Now more than ever, there is a critical need for research-based financial literacy educational programs to reach individuals at all age and socioeconomic levels, particularly in the early years. Our nation's educational systems are an effective conduit through the use of quality programming with a common set of educational standards, pre- and post-education assessment tools, effective training programs for educators, and materials which appropriately serve various segments of adult and child populations. The goal of these efforts is to develop an adult population of consumers that have adequate skills and confidence for making day-to-day financial decisions, and planning for their financial futures.

Thank you again for introducing H. Res. 737. Your continued leadership and commitment to financial literacy is essential to raise awareness of the need to implement a national strategy, and improve the money, credit, and debt management skills of all individuals.

Sincerely,

LIZ COIT,
*Executive Director.*

---

NORTH AMERICAN SECURITIES
ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
*Washington, DC, April 4, 2006.*

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BIGGERT AND CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: On behalf of NASAA thank you for introducing H. Res. 737, which supports the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month. As the Resolution details, the need for financial education in the United States has never been greater. With a majority of American investing in our capital markets, there is a growing obligation to ensure our citizens are equipped with a basic understanding of the principles of savings and investing and the ability to recognize and avoid financial fraud.

State securities regulators have a long tradition of protecting investors through education, and many have established an investor education department within their regulatory agency. Several years ago, recognizing the importance of financial literacy

to the prevention of fraud and abuse, the NASAA Board of Directors created an Investor Education Section to develop and support financial literacy and education programs to be delivered at the state level.

As part of the effort to educate our nation's youth, in April, state securities division staffs will join in celebrating ''Financial Literacy Month'' by visiting schools throughout their state to teach students about personal finance, the capital markets, investment choices and fraud.

Reaching out to our young citizens is just one component of the ongoing financial education effort undertaken by state securities regulators. We are dedicated to improving financial literacy for our constituents of all ages, recognizing that financial education has a direct impact on the economic health of our families, communities, states and this country overall.

We commend you for your continued efforts to draw attention to the importance of financial literacy programs. Please contact Daphne Smith, Tennessee Securities Commissioner and Chair of NASAA's Investor Education Section, or Deborah House in NASAA's corporate office if we may be of further assistance to you. We look forward to continuing our work with you and your offices on this particular issue.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA D. STRUCK,
*NASAA President,*
*Wisconsin Securities Administrator.*

---

VISA U.S.A. INC.,
*Washington, DC, April 4, 2006.*

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES BIGGERT AND HINOJOSA: I am writing to commend you for introducing H. Res. 737, a ''Resolution Supporting the Goals of Financial Literacy Month.''

Visa, through its ''Practical Money Skills for Life'' program, has been working to expand and improve financial literacy for youth in schools, as well as consumers at all stages of life. This is an award-winning comprehensive educational program, which includes interactive, computer based activities, as well as plans that can be used by teachers to deliver financial literacy lessons in the classroom. We developed Practical Money Skills for Life in close consultation with educational and nonprofit financial literacy organizations. These materials are available for free through the Internet at *http://www.practicalmoneyskills.com/.*

We look forward to working with you, the House Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, the Financial Literacy and Education Commission, and other policymakers, to advance this very important cause.

Thank you again for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

LISA B. NELSON,
*Senior Vice President & Director,*
*Government Relations.*

---

LAW DEPARTMENT,
MASTERCARD INTERNATIONAL,
*Purchase, NY, April 4, 2006.*

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BIGGERT AND CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: I am writing to communicate MasterCard's dedication and commitment to increasing financial literacy rates, and we commend the efforts of you and your colleagues on H.R. 737. This bill is yet another example of your admirable devotion to this critical issue.

MasterCard International will continue consumer education during Financial Literacy Month by hosting activities across the country that help Americans successfully manage their personal finances. Events include the launch of the Spanish language version of our Debt Know How Web site (www.debtknowhow.com), activities with policymakers on Capitol Hill that showcase MasterCard's consumer education programs, and a debt training seminar at the 2006 California Summit on Financial Literacy.

Please let us know if we can ever be of assistance to you or your staff.

Sincerely,

JOSHUA PEIREZ,
*Senior Vice President &*
*Associate General Counsel.*

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank some of the people in my home State of Illinois who have demonstrated their commitment to educating Americans of all ages about savings and finance: Susan Beecham, founder of Money Savvy Generation and the inventor of my favorite financial literacy tool, the Money Savvy Pig; and then there is Joanne Dempsey, Illinois Council on Economic Education; and one of my good friends, the other Judy from Illinois, Illinois State Treasurer Judy Baar Topinka.

Mr. Speaker, most of our States do not require schools to have financial literacy programs, and the majority of students failed a basic financial literacy exam. Many eighth graders do not know the difference between cash, checks, and credit cards. And most college students have at least one credit card with a large unpaid cash balance. Adults have not fared very well either, and the number of ''unbanked'' households in the United States is estimated to be close to 10 million.

Studies show that Americans are not saving for life's expensive, and at times unexpected, needs such as education, retirement, and health care. Now is the time for us to encourage our children and adults to learn about finance and economics and engage in good budget and long-term savings habits.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), for his dedication to this issue and sponsorship of this resolution. I would also like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for cosponsoring this resolution and moving it through his committee. And I would especially like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for managing this resolution and my colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for managing the resolution. And last I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) for their support of the resolution and their commitment to financial literacy.

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

I want to commend my colleagues, Representatives BIGGERT and HINOJOSA, for the outstanding work that they continue to do in this important area.

The importance of financial and fiscal responsibility cannot be overstated. Personal financial literacy is essential to ensure that individuals are prepared to manage money, credit, and debt and become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens. And that is why I am pleased to support H. Res. 737, introduced by Representative BIGGERT of our great State, that is, the State of Illinois.

Personal savings as a percentage of personal income decreased from 7.5 percent in the early 1980s to a negative 0.2 percent in the last quarter of 2005. As the resolution notes, 92 percent of college students acquire at least one credit card by their second year in college; yet only 26 percent of people between the ages of 13 and 21 reported that their parents actively taught them how to manage money.

The Jump$tart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy seeks to improve the personal financial literacy of young adults. Jump$tart's purpose is to evaluate the financial literacy of young adults; develop, disseminate, and encourage the use of financial education standards for grades K–12; and promote the teaching of personal finance.

□ 1315

To that end, Jump$tart has established 12 must-know personal finance principles for young people to improve their financial future. It would not hurt if adults also followed these 12 steps as well.

The 12 financial principles stressed during Financial Literacy Month for Youth are map your financial future; do not expect something for nothing; high returns equal high risk; know your take-home pay; compare interest rates; pay yourself first, money doubles by the rule of 72, to determine how long it would take your money to double, divide the interest into 72; your credit past is your credit future; start saving young; stay insured; budget your money; do not borrow what you cannot repay; and let me add one more, especially since the 15th is not too far away, pay all of your taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution supporting the goals of financial literacy month, and urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the powerful Rules Committee.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and congratulate him and his colleagues on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee for their hard work on this important issue.

As I look around the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I, of course, want to say that this Illinois nexus here between DAVIS and BIGGERT is obviously a great one and very committed to the issue of financial literacy, and my good friend from Texas, RUBÉN HINOJOSA, has done so much to further this cause.

I want to say that I remember it was probably a decade ago that Mr. POMEROY and I stood here beginning to focus attention on this issue. I want to again say how much I appreciate the fact that Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. HINOJOSA have led the charge here. I believe that this resolution is very deserving of our support. I see my friend EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON here as well, so I suspect she is supportive of this, and Mr. SHERMAN and others.

I do believe if we look at where we are as a Nation today, it is amazing what the 21st century has wrought. We are all so supportive of these dramatic changes that have been made, improving the quality of life and the standard of living for people. But one of the things we point to is the fact we see this emerging investor class; 56.7 million American families are today members of the investor class.

What has all of this technological change brought about? Well, one thing is the explosion of the access to all kinds of different financial products and services out there. Many of them are offered to young people who, unfortunately, don't really have much of a grasp or understanding of financial responsibility and financial literacy.

That is why what we are doing here today is the right thing. In fact, I am very pleased to see that the Commission on Financial Literacy that has been put into place just yesterday made the decision to move ahead with positive methods of education advancing this cause.

If we are going to see the number of investors in the United States of America grow, and as we want to continue to see the standard of living increase for so many people, with that obviously comes responsibility. As people take on responsibility, the best way for them to do it is if they have the kind of literacy that is necessary in dealing with this explosion of financial products and services that are out there.

So, I simply want to say congratulations. Here we are, trying to encourage education in science, technology, engineering and math, the STEM Program we were talking about just last week, and as well we are proceeding with the work on our very important higher education bill, and key to that is our quest to ensure that people understand these different financial products that are there.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleagues who have been so involved in this, and I hope very much that we will be able to have strong support for this measure. I hope we have unanimous passage of it. We will be able to at that point see a greater understanding and an enhancement of these toll-free numbers that are out there and all the other educational tools that my friend Mrs. BIGGERT talked about.

With that, I encourage strong support for the resolution.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I rise in strong support of H. Res. 737, supporting the goals and the ideal of Financial Literacy Month.

Mr. Speaker, we need to care more about financial literacy in this country and making sure our constituents have the tools to be responsible consumers, to make them good savers and to make them great investors.

In a new survey conducted by the Financial Literacy Forum, two of every five Americans say they know only some, little or not much about how to manage their finances and only 10 percent of college students have had financial education in high school. We used to learn financial skills at home or at school, but now Americans aren't even being taught these crucial life skills in either place.

Now, more than ever before, we Americans need to be financially literate. The average American family spends $200,000 to raise a child to the age of 18, and yet the United States savings rate barely breaks above 1 percent. The cost of education, as everyone knows, is skyrocketing. Undergraduate students have an average credit card balance of about $3,000.

I am not saying that greater financial literacy will solve all of our problems, but it will help people to manage their financial issues better. Sound financial knowledge helps individuals prepare to own a home, to save for retirement, to protect themselves from fraud, to start a business, to plan for college. And the benefits of financial literacy accrue not just to the individual, but to our communities as well. The more people in our communities save, the more they can invest, the more they can create business, the more we create and build America. Financial literacy is really the cornerstone to lasting wealth creation. And, above all, remember it is not how much you make, it is what you do with the money you get.

So I would like to thank my colleagues again for introducing this important legislation, and I would urge the House to support H. Res. 737.

Ms. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, making thoughtful and informed decisions about your finances is more important than ever. Financial literacy and education are the foundation for wealth building. Being knowledgeable of the different financial products available leads to increased wealth among individuals and families and is key to stimulating the economy.

There are many more aspects of financial literacy than knowing how to open and maintain a savings or checking account. In today's society, increasingly more adults, young and old participate in financial decision making including, life insurance coverage, 401(k)s, stocks, business, investments, credit cards, mortgage loans, and automobile financing.

I believe that financial literacy should be taught at an early age. Parents should instill in their young children the value of saving and investing. According to the American Bankruptcy Institute, more young people filed for bankruptcy than graduated from college in 2001. In addition, personal bankruptcy filings were up 7.4 percent last year.

There are several programs like JumpStart, which are geared toward teaching children and young adults the basics of financial management. The JumpStart Organization in Ohio was recently awarded a $10,000 grant from The McGraw-Hill Companies to launch Financial Literacy for Teachers Training Workshops for Pre-Teachers and Teacher Training in Personal Finance Basics in five different regions in Ohio. This grant will equip them with the knowledge, tools, skills and resources to instruct their students to develop personal financial skills and to enable them to apply money management skills effectively in their everyday lives.

Surprisingly, half of all Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. In addition, 40 percent of Americans say they live beyond their means. I realize it is often more difficult for lower income individuals and those who live on a month to month basis to save, but one would be surprised how much a small weekly or monthly saving could accumulate over a period of time if it is allowed to grow.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this resolution, and urge my colleagues on the House and Senate to pass this important measure.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 737, which would support the goals and ideals Financial Literacy Month, among them raising public awareness about the importance of financial literacy.

As many of my colleagues are aware, borrowing—particularly on credit—has increased dramatically in recent years, while private savings have fallen. At the end of 2004, Americans carried 657,000,000 bank credit cards, 228,000,000 debit cards, and 550,000,000 retail credit cards—that comes to 6.3 bank credit cards, 2.2 debit cards, and 6.4 retail credit cards per household. The household debt of United States citizens climbed to $11,000,000,000 by the close of the third quarter of 2005. Meanwhile, personal savings as a percentage of personal income have decreased from 7.5 percent in the early 1980s to negative 0.5 percent in 2005, the first year that the rate has been negative since the Great Depression.

My colleagues are familiar with these statistics and the problems that such trends create for our economy, among them our low current accounts balance and our oft-cited trade deficit.

Americans should be familiar with the financial tools and strategies that can reverse these trends—tools and strategies made available by programs like Financial Literacy Month. By working to improve the financial literacy of people from all ages and walks of life, we can

help high school and college students prepare themselves for more responsible adult lives, help parents continue to provide for their children, and help retirees create sustainable plans for their golden years. Greater financial literacy will reduce the number of Americans forced to file for bankruptcy, increase the nation's private savings, and empower more Americans to make informed decisions in an increasingly complex market. Altogether, it will spur growth in our nation's economy.

In New Jersey, our credit unions have come together with the Department of Banking and Insurance for initiatives like the New Jersey Financial Literacy Awareness Network (NJFLAN) to help New Jerseyans better understand and manage their finances. NJFLAN partners with community organizations, schools, corporations, and financial institutions to distribute multilingual educational materials. The New Jersey Credit Union also set up a grant-making foundation to back initiatives to improve financial literacy within our state. These are two examples of positive, practical efforts that can be made at the state and district levels to further the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month.

I am proud to cosponsor this resolution and urge my colleagues to pass this resolution today.

Mr. BACA, Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Financial Literacy Month and in full support of H. Res. 737, which I have cosponsored. As a member of the Congressional Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, I encourage all of my colleagues to use this time to raise awareness about the importance of financial education and to support efforts that prepare Americans with the skills and know-how they need to manage money, credit and debt.

I'd also like to take this time to call attention to an important consumer issue that is affecting millions of Americans all across the nation.

Among the most vital pieces of information that can prepare individuals to make informed financial decisions is a credit report. Understanding one's credit report plays a key role in home-ownership readiness, increasing financial literacy, and monitoring for identity theft and or/fraud.

In recognition of the important role a credit report plays in enhancing financial literacy and combating identity theft, Congress passed legislation that entitles all consumers to one free credit report each year.

However, since the law's passage in 2003 nearly 30 million Latinos within the United States including almost 3 million in Puerto Rico—who have limited English language skills, are being excluded from this new right. They cannot obtain access because the system to order free credit reports—a website and toll-free hotline—is only available in English. As a result, millions are denied this information, which is essential to making informed financial decisions and to guarding against identity theft.

Identity theft is a serious and pervasive crime that affects millions of American families. According to a recent study by the Department of Justice, an estimated 3.6 million U.S. households—or about 3 out of every 100—were victims of identity theft in 2004.

During last month's markup of the Financial Data Protection Act (H.R. 3997) in the House Financial Services Committee, I called on America's leading credit bureaus to implement new procedures and services to help Spanish speakers obtain copies of their free credit report, understand the financial information it contains and learn about ways they can guard against identity theft, detect it or take corrective action if they discover they have been victimized. The right to a free credit report is a right for all consumers. In order for tens of millions of Spanish speakers to gain access, the system for ordering free credit reports must be made available in Spanish.

Last week, members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, of which I am First Vice Chair, met with executives from Equifax, Experian and TransUnion to discuss this issue and to ask them to take additional steps to protect Latinos who have limited English language skills. The CHC will continue to monitor this issue to ensure their full compliance with the law. They must be held accountable.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of H. Res. 737 and encourage all members to support the ideals and goals of Financial Literacy Month.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in an era when Americans' dependence on federal entitlements is increasing, when the number of Americans filing for personal bankruptcy rose an astounding 30 percent in the past year, and when our national savings rate is at its lowest point since the Great Depression, it is imperative that our Nation's youth understand the importance of long-term financial planning, particularly personal savings and investment.

We need young Americans to develop basic financial skills and knowledge to help them prepare for their future. They need to learn and understand basic principles such as compound interest, market capitalization, and how to avoid credit card debt. Learning simple concepts such as these during childhood cultivates lifelong habits of responsible financial management.

In particular, we must emphasize the value of investing early. We must stress the significance of tax-advantaged savings opportunities such as Roth IRA's, Health Savings Accounts, and 401(k) contribution plans offered by employers—especially when a match is offered—as well as numerous other vehicles for building substantial nest eggs for retirement.

Improving the financial literacy of our youth will equip the American workforce of tomorrow with the tools to grow our national economy and to achieve personal financial success and security in retirement. I urge my colleagues to join me in offering House Resolution 737 their full support.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 737, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 737.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. 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.

## FRANCISCO 'PANCHO' MEDRANO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4561) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8624 Ferguson Road in Dallas, Texas, as the ''Francisco 'Pancho' Medrano Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4561

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

**SECTION 1. FRANCISCO "PANCHO" MEDRANO POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8624 Ferguson Road in Dallas, Texas, shall be known and designated as the ''Francisco 'Pancho' Medrano Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Francisco 'Pancho' Medrano Post Office Building''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4561, offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON). This bill would designate the postal facility in Dallas, Texas, as the Francisco ''Pancho'' Medrano Post Office Building.

Francisco ''Pancho'' Medrano was a driving force in bringing the Hispanic culture into the City of Dallas and working to eliminate discrimination. Medrano was an activist and a hero with Dallas' Hispanic communities and promoted the importance of civic responsibility and political participation.

Mr. Medrano is well-known for his years of union and civil rights work with the United Auto Workers. During his years with the UAW, he integrated lunch counters in Dallas, took part in civil rights marches in the Deep South and organized farm workers in the Texas valley. However, his work was

not just confined to the UAW. He participated in numerous equality campaigns in Mississippi, Arkansas and Texas.

I urge all Members to honor the perseverance of this honorable civil rights leader by passing H.R. 4561.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the author of this resolution, the Honorable EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON from Texas.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. TOM DAVIS and the ranking member, HENRY WAXMAN, of the House Government Reform Committee and also the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and the ranking member, Mr. DANNY DAVIS, for moving this important legislation through the committee. This resolution has been endorsed by every single Member from the Texas delegation.

Francisco ''Pancho'' Medrano played an integral part in bringing Hispanics into the cultural and social mainstream in Dallas. He was a leader to his community in the struggle against discrimination.

The son of a Mexican laborer, Pancho Medrano was born in Dallas in 1920. In his youth, in 1952, he was heavyweight boxing champion of Mexico, and grew up as a community activist in the fight for social and economic equality.

He grew up in an area of Dallas called Little Mexico and he encountered much prejudice and segregation. But he never was considered violent. As a young man, he was banned from public swimming pools and all of the other things, and frequently said that he didn't see that he should be any different from any other black American because he was treated the same way.

At the beginning of World War II, when unions began to form in the Dallas area, he was inspired by the political conditions around him. He was captivated by the political agenda of the United Auto Workers and he was then named by Walter Reuther to be organizer of the UAW Union in Dallas. His work had an immeasurable impact on the lives of thousands of working women and minorities.

In 1960, when television began to change the visibility of the American civil rights movement, the UAW president commissioned him to be an international representative for civil rights. So he participated in all the landmark marches with Martin Luther King. He was probably one of the only Mexican Americans in the Montgomery boycott and in Selma along with Dr. King.

He continued his organizing throughout the country, including Chicago, Detroit, Indianapolis, California and Arizona. He worked to help repeal the poll tax in 1964, and he really spoke all the time about understanding the struggle of all of the African Americans, because he fought the same battle for all.

He was a father of five. Pancho, Jr., had preceded him in death. He died in 2002 but continued to be active up to his death. His only daughter, Pauline, is a member of the city council, his son Robert has been, and his son Ricardo has been on the school board.

It is important I think for all young people to know that we have had leadership that came along and made things better for them and did not have to be violent. He was always a gentleman, but never silent when it came to rights.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman TOM DAVIS and Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN of the House Government Reform Committee for their leadership on moving this important resolution through the committee and to the House floor for its consideration today.

''Pancho'' Medrano played an integral part in bringing Hispanics into the cultural and social mainstream in Dallas.

He was a leader to his community in the struggle against discrimination.

The son of a Mexican laborer, Pancho Medrano was born in Dallas in 1920.

Pancho Medrano, who in his youth was the 1952 Heavyweight Boxing Champion of Mexico, grew up to be a community activist in the fight for social and economic equality.

Growing up in the Little Mexico area of Dallas, Medrano encountered prejudice and segregation. As a young man, he was banned from the public swimming pool as well as banned from watching movies within the public park in Little Mexico.

Medrano attended St. Ann's Catholic School and Dallas public schools through the eighth grade. At the beginning of 9th grade, his high school principal told him he could no longer attend classes and directed him to go to work at the local rock quarry.

While working at the quarry, Medrano trained to become a riveter and eventually went to work at the North American Aviation Company. There were few skilled minority workers at the plant, and the majority of white workers refused to work with Medrano. Conditions at the plant were even worse for African Americans, as nearly all of them were assigned to cleaning restrooms. Medrano was surrounded by an environment where everything, even the punch clocks, were segregated.

At the beginning of World War II, unions began forming in the Dallas area.

Inspired by the political conditions around him Medrano was captivated by the political agenda of the United Auto Workers, in particular the motto that there shall be no discrimination based upon race, color, or creed, and sex.

Medrano played a key part in organizing the UAW union in Dallas.

His work made an immeasurable impact in the lives of thousands of working women and minorities.

In 1960, when television began to change the visibility of the American Civil Rights Movement, UAW President, Walter Reuther, commissioned Medrano as a special UAW International Representative for Civil Rights.

Medrano went on to participate in virtually all of the landmark events of the civil rights movement.

Mr. Medrano integrated lunch counters in Dallas, and took part in civil rights marches in the Deep South.

He organized demonstrations in Dallas and was involved in the integration in Little Rock.

Often times there were no Mexican-Americans organizing these civil rights demonstrations. Medrano played a key part in organizing and energizing the Mexican-American community throughout the South.

Medrano participated as one of the only Mexican-Americans in the Montgomery Bus Boycott.

He also marched in Selma along with Dr. King.

He continued his organizing throughout the country including: Chicago, Detroit, Indianapolis, California and Arizona.

In addition, he organized farm workers in the Texas Valley alongside civil rights leader César Chávez.

In 1967, Texas Rangers broke up a peaceful protest where Medrano and five women attempted to picket a train carrying melons picked by non-union workers. The protest in Mission, Texas, was part of a year-long effort by farm workers.

During this time, Medrano and others were subjected to persistent harassment and violence from law enforcement officers for their union-organizing protests. Medrano sued the Ranger who broke up the protest. He took his case all the way to the Supreme Court—overturning the Texas laws that barred mass demonstrations.

Medrano worked with the UAW to help repeal the poll tax in 1964. Mr. Medrano said, ''I could understand the struggle of black people because my people were experiencing the same sort of thing.'' Medrano was driven to fight for economic and social justice for all individuals—Hispanics, Blacks, Women, and others.

Mr. Medrano's work to end discrimination and prejudice has had a profound and lasting effect on myself and on the lives of millions of Americans.

We must all work to carry on his remarkable legacy.

Even when he retired in Dallas, Medrano continued to be an active member of UAW Local 848's retiree group.

Mr. Medrano passed away in April of 2002.

In addition to his daughter, Pauline, he is survived by three sons, Robert, Ricardo, and Rolando.

There are many young people who may not know of, or did not experience Mr. Medrano's battle towards equality. It is imperative we recognize and celebrate our civil rights leaders as a nation. Honoring leaders such as Pancho Medrano teaches our young people about the leaders who came before them—and hopefully gives a new generation the inspiration to fight for change.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4561, to name the postal facility at Ferguson Road in Dallas, Texas in honor of Pancho Medrano.

□ 1330

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, just to close, I strongly rise in support of this postal facility naming for Mr. Frances Pancho Medrano, who was an outstanding community activist. I think it is the kind of people that he

was who really make America and have made America what it ought to be, and so I strongly support this resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the naming of a United States Postal Facility in Dallas, Texas as the "Francisco 'Pancho' Medrano Post Office Building." Pancho Medrano was the embodiment of the civil rights movement for the Hispanic community in Dallas. He was a decisive leader in encouraging Hispanics to actively participate in the political process in Dallas. Mr. Medrano brought Hispanics into the city's mainstream community and mentored a generation of Dallas political leaders. His operational base centered in Little Mexico, an enclave immediately north of downtown Dallas. In this neighborhood where he was banned from swimming in the public pool as a child, he raised a family whose name became synonymous with civic life.

Not only was he a strong civil rights leader, but along the way, he became a very talented and successful heavyweight prize fighter.

Today Pancho Medrano would be most proud of his family's achievements. One of his sons was a Dallas ISD school board member. Another was selected to serve on the Dallas City Council and Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport Board. Additionally, his daughter, Pauline Medrano, was recently elected to the Dallas City Council, representing the area that has long been home for the Medrano family. She proudly carries on the legacy of leadership and passion to serve the community. I will continue to work with her locally to better our great city.

Therefore, it is with distinction that I recognize the designation of the United States Postal Facility located at 8624 Ferguson Road in Dallas, Texas as the "Francisco 'Pancho' Medrano Post Office Building." I ask that all of my fellow colleagues support H.R. 4561.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4561.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4561.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COACH JOHN WOODEN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4646) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7320 Reseda Boulevard in Reseda, California, as the "Coach John Wooden Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4646

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

**SECTION 1. JOHN WOODEN POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7320 Reseda Boulevard in Reseda, California, shall be known and designated as the "Coach John Wooden Post Office Building".

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4646, offered by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). This bill would designate the postal facility in Reseda, California, as the Coach John Wooden Post Office Building.

John Wooden is often referred to as the most successful coach in college basketball history. At UCLA, Mr. Wooden's team scaled unprecedented heights. The Bruins set all-time records with four perfect 30–0 seasons, 88 consecutive victories, 38 straight NCAA tournament victories, 20 PAC–10 championships, and 10 national championships in which seven of these championship victories were won consecutively.

Considered one of the finest teachers the game has ever known, Coach Wooden's approach was centered on conditioning, skill, and teamwork. Coach Wooden's principles both on and off the court dictated his success in creating what is certainly the greatest dynasty in basketball history. I urge all Members to honor this dedicated and inspiring teacher by passing H.R. 4646. And I want to wish Coach Wooden a speedy recovery and a return back to his home.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the author of this resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting as we have concluded March Madness, the NCAA Championship playoff for men's basketball, that we reflect upon the great success of a man I think is the greatest coach of all time in any sport. That is the Wizard of Westwood, Coach John Wooden, a man who meant so much to basketball players, fans, to sport in general, to our society, and especially to us in his home area, the San Fernando Valley.

I attended UCLA and graduated in 1975. I was there for 3 years. And in just my 3 years, I saw in the 1972–1973 season a 30–0 record, National Championship, and Coach John Wooden named Coach of the Year.

Then in my next year at UCLA, Coach John Wooden achieved a record of 26–4, reached the semi-finals in the national tournament, and coached the great Bill Walton in his final season. And then finally, not in Bill Walton's final season, but in Coach John Wooden's final season at UCLA, 1974–1975, a record of 28–3, and a National Championship. What a way to end a coaching career; a coaching career that included ten National Championships.

Now, as the gentleman pointed out, Coach John Wooden was hospitalized just a few days ago. He watched the UCLA team come in second in the nation from his hospital bed. But I am pleased to report that he is to be discharged from the hospital today and has been given a basically clean bill of health. I hope very much that he is watching us either as he is about to leave the hospital or as he has just returned home to his home in Encino.

Coach John Wooden was the first individual inducted to the Basketball Hall of Fame as both a player and a coach, and in fact, only three individuals to date have been so inducted. He is now 95 years old, has been a resident of my district for the 10 years that I have served with Congress, and for far longer than that.

He was born in 1910. He went on to Purdue University, where in 1932, he was National Player of the Year and led his team, the Boilermakers, to the National Championship.

In the 1940s, he came to us at UCLA, having first served his country as lieutenant in World War II. There at UCLA, he led us to 10 National Championships, including 7 in a row. Under his tutelage, UCLA had 7 perfect 30–0 seasons and won 19 conference championships. His teams once won 88 games in a row, the longest streak in basketball history and I believe the longest streak in any major sport. He also won a record 38 consecutive NCAA tournament games.

Wooden was the NCAA Basketball Coach of the Year six times. He was named Man of the Year By Sporting News in 1970, and by Sports Illustrated in 1973. When he reached retirement at UCLA in 1975, his total record was 620 wins versus 147 losses.

But his leadership was not just on the court. He inspired so many by his testament to leadership, to success, to dedication, and to sportsmanship. He wrote several books, including Wooden On Leadership, also including My Personal Best: Life Lessons From An All-American Journey, and even a children's book, Inches and Miles: the

Journey to Success. He was famous for his Pyramid of Success which inspired so many in their adult lives to focus on team spirit, competitiveness, and teamwork.

In conclusion, I cannot think of a better way to honor Coach John Wooden in the San Fernando Valley than naming a Federal building in Reseda, the Reseda Post Office, after Coach John Wooden. Reseda is the community located immediately adjacent to Coach John Wooden's home community of Encino.

Just a few years ago, we named the Encino Post Office after another basketball luminary, Chick Hearn, the most famous basketball broadcaster of all time. And so now we will have two post offices located just a few miles apart honoring the two greatest basketball names in the history of the San Fernando Valley. Coach John Wooden's daughter, Nancy, lives in Reseda with her husband, as does his grandson-in-law Paul, who was recently honored at a celebration that I was able to attend—the Walk of Hearts, where we honor in Canoga Park the great teachers of the San Fernando Valley. Of course, just a few years earlier, the first teacher so honored was Coach John Wooden himself.

Coach John Wooden means so much to our area, so much to sports fans around the country and around the world. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and I think we should move forward with this bill.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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, as a member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 4646, legislation naming a postal facility in Reseda, California after Coach Wooden. This measure which was introduced by Representative SHERMAN on December 18, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on March 30, 2006, enjoys the support and co-sponsorship of the entire California delegation.

John Wooden, a native of Indiana, actually began his love of the game by playing basketball at Martinsville High School in Martinsville, Indiana. He was an All-State selection in high school and an All-American guard at Purdue University.

After graduating from Purdue, he became a high school teacher and coach, gaining a record of 218 to 42 as a high school coach. After serving in World War II, John Wooden took a coaching position at Indiana State University prior to becoming the head coach at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Well, we have heard all the things that he did in California, but those of us who were not from California were actual admirers of John Wooden through the whole period of watching him direct his teams, knowing that in all likelihood they were going to win, that it was virtually impossible to defeat them. So I can understand the kind of feeling that Representative SHERMAN and all of the people of that great area where he lived and spent the last days of his life, and still is there, and he is, indeed, an icon.

So I join with you, Mr. SHERMAN, in urging passage of this resolution, and I commend you for bringing it before us and putting it before the House.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), another great coach that this country has known.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. SHERMAN for bringing this legislation to the floor.

I just wanted to say a couple of words about Coach Wooden. I have known him personally and I understand he has been ill. I hope he is watching today. Of course everyone has discussed his record, the seven straight national championships and 10 national championships in 12 years, which is remarkable, 88 straight wins. But the thing I thought I would mention is that the most significant thing that I know about John Wooden is not his record, but it is rather the way he went about achieving that record.

One thing that I picked up from him that was invaluable to me as a coach was that he never talked to his players about winning. You would think in a business that is so keyed to winning that you would frequently mention the word winning, but he never did. He always talked about process. He always talked about how you went about achieving excellence, starting with the way you put your socks on, the way you shot free throws, the way you passed the ball. He was a tremendous detail person, a great emphasis on fundamentals.

One quote that he had in one of his books that I thought was significant was he talked about Cervantes. Cervantes mentioned that the journey is more important than the end. What he was saying was that it is not the final destination but it is how you get there. Of course, we are in a business here that is very end, very goal-oriented, and sometimes the end justifies the means. And so I have always appreciated that about John. It was simply what he taught his players and what he taught people in coaching in general about how to approach the game. So there could not have been a finer person chosen for this honor.

Thank you for so honoring him and we hope that he recovers quickly and is out of the hospital.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4646. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4646.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1345

## EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT A NATIONAL METHAMPHETAMINE PREVENTION WEEK SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 556) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Methamphetamine Prevention Week should be established to increase awareness of methamphetamine and to educate the public on ways to help prevent the use of that damaging narcotic.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 556

Whereas methamphetamine is a highly addictive, man-made drug that can be injected, snorted, smoked, or ingested orally, the effects of which include feelings of euphoria that last for up to 24 hours and psychotic behavior such as auditory hallucinations, mood disturbances, delusions, and paranoia, potentially causing the user to experience homicidal or suicidal thoughts as well as violent behavior and brain damage;

Whereas the number of admissions to treatment in which methamphetamine was the primary substance of abuse increased exponentially from 20,776 in 1993 to 116,604 in 2003;

Whereas methamphetamine is easily produced in clandestine laboratories, known as ''meth labs'', using a variety of volatile and toxic ingredients available in stores, and presents a danger to the individual preparing the methamphetamine, the community surrounding the laboratory, and the law enforcement personnel who discover the laboratory;

Whereas the Drug Enforcement Administration reports that domestic meth lab seizures have increased from 7,438 in 1999 to 17,170 in 2004;

Whereas studies have found that methamphetamine use is strongly linked to identity theft, domestic violence, overall crime rates, child abuse, and child neglect;

Whereas the National Association of Counties has conducted surveys with law enforcement and child welfare officials in more than 500 counties, and found that 87 percent of all law enforcement agencies surveyed reported increases in methamphetamine-related arrests in recent years, and 40 percent of all the child welfare officials in the survey reported increased out-of-home placements of children due to methamphetamine use;

Whereas methamphetamine use and production is prevalent around the world;

Whereas approximately 65 percent of the methamphetamine supply in the United States is trafficked in the form of a finished product from other countries;

Whereas the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime reports that more than 30,000,000 people around the world use amphetamine-type stimulants, a number that eclipses the combined global use of cocaine and heroin;

Whereas methamphetamine and narcotics task forces, judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, substance abuse treatment and rehabilitation professionals, law enforcement officials, researchers, students and educators, community leaders, parents, and others dedicated to fighting methamphetamine have a profound influence within their communities; and

Whereas the establishment of a National Methamphetamine Prevention Week would increase awareness of methamphetamine and educate the public on effective ways to help prevent methamphetamine use at the international, Federal, State, and local levels: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) a National Methamphetamine Prevention Week should be established to increase awareness of methamphetamine and educate the public on effective ways to help prevent methamphetamine use at the international, Federal, State, and local levels; and

(2) the people of the United States and interested groups should be encouraged to observe National Methamphetamine Prevention Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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 gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H. Res. 556 offered by the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD). This resolution would recognize the importance of educating people of all ages about the dangers of methamphetamines.

Methamphetamines are highly addictive, dangerous stimulants that are sold in powder, pill and capsule forms and can be inhaled, swallowed or injected. The physical effects of methamphetamines use include alertness, euphoria, appetite loss, elevated heart rate, and increased respiration. The most popular form of the drug, referred to as crystal meth, has become increasingly widespread and can result in overdose, causing both stroke and heart failure.

While the median age of the habitual meth user is 30 years, the drug is starting to strengthen its hold on younger generations. The number of teenagers who have reported using meth has increased dramatically over the past few years. It is extremely easy for young people to access Internet information outlining recipes and places to obtain ingredients for manufacturing the drug.

This legislation would help to increase awareness of this serious epidemic and educate the public about the dangers of meth use.

I urge all Members to come together and to commit to the task of educating our youth about the dangers of methamphetamines use by adopting H. Res. 556.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), the author of this legislation.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Georgia as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in strong support of H. Res. 556, a resolution I have introduced to establish National Methamphetamine Prevention Week.

As was mentioned earlier, methamphetamine is a cheap, addictive drug that has penetrated the smallest of communities and has reached epidemic proportions in this country and throughout the world. In fact, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime reports that more than 30 million people around the world use amphetamine-type stimulants, a number that surpasses the global use of cocaine and heroin combined.

Domestically, we have seen the number of meth lab seizures decline in some areas over the last years, yet increase in others as the epidemic has moved from west to east. For example, in 1999, California busted 2,579 meth labs domestically, while Missouri that year busted 439. However, by 2004, California had reduced their labs to 764, while Missouri increased to an astonishing 2,788.

The situation with methamphetamine is evolving, and as local police and drug task forces become more efficient in shutting down the local, clandestine labs, the supply shifts to become increasingly filled by finished product imported from Mexico and other countries, often in a more potent form.

In my home district in southwest Washington, for example, we have seen the purity of meth increase on the street by over 43 percent in just the last 4 years. This is a disturbing pattern. Its history has taught us that along with increases in purity, so goes admissions to treatment centers, drug-related crimes, arrests and overdoses.

Judge Woolard from Clark County in my home district has explained to me that the meth epidemic can be encapsulated in the following statistics: 80 percent of the kids in foster care in my home county have parents who are meth addicts; 80 percent of the criminal cases brought before the courts involve drug use; and 75 percent of the kids in juvenile detention are now involved with meth.

This is not a problem that is going away without a comprehensive plan for action.

My colleagues and I have recently addressed the issue of domestic supply with the passage of the Combat Meth Act which had overwhelming support in this body. We also continue to move forward on efforts to deal with the international supply of meth precursors, and will soon insist that companies where these products are produced limit and track the shipment of methamphetamine.

We have to address the demand side as well, and we can do this by continuing to fund programs such as the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign and Safe and Drug Free Schools. Additionally, we can encourage our communities to get involved in the fight against meth at the ground level. That is why National Meth Prevention Week is so important.

This bill will allow and encourage local communities in a nationwide effort to address all aspects of the meth problem from prevention to intervention to treatment.

It will also provide us an opportunity to dedicate 1 week out of the year that should actually be a nationwide effort to engage students and children in discussions and activities that will underscore the importance of avoiding methamphetamine use.

I am pleased that the legislation has 63 bipartisan cosponsors, as well as the support of the National Association of Counties, National Narcotic Officers Coalition, National Criminal Justice Association and the Association for Addiction Professionals.

I want to particularly thank the co-chairs of the Meth Caucus, Chairmen LARSEN, BOSWELL, CANNON and CALVERT, as well as Chairman SOUDER who has been a leader on this issue throughout the Congress. They have been tremendous allies in this fight, and I am happy to work with them on a bipartisan basis.

I also want to again thank Chairman DAVIS, Ranking Member WAXMAN and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I want to thank my own staff, Katie Stevens, for her work on this, as well as the law enforcement treatment and prevention professionals in my district who have done such an outstanding job combating this horrific drug.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of H. Res. 556 today. I hope the action will then be followed by the speedy adoption of the companion bill in the other body, S. Res. 313, offered by my colleague and friend Senator CANTWELL.

Let us unite today to send a joint message to our local communities, as well as our friends overseas, that we acknowledge the devastating impact of this drug and are united in our fight against it.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), my friend and distinguished colleague.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, as well as my colleague, Representative DAVIS from Illinois, and I thank Representative BAIRD from Washington for bringing this bill up, H. Res. 556.

I am a physician Member of the body, and I see, and I did in my practice, of course this has been 4 years ago, a lot of drug addiction unfortunately, and this methamphetamine issue, Mr. Speaker, has reached exponential and unbelievable proportions.

When some of us were in college, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you remember this or not, but I certainly do, to study and cram for a test at the last minute, there were always these little pills floating around the fraternity house that you could take. It would literally allow you to stay up all night, and you had an accelerated sense of awareness and could not sleep, and sometimes you literally could go through a whole calculus textbook and do a whole semester's worth of work in one night and think that you were going to go in and ace the test. That rarely happened. That sense of euphoria was there, Mr. Speaker, but when you got that final grade back, that A you thought you had made might more often was a C- or a D. But that was then and this is now.

Just listen to this little bit of background and why this idea of Representative BAIRD's of having a National Methamphetamine Prevention Awareness Week is so important.

Methamphetamine is a highly addictive, man-made drug that can be, and I remember you just swallowed a pill, but today can be injected, snorted, smoked and, of course, ingested orally. It causes these feelings, Mr. Speaker, of euphoria that last up to 24 hours, psychotic behavior, auditory hallucinations, mood disturbances, delusions, paranoia, potentially causing the user to experience homicidal or suicidal thoughts, as well as violent behavior, brain damage.

The scary part about this is it is so easily made, as the previous speakers have talked about, and these clandestine labs in these homes are a lot of times in rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a fairly rural area, northwest Georgia. I have one county in particular who are a great people. I will not mention the name of the county because they do not deserve, I do not think, to be overly criticized because they are working really hard to try to solve this problem in the northwest, but it is a huge problem, and I wanted to take an opportunity in particular, and in this instance I will name names.

One of my constituents, she is a real estate agent, works hard, single parent. Her name is Betty Brady. When I was in that county recently, Betty gave me a book that she had written, and it was just kind of a small paperback, almost a syllabus. It was the first time, Mr. Speaker, that she had ever made any attempt at authoring a book. That was not her profession. She is not a professional writer, but she wrote that book talking about her daughter Jennifer.

Jennifer's now, thank God, recovered fully from her methamphetamine addiction. She is 24 years old, young lady who is working very hard in the community now, with an outreach, working with law enforcement, talking in school, trying to bring awareness, just as this bill is going to do and why I am so much in favor of it. But it is a heartrending story of this perfect child. They have a son as well and this little perfect daughter, you know, the apple of their eye, and then all of the sudden she fell in with the wrong crowd and got into this methamphetamine addiction and just about destroyed her life. As Betty says in the book, so many of this young lady, her daughter Jennifer's friends did lose their lives, either by getting too much or main-lining something and then going into respiratory depression or whatever.

I am just shocked when I read some of the statistics, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime reports that more than 30 million people around the world use methamphetamine-type stimulants, a number that eclipsed the combined global use of cocaine and heroin.

That is the problem that Representative BAIRD is so aware of and why this H. Res. 556 is such an important thing to do, so that people like Betty Brady that are out there in the trenches struggling to make youngsters aware, this will be a week where they can really bring that focus and get into the schools and let people know that this is highly addictive. This is not just the speed that truck drivers used to take so they could drive to the west coast without stopping. This is something that is a very, very serious drug.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia, my colleague, Representative WESTMORELAND, for letting me take a few minutes and just talk about this, and I commend Representative BAIRD. We are fully supportive of it, and I am sure that an overwhelming majority, if not unanimous, vote on this is in order.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Drug Policy and the former Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

□ 1400

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank Mr. BAIRD for this resolution, which I strongly support.

As the ranking member of the Drug Subcommittee of the Government Reform Committee, I have traveled, along with Congressman SOUDER, throughout this entire country, and we have had an opportunity to go to many, many places that are usually rural in nature, and we have seen the effects of methamphetamine use. We have heard drug court judges, we have listened to foster care parents, we have listened to wonderful people like the lady that was just mentioned who have seen their children go through being addicted to methamphetamine.

While I am from an urban area, if I were to close my eyes and if we were to substitute the name of this drug for crack cocaine or cocaine, a lot of the same types of stories I have been hearing for many, many years in the 7th Congressional District of Maryland are the stories Mr. SOUDER and I heard all over urban areas throughout our country.

Drugs are a major damaging element in our society. I have seen so many families destroyed. And by the way, it is not just the person who uses the drug but their families are affected, their communities are affected and their children are affected. So often the property values go down in a neighborhood because of the use. Methamphetamines fall right in that category.

Methamphetamines are easy to produce. As a matter of fact, you can find the ingredients and how to do it and make them on the Internet, and that is one of the things that is so frightening about this. When I think about some of the addicts that live in my district, they often have a hard time getting ahold of the crack cocaine or getting ahold of the cocaine. When I think about methamphetamines, however, it seems as if this is one of the things that folks could do and find it might be a little easier and a little bit cheaper to get to.

That is one of the many reasons why we have to stand up and we have to do things like Representative BAIRD has suggested in this legislation. We have to make sure that parents are aware, that coaches, and that people in our communities are aware, neighbors and friends are aware so that perhaps we can prevent some of this.

As we traveled throughout the United States in our subcommittee, we had people come and testify and show us pictures of how they looked before using methamphetamines. And when we would see them, sometimes maybe a year later after using them, maybe 7 months later, they looked like a ghost of themselves.

As one young man said to me, and I shall never forget it as long as I live, it is embedded in the DNA of every cell in my brain, he said, when I went out there to simply get a high, I went and I got high over and over again. I would stay up for days. Stay up for days. And he said, I got high. Man, I thought I was on cloud nine. He said, then there came a time when I tried to get off and it was very difficult to do it. He said, but I finally licked it. But he said, then I looked at myself in the mirror and I said, self, will you forgive me? And he said self said back to him, yeah, I forgive you. And then he said something

that is embedded in the DNA of every cell of my brain. He said but my body wouldn't forgive me. My body that now looked about 10 or 15 years older with all kinds of sores all over his body.

So we must continue this fight. It is a very important fight. It is a fight for the soul of America. So often what happens is that people look at the drug war, if you want to call it that, the efforts to stop drugs, as a negative issue. But let me tell you something, there are too many lives that are being robbed every day, too much potential. When we think about our children and we think about people who are living a wonderful family life and doing well, the one thing that can suck the blood out of them, suck the life out of them and their communities is drugs.

So I applaud Mr. BAIRD and all of our colleagues who have made this methamphetamine war effort their effort. For I have often said that our children are the living messages we send to a future we will never see. But the fact is, if we do not address this issue now with prevention, intervention, and treatment, they will never see that future either.

And so I would hope that all of the Members of this great House will vote in favor of this legislation and that when methamphetamine week comes around that we will not just think of the rural areas and what is going on there with methamphetamines, but we will think about all our efforts dealing with drugs, all kinds of drugs, and remind ourselves that we are determined to make sure that this element, that this negative element, that this poison of death does not invade our communities. And if it does, that we will stand up and fight with everything we have got, as if our lives depended on it, because they do.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add my congratulations to Congressman BAIRD for H.R. 556.

First of all, the good news. In many parts of the country, cocaine and heroin are being diminished rather rapidly. The bad news is that the reason in many cases this is happening is simply because methamphetamine has come in. Methamphetamine is cheaper. It is more addictive. If we had a map here, we could see the sweep of the growth of methamphetamine from the southwestern part of the United States all the way across the country, and now maybe just a few States in the northeast are somewhat preserved from having to battle this problem. But, of course, that problem is going to be coming in their direction.

The State of Nebraska recently released a study which indicated there were 22,000 people addicted to methamphetamine. In the State of Nebraska, that would be equivalent to about the eighth or ninth largest community in the State of Nebraska. A study in Arkansas recently indicated that the average meth addict will cost the State of Arkansas $47,500, in view of crimes, children in foster care, time in prison and so on. So if you multiplied that out, 22,000 people by $47,500, you are talking about over $1 billion in a State with 1.7 million people. So it is a significant, huge problem.

Just as an example of one of the more innocent victims, a child born to a mother addicted to methamphetamine will usually cost anywhere from $700,000 to $1.7 million to get that child from birth to age 18 because of the devastation and the defects the methamphetamine has caused in that child, not to mention the amount of pain the child goes through.

So as has been mentioned earlier, there really is not one answer to this problem. It has to be multifaceted. And, really, we are looking at three things.

Number one is education. And as Congressman BAIRD mentioned, the scary thing is that the age is getting less and less and less. So you have to start in about the 3rd or 4th grade letting kids know what this is, what is in it. You also have to educate parents, because parents are the number one determinant as to an attitude that a person is going to have towards substance abuse.

So for every dollar that we spend at the front end in education and prevention, it has been proven that we save $10 or $15 at the back end in terms of the devastation that the drugs cost. So we have to spend more in prevention, we have to spend more in education, and I think that is something this body needs to keep in mind.

Secondly, law enforcement. The number one law enforcement tool we have for methamphetamine is the drug task forces, and this is funded primarily by the Byrne Grants. Last year, we zeroed out the Byrne Grants. And we fought with every fiber that we had here to get about two-thirds of that funding back, but it wasn't enough. So we have to make sure that the Byrne Grants are fully funded, because again, in the White House budget, they have been zeroed out this year. We absolutely have to have those.

And the last issue is treatment. It has been proven that drug courts are much more effective than throwing people in prison. We have so many people who are simply addicted and they are sent to prison. A drug court enables them to be tested twice a week, they get treatment, and they can usually hold their families together and pay taxes. So we think these are all things that are very, very important.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The gentleman from Illinois has 8 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for giving me time to speak in favor of H.R. 556. I would like to especially thank one of my own constituents, way in the past, back in the early 1950s, I think, when Congressman BAIRD stomped my district, the Third Congressional District. I want to thank him for his leadership in this arena.

Mr. Speaker, an epidemic is sweeping our great Nation. It is an epidemic that affects people in all congressional districts, especially those congressional districts that are mainly rural. It has no regard for gender, race, economic status or where you live. Of course, I am speaking about the use of methamphetamine. This drug is easy to make, easy to get, and easy to fall victim to.

We have all seen the ways in which meth transforms individuals, from soccer moms to addicts living on the streets. Mr. Speaker, I fully support H.R. 556, and I am a cosponsor of this important resolution.

I am a believer in the old saying that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and it is clearly understood that for every dollar that the Federal Government spends in prevention programs, it saves the Federal Government $7 in cure. By passing this important resolution and expressing our support for the National Methamphetamine Prevention Week, we take one more important step towards eliminating meth.

As we are having this debate, I want to raise awareness of other actions, as our previous speaker talked about. I have joined my colleagues in urging the Budget Committee to restore funding for the JAG-Byrne Grants and the COPS programs. Both of these funding streams aid local law enforcement agencies in their work to eradicate meth from our neighbors. This money goes towards paying the cost of investigating, prosecuting, and cleaning up peddlers of meth and their highly toxic labs. We cannot stop idly by and watch this important funding disappear.

Mr. Speaker, today I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 556 and support restoring funding for other important law enforcement tools as we take up the budget this week.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. GINGREY for their thoughtful remarks.

Just to close my portion of this commentary, people sometimes ask why I am so committed to this. Before I was in Congress, I spent 23 years as a clinical psychologist and I saw cases of families and lives devastated by meth. Since coming to Congress, I visit every high school in my district, I try to do it every 2 years, and last fall, I visited

a little tiny rural school and was talking to the kids about the danger of methamphetamines.

And this little 16-year-old gal said quietly to her classmates, you really need to listen to what he says. I was taken aback that a young lady would speak out in front of her peers. And I gently said, you know, you must have some experience with this. And she said, I do. My mother died of methamphetamine use 3 months ago.

Then I was back this spring, on our spring recess which we all just came back from a couple of weeks ago, and a woman handed me a letter that described how her 2-year-old granddaughter was beaten to death by a meth addict boyfriend who was in the house at the time and was tweaking on methamphetamine. He struck her so hard she died, and then just put her in bed for someone else to find the next day. This was a little 2-year-old girl, the apple of her family's eye.

And as if that isn't enough, I was speaking to a rotary club about something entirely different, and a prominent leading businessman came up to me quietly, shook my hand, and said, thank you for what you are doing on the issue of methamphetamine. My 25-year-old son is addicted to this drug and it would not surprise us if he died of his use of this drug.

Methamphetamine, as my colleagues have said, is a devastating drug, and we must do everything in our power to keep families' lives from being further destroyed by it. And I thank all my colleagues for supporting this important resolution and hope we can make a difference, and I know we can if we work together.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will use the rest of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, let me commend all those who have spoken on this issue, and I commend Mr. BAIRD for bringing it before us.

Drug use and abuse is one of the major problems facing our country today, not in any one part of the country but all over America. I happen to live in a county where there are 800,000 drug users, where there are 300,000 who admit to using drugs on a regular basis.

□ 1415

I admit it is a large county. It is the second largest county in the Nation. But even with it being the second largest county in the Nation, 800,000 people, that is an awful lot. Much of the crime that exists in our country is associated with drug use and abuse. We have to make sure that we provide the resources for prevention. We also have to make sure that we provide the resources for treatment. I am an advocate for something called treatment on demand where we try and make sure when people who are addicted are ready for treatment, resources are available for them. I commend the gentleman from Washington for introducing this legislation, and I urge its passage.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 556, a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Methamphetamine Prevention Week should be established to increase awareness of methamphetamine and to educate the public on ways to help prevent the use of that damaging narcotic.

Meth addiction is a growing problem in the United States and one that is destroying lives, families and towns.

I agree that the United States must face this problem head on. However, there are many drugs that are equally as damaging and should not be overlooked.

Crack cocaine has ravaged our cities for more than 20 years. Crack is very addictive, and after even a small amount of use can cause significant damage to a user's health.

One way the U.S. Government attempted to fight the crack epidemic was to impose mandatory minimum prison sentences. Under the terms of these mandatory minimum sentences, someone caught carrying just 5 grams of crack received an automatic 5-year prison sentence. To receive the same sentence for powder cocaine, a person must be caught with 500 grams of powder cocaine under current law.

As Families Against Mandatory Minimums (FAMM) notes, mandatory minimum sentences affect people of color disproportionately in three ways: More arrests for drug crimes, overall increases in the severity of drug sentences, and harsher treatment compared to white arrestees.

This sad fact is clearly revealed in our Nation's prison statistics: Two-thirds of the 2 million Americans in jail or prison are African American or Hispanic. African Americans make up approximately 12 percent of the population and are 13 percent of the drug users, yet they constitute 38 percent of all drug arrests and 59 percent of those convicted of drug offenses. Nationwide, African American males sentenced in State courts on drug felonies receive prison sentences 52 percent of the time, while white males are sentenced to prison 34 percent of the time.

Mr. Speaker, as Congress debates how best to address the meth problem, I urge my colleagues to resist the simple answer of "more jail time." Mandatory prison sentences do not work and do not provide hope for our Nation's drug users.

Instead, we should push education, as this resolution calls for. We should also substantially increase funding for treatment and job training because without these tools, addiction will be a vicious cycle for most people.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 556, a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Methamphetamine Prevention Week should be established to increase awareness about methamphetamine and to educate the public on ways to help prevent the use of this damaging narcotic. Methamphetamine, or meth, has become the most dangerous drug problem of small-town America.

Meth is a highly-addictive and treatment-resistant drug produced from readily-accessible materials found in every local hardware or drug store in America. The explosion of this very destructive synthetic drug has already taken a brutal toll on children, families and the environment in my district in Minnesota and across the Nation. Dealing with the enormous economic and social effects of meth—whether it is diverting tax dollars from already-strapped county budgets, or devoting manpower hours to locate and clean up remote meth labs, or treating meth addicts at the local hospitals and clinics—consumes our society's resources at an astounding rate.

A daunting challenge of the meth epidemic lies in the very nature of this drug; it is a highly addictive substance that is considered to be the most treatment-resistant of all illegal drugs. Many people get hooked after only one use, and some recent studies have demonstrated that meth causes more damage to the brain than heroin, alcohol, or cocaine. Meth use not only modifies behavior in an acute state, but after taking it repeatedly, the drug also literally changes the brain in fundamental and long-lasting ways. Helping meth addicts is a very difficult and expensive proposition, because 30 days of treatment is often not enough. This all-consuming addiction is harmful not only to the user, but to that user's children, who are robbed of nurturing parents and a secure home; nationwide, approximately 3,200 children were present during the seizure of meth labs last year alone.

Our health care and social services systems need more funding for prevention and treatment, because only by breaking that cycle of demand can we bring lasting change to the entire community. Parents and educators play a vital role in encouraging young people to make the right decisions, because many children do not understand the inherent risks associated with experimenting with the drug. Preventing drug use is the first step to avoiding drug addiction, and H. Res. 556 will provide the opportunity to dedicate one week out of the year to engage students and children in discussions and activities that will underscore the importance of living a meth free life.

Like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am very concerned about the threat that the meth epidemic poses to local communities in my Congressional district and across the Nation. Earlier this year, I introduced the Methamphetamine Eradication Act (H.R. 4763), which is a balanced, comprehensive federal approach to addressing problems related to meth abuse. As a Co-Chair of the Congressional Rural Caucus' Meth Task Force, I will continue to work with my colleagues in Congress to increase public awareness and to find a bipartisan solution to the meth epidemic.

The Federal Government must be a more effective partner in the fight to eliminate the threat posed by meth. By establishing a National Methamphetamine Prevention Week, we can give our local communities the opportunity to highlight their meth-related activities and take pride in their response to the scourge of this drug.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 556. This resolution supports the establishment of a National Methamphetamine Prevention Week to increase public awareness throughout the country of the harmful effects of methamphetamine and to educate local communities on ways to effectively prevent and curb methamphetamine use.

The production, trafficking, and use of methamphetamine are growing and significant substance abuse and public health issues for the United States. Methamphetamine has

emerged in recent years as a leading national drug control policy challenge. Coordination between all levels of government is needed if the challenge of curbing methamphetamine use is to be met and fulfilled. Public awareness and involvement is also important to effectively preventing the use of methamphetamine within our local communities.

Guam is no exception to the alarming trends in methamphetamine use. The trafficking and use of methamphetamine on Guam has risen in recent years and directly affected the youth of our island. Today methamphetamine-related arrests on average constitute three quarters of the adult drug-related arrests on Guam each year. The Guam Department of Customs and Quarantine has seized more grams of amphetamines than any other illegal narcotic over the past several years. Additionally, more than half of the individuals admitted for substance abuse treatment on Guam are methamphetamine users.

The increase in the abuse of the drug spans all ethnic, cultural, and age groups. There are currently no national observances or coordinated programs dedicated to the fight against methamphetamine despite the alarming national and local trends. A "National Meth Prevention Week" would be the first of its kind. I strongly support H. Res. 556 for this reason and know that such an undertaking would facilitate a national dialogue for communities to share information on what programs, methods and initiatives work best for combating methamphetamine use.

I look forward to promoting National Meth Prevention Week on Guam. I thank our colleague from Washington, Mr. BAIRD, and our colleague from Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, for their leadership on national drug control policy and in particular for the efforts in promoting national awareness of the dangers associated with methamphetamine abuse.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 556, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 556.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. 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.

## AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 360) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 360

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*,

**SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 25th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service (in this resolution referred to as the ''event''), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to honor the law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2005.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on May 15, 2006, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

**SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

**SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.**

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event.

**SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.**

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 360.

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

There was no objection.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 360 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service to be held on Monday, May 15, 2006.

I am pleased to join the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for the second consecutive year in sponsoring the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary annually sponsor this event honoring some of America's bravest men and women. The memorial service will honor the 155 Federal, State and local law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting their communities in 2005.

I would also like to recognize the five peace officers killed in the line of duty in 2005 from my home State of Pennsylvania: Edward Schroeder, Jr., Jesse Sollman, Paris Williams, Sr., Brian Gregg, and Joseph Pokorny. We are grateful for their service and sacrifice.

This will be the 25th time that this event has been held on the grounds of the Capitol. This memorial service is part of National Police Week, which was created by law in 1962 and runs this year from May 9 through May 15.

Police Week draws officers, their families, and survivors of fallen officers from around the country, and includes such events as the Blue Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral Church, a candlelight vigil at the National Law Enforcement Memorial, and a 50–K relay race.

The memorial service begins at noon on Monday. Following the ceremony on the Capitol Grounds, there will be a procession to the Law Enforcement Memorial and a wreath-laying ceremony.

I encourage my colleagues to attend this much-deserved memorial service and honor those who protect our communities on the front lines.

I would also like to recognize Jacob Joseph Chestnut and John Michael Gibson, the two Capitol Police officers killed in the line of duty in 1998. Both 18-year veterans of the Capitol Police, their sacrifice will never be forgotten.

The authorization of the use of the Capitol Grounds is just one of the ways Members of Congress recognize the service of peace officers and memorialize those who have fallen in the line of duty.

I was proud to be part of the First Annual Congressional Longest Yard Classic, a bipartisan fund-raiser to benefit the Capitol Police Memorial Fund, which assists the families of the fallen Capitol Police officers like Jacob Chestnut and John Gibson, who bravely gave their lives defending the United States Capitol and many of us who work here.

The idea of a football game fund-raiser was conceived by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI). It was a takeoff of the movie ''The Longest Yard'' with Members of Congress acting as the inmates and the Capitol Hill Police the guards. We were to battle it out on the gridiron. I thank Mr. RENZI for his help in organizing the fund-raiser and thank the 33 Members of Congress who participated. Some would say it was a wonderful experience despite the rain, but I would say it was a wonderful experience because of the rain.

Those 33 Members of Congress, all of us washed-up athletes, were able to

play the much-superior Capitol Police Force to a 12–12 tie. For us it was a great joy. But most importantly, we were able to raise nearly $60,000 for the Capitol Police Memorial Fund. I look forward to next year and for the match-up to continue to honor these brave men and women, and also for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service, which will be held on Monday, May 15. I support this measure and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

House Concurrent Resolution 360 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 25th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service, a most solemn and respectful public event honoring the brave, heroic officers who have fallen in the line of duty. The event, scheduled for May 15, will be in coordination with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police.

Mr. Speaker, on average, one officer is killed in this country every other day. Approximately 23,000 are injured every year, and thousands more assaulted. Sadly, 155 names will be added to the memorial wall this year, including the names of five women who were killed in the line of duty. The fallen officers come from 32 States, the Federal Government, and Puerto Rico. Their average age was 38 years and 7 months. The youngest officer was 21 years old.

The memorial service is a fitting tribute to Federal, State and local police officers who gave their lives protecting our families, our homes, our places of work. They serve every day on the front lines in the battle to keep our communities safe. They sacrifice so much, and for this we are all, each of us, eternally grateful.

It is in this spirit of appreciation that in my hometown, Buffalo, Police Officer Greg O'Shei initiated the public recognition of fallen officers by memorializing their names on signs posted throughout the city of Buffalo. Officer O'Shei's efforts have reminded us every day in Buffalo and throughout the Nation of these brave sacrifices that are made daily.

The ceremony to be held on May 15 is the 25th anniversary of this memorial service which was established as a national event by President Kennedy in 1962. Consistent with all Capitol Hill events, the memorial service will be free and open to the public. I support the resolution and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this tribute to our fallen peace officers.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure and thank my colleague from New York for his tribute to those fallen officers and people who serve and protect us every day.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 360, a resolution to authorize use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service on May 15, 2006.

In October 1962, President Kennedy proclaimed May 15th as National Peace Officers' Memorial Day. Each year on this date we, as a Nation, have an opportunity to honor the devotion with which peace officers perform their daily task of protecting our families, co-workers, friends, and ourselves. The 2006 event marks the 25th anniversary of the Capitol Hill event. In the post September 11 environment, the work of selfless police and firemen has become our model of courage and moral strength.

There are approximately 700,000 sworn law enforcement officers serving the American public today. Ten percent of the police force officers are women. Law enforcement officers include those that work not only for states, counties and the federal government, but also military police, correction officers, and peace officers in the U.S. territories. In 2005, 155 officers were killed on the job; 5 of these officers were women. The leading cause of death was gunshot wound.

It is most fitting and proper to honor the lives, sacrifices, and public service of our brave peace officers. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 360.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 360.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HONORING AND CONGRATULATING MINNESOTA NATIONAL GUARD ON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 371) honoring and congratulating the Minnesota National Guard, on its 150th anniversary, for its spirit of dedication and service to the State of Minnesota and the Nation and recognizing that the role of the National Guard, the Nation's citizen-soldier based militia, which was formed before the United States Army, has been and still is extremely important to the security and freedom of the Nation.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 371

Whereas the Minnesota National Guard traces its origins to the formation of the Pioneer Guard in the Minnesota territory in 1856, two years before Minnesota became the 32nd State in the Union;

Whereas the First Minnesota Infantry regiment was among the first militia regiments in the Nation to respond to President Lincoln's call for troops in April 1861 when it volunteered for three years of service during the Civil War;

Whereas during the Civil War the First Minnesota Infantry regiment saw battle at Bull Run, Antietam, and Gettysburg;

Whereas during a critical moment in the Battle of Gettysburg on July 3, 1863, 262 soldiers of the First Minnesota Infantry, along with other Union forces, bravely charged and stopped Confederate troops attacking the center of the Union position on Cemetery Ridge;

Whereas only 47 men answered the roll after this valiant charge, earning the First Minnesota Infantry the highest casualty rate of any unit in the Civil War;

Whereas the Minnesota National Guard was the first to volunteer for service in the Philippines and Cuba during the Spanish-American War of 1898, with enough men to form three regiments;

Whereas one of the three Minnesota regiments to report for duty in the War with Spain, the 13th Volunteer regiment, under the command of Major General Arthur MacArthur, saw among the heaviest fighting of the war in the battle of Manila and suffered more casualties than all other regiments combined during that key confrontation to free the Philippines;

Whereas after the cross-border raids of Pancho Villa and the attempted instigation of a war between the United States and Mexico, the border was secured in part by the Minnesota National Guard;

Whereas the Minnesota National Guard was mobilized for duty in World War I, where many Minnesotans saw duty in France, including the 151st Field Artillery, which saw duty as part of the famed 42nd ''Rainbow'' Division;

Whereas the first federally recognized Air National Guard unit in the Nation was the 109th Observation Squadron of the Minnesota National Guard, which passed its muster inspection on January 17, 1921;

Whereas a tank company of the Minnesota National Guard from Brainerd, Minnesota was shipped to the Philippines in 1941 to shore up American defenses against Japan as World War II neared;

Whereas these men from Brainerd fought hard and bravely as American forces were pushed into the Bataan Peninsula and ultimately endured the Bataan Death March;

Whereas men of the Minnesota National Guard's 175th Field Artillery, as part of the 34th ''Red Bull'' Division, became the first American Division to be deployed to Europe in January of 1942;

Whereas when the 34th Division was shipped to North Africa, it fired the first American shells against the Nazi forces;

Whereas the 34th Division participated in six major Army campaigns in North Africa, Sicily, and Italy, which led to the division being credited with taking many of the enemy-defended hills in the European Theater as well as having more combat days than any other division in Europe;

Whereas the Minnesota National Guard served with distinction on the ground and in the air during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm;

Whereas Minnesota National Guard troops have helped keep the peace in the former Yugoslavia, including 1,100 troops who have seen service in Bosnia, Croatia, and Kosovo;

Whereas the Minnesota National Guard has participated in keeping America safe after September 11th, 2001, in numerous ways, including airport security;

Whereas the Duluth-based 148th Fighter Wing's F–16s flew patrols over cities after September 11th for a longer time than any other air defense unit;

Whereas over 11,000 members of the Minnesota National Guard have been called up for full-time service since the September 11th terrorist attacks;

Whereas as of March 20, 2006, Minnesota National Guard troops are serving in national defense missions in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Kuwait, Qatar, Oman, and Iraq;

Whereas more than 600 Minnesota National Guard troops have been deployed to Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom;

Whereas members of the Minnesota National Guard, serving in the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Infantry Division, have been a part of the State's largest troop deployment since World War II, with more than 2,600 citizen soldiers called to service in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas the Minnesota National Guard has greatly contributed not only to battles but to the suppressing of violent riots, such as the 1947 national meat processors strike, in which they aided helpless police officers, and the fight against natural disasters such as the Red River flood in 1997 in which they organized search and rescue missions, helped shelter people who were left homeless, ran logistics, and helped sandbagging efforts; and

Whereas on April 17, 2006, the Minnesota National Guard will celebrate its 150th anniversary along with its historical and recent accomplishments: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) honors and congratulates the Minnesota National Guard for its spirit of dedication and service to the State of Minnesota and to the Nation on its 150th anniversary; and

(2) recognizes that the role of the National Guard, the Nation's citizen-soldier based militia, which was formed before the United States Army, has been and still is extremely important to the security and freedom of the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 371 honoring and congratulating the Minnesota National Guard on its 150th anniversary. Since Minnesota's early days as a frontier territory, Minnesotans have stepped forward to protect and defend their fellow citizens.

Tracing their origins back to the Territorial Pioneer Guard, today's National Guardsmen continue to proudly serve their State and Nation in times of crisis and need. It is this dual service that makes the National Guard unique among our Nation's military services. Whether it is reinforcing levees along the Red River that borders Minnesota and North Dakota, patrolling the skies above New York City, or escorting supply convoys in Iraq, members of Minnesota's National Guard have answered the call of State and national leaders, as they have done for 150 years.

In recent years, unprecedented natural disasters have highlighted the Minnesota National Guard's traditional State role. In April 1997, heavy winter snowfall and unseasonably warm spring temperatures combined to cause massive flooding of the Red River which forced the evacuation of 50,000 citizens from Grand Forks, North Dakota. As we stand here today, Minnesota's National Guard is again moving to the Red River.

National Guardsmen and residents of both States struggled valiantly to keep the rising water at bay. Despite their best efforts that year, the river could not be contained. Floodwaters quickly breached the levee near Breckenridge, Minnesota, forcing its 4,000 residents to flee. In the midst of heavy rain, snow and 60-mile-an-hour winds, Minnesota National Guardsmen seamlessly switched from their engineering mission to rescue and evacuation operations. Residents of western Minnesota remember the destruction wrought by the floodwaters, later described as a once-in-500-years event; but they also recalled that Minnesota's citizen soldiers were there to assist them throughout the disaster.

In 2005, members of the Minnesota Guard were again called to the scene of a major natural disaster, and the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina soon developed into our Nation's largest evacuation and recovery operation.

Quickly overwhelmed by the devastating effects of the hurricane, the State governments of Mississippi and Louisiana urgently requested assistance, and Minnesota National Guard in conjunction with units from other States responded. C–130s from the St. Paul-based 133rd Airlift Wing hauled more than 600 passengers and 370 tons of cargo to the stricken States while Minnesota Army National Guard aviators transported over 400,000 pounds of sand bags to help reinforce the failing levees.

Since the tragedy of September 11, 2001, the Minnesota National Guard has also answered the calls of our national leadership to perform vital Federal missions.

□ 1430

Following the attacks on New York and Washington, D.C., F–16s from the Duluth-based 148th Fighter Wing provided combat air patrols over the two cities and deployed personnel and aircraft to an alert facility at Tyndall Air Force Base in Florida.

In the years since 9/11, Minnesota's Army National Guard has assumed key stabilization missions throughout the world.

Though the treaty that ended years of conflict in the Balkans bears the name of an Ohio city, soldiers from the Minnesota National Guard played a large role in implementing that peace. In 2003, over 1,000 soldiers from Minnesota took over peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, performing such vital missions as collecting weapons and identifying mine fields to protect the civilian population.

The Balkan peacekeeping mission was expanded in 2004 when 1,000 members of the 34th Infantry Division, the famed ''Red Bulls,'' deployed to neighboring Kosovo. I was privileged to witness the great work performed by Major General Erlandson and his Minnesota Guardsmen who served on the KFOR mission in Kosovo.

The camaraderie and experience gained in Bosnia and Kosovo has lived on as those two previous deployments volunteered to accompany and assist their fellow Guardsmen as the 1st Brigade Combat Team from the 34th Infantry Division moves out for duty in Iraq. Having just completed 6 months of training in Mississippi, the first BCT has now moved into theater to assume responsibility for stability operations in Iraq.

As the 2,600 Minnesotans travel into harm's way, we must commend and remember the three members of the Minnesota National Guard who preceded them and made the ultimate sacrifice last year in defense of our freedom, 1st Lieutenant Jason Timmerman, Staff Sergeant David Day, and Sergeant Jesse Lhotka.

As we honor the Minnesota National Guard today for 150 years of service, we would do well to heed the words taken from a speech Lieutenant Timmerman wrote for the Lake Benton High School Veterans Day Ceremony in 2003: ''Show respect to those who have served. Most important of all, show your gratitude by enjoying the freedoms and rights that so many service members have fought and died for. Don't let their deaths be in vein. Exercise your right to vote, your right to free speech, and be happy for your freedom to do as you wish.''

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 371, honoring and congratulating the Minnesota National Guard for its dedication and service to the State of Minnesota and to the people of this Nation. The role of the National Guard has been and will continue to be extremely important to the security and freedom of the United States, and it is especially appropriate that we recognize this great organization. And so I join my colleague from the other side of the aisle in supporting this measure.

I would also like to recognize the gentlemen from Minnesota, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. KLINE, for bringing this resolution forward today.

Mr. Speaker, the National Guard represents the spirit of our Founding Fathers and our country's first citizen soldiers who formed the Guard before there was an Army. And the Minnesota National Guard traces its origins to

the formation of the Pioneer Guard in the Minnesota territory in 1856, 2 years before Minnesota became the 32nd State in the Union. The 1st Minnesota Infantry was among the first regiments in the Nation to respond to President Abraham Lincoln's call for troops in April of 1861, when these courageous soldiers volunteered for 3 years of service during the Civil War.

Since then, the Minnesota National Guard has served our Nation in countless ways. Its historical accomplishments are too numerous to list, and its recent contributions have been extraordinary.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are a Nation at war. Since the September 11 terrorist attacks, members of the Minnesota Guard have been keeping America's airports and waterways safe, and over 11,000 members have been called up for full-time service.

More than 600 troops have been deployed to Afghanistan for Operation Enduring Freedom. More than 2,600 citizen soldiers have been sent to Iraq. Other members of the Minnesota Guard are conducting important national defense missions in Pakistan and Kuwait and Qatar and Oman.

And so I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. The Minnesota National Guard deserves strong recognition, strong recognition for 150 years of dedicated service, and this is a fitting opportunity to honor its members, the sacrifices they are making every day, and their valuable contributions to the security and freedom of our Nation.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I now take a great deal of pleasure in yielding 5 minutes to the author of this bill, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), my good friend and my colleagues.

I am pleased to stand here and rise to speak in support of this resolution that we have offered to honor and congratulate the Minnesota National Guard on their 150th anniversary.

On April 17, 2006, the Minnesota National Guard will celebrate 150 years of history, a history that extends from the battlefields of the Civil War to the war on terror in the desert sands of Iraq.

When President Lincoln sent out his calls for troops in the early days of the Civil War, among the first militia units to respond were from Minnesota. These men, who were from the 1st Minnesota Infantry Regiment, saw battle at Bull Run, Antietam and Gettysburg.

At a pivotal moment in the pivotal Battle of Gettysburg in the fight to preserve our national union, the 1st Minnesota answered the call, even though it resulted in the suffering of the highest casualties of any unit in that war. In a real sense, they may have saved the Union.

On July 3, 1963, as my colleague, Gil Gutknecht, so eloquently will speak of, 262 men of the 1st Minnesota Infantry closed the gap in the Union line, stopped the desperate Confederate attack at the center of the line on Cemetery Ridge. Only 47 of them answered the roll call the next day.

Had these men not acted with courage and boldness to turn back the charge and buy the rest of the U.S. Army precious time to reinforce, Confederate forces may have been able to breach Union lines. What began as the beginning of the end of the war would have turned out differently on that day.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege to go to Iraq three times to meet our soldiers and the commanders on the ground. I prefer to talk to the people who are there to learn what is going on, not to see the latest sensationalist 30-second story of gloom and doom and defeat.

On one of these trips, I met with members of the Minnesota Guard serving with the 1st Cavalry Division. I asked them, what is your best and your worst experience here in Iraq? One of them said to me that his best experience was listening to the Iraqis complain to him. I said, you should be in Congress.

He told me that you knew that they knew that the Iraqis would never have dreamed of complaining to one of Saddam's soldiers. But even though he stood there with a rifle over his shoulder, clearly having power over them, they felt comfortable complaining to him, confirming that he and his colleagues had given them a gift of incomparable value, the gift of freedom, the gift of freedom of speech, the gift of protest.

That is what 2,600 members of the Minnesota National Guard now staging in Kuwait as part of the 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 34th Red Bull Division, the highest rated brigade in the whole Guard, are bringing to the Middle East. That is why my nephew interrupted his college studies to recently serve a tour of duty with the Minnesota Guard.

At the same time, while they are bringing safety and security to America by battling terrorists abroad, the Guard is also helping to bring relief to families in need at home. As we speak here today, members of the Minnesota National Guard are responding to destructive flooding in northwestern Minnesota where their experience, professionalism and planning are saving property and lives.

These selfless deeds, at home and abroad, show the sacrifice and heartfelt dedication of every member of the Minnesota National Guard.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that my colleagues and I rise to honor and congratulate the Minnesota National Guard for 150 years of service to their State and country.

I have absolute confidence that future generations of Americans will continue to witness firsthand the great deeds of the Minnesota National Guard, and will continue to have cause to say thank you.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the brave men and women who for the past 150 years have served Minnesota and Americans as members of the Minnesota National Guard.

I would also like to honor the family members who have stood by our Guardsmen and women during times of peace and war.

The men and women of the National Guard have contributed to the freedom and security of this country from their heroism in the Civil War to their service today in Iraq.

The Minnesota National Guard was key in ensuring victory for the Union forces at Gettysburg. They saw battle in the Spanish American War, World War I, World War II, Afghanistan, and Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

These brave men and women have also worked to help and keep the peace in Bosnia, Kosovo and Croatia.

Since September 11, over 11,000 members of the Minnesota National Guard have been activated to help serve and protect Minnesota and the United States. Today the members of the National Guard are serving both within the State and around the world.

In Minnesota, members of the National Guard are critical to helping Minnesotans protect their businesses, their homes and their schools. And they are prepared to stand with them to help these very same citizens rebuild their lives after the flooding recedes in the Red River Valley.

Just last month, I had the honor of attending, along with Congressman COLLIN PETERSON, a send-off celebration for over 2,600 members of the Minnesota National Guard. They were being deployed to Iraq from Camp Shelby, Mississippi.

And I also had the privilege of attending a deployment at St. Paul Holman Field. It was wonderful and a very special moment to be with these men and their families, these women and their families as they were deployed, because the sacrifices these men and women are making to serve our country, and being separated from their families and loved ones is truly something that we as Americans should honor and respect.

It has also been my privilege to work closely with the Minnesota National Guard in my district to maintain the Arden Hills National Guard training site, as well as the Air Guard's Holman field facility. These two facilities are essential to keeping our community strong and the Guard prepared and Minnesota and our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Minnesota's National Guard is a proud and distinguished history. Farmers, factory

workers, policemen, students, doctors, business owners, for the past 150 years, have become citizen soldiers serving their country and their community.

Every Minnesotan, and all of America, owes a debt of gratitude to the brave men and women who serve our country today as in years past. And today, we send them our thoughts and our prayers for a speedy return home and a very safe return home.

And I would like to take a second to honor a veteran from Minnesota who is on the floor, Mr. KLINE, and his family for the service that they have given our country, for the active duty are also standing side by side.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her kind words. And now I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I too pay tribute to Colonel KLINE for your heroic service to the country that we all love.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 371, to honor, congratulate and thank the brave men and women of the Minnesota National Guard on its 150th anniversary.

The Minnesota National Guard represents the very best of duty, honor and country. I join the people of the Third Congressional District of Minnesota in thanking each and every Guard member, past and present, for their selfless service.

Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out by previous speakers today, the Minnesota National Guard traces its origins to the Pioneer Guard of the Minnesota territory in 1856, formed 2 years before Minnesota became the 32nd State. The 1st Minnesota Infantry was among the very first regiments to respond to President Lincoln's call for troops during the Civil War.

□ 1445

In fact, the 1st Minnesota Infantry had the highest casualty rate of any unit in the Civil War. The Minnesota National Guard went on to serve bravely in the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II. The Minnesota National Guard also served with great distinction on the ground and in the air during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and Minnesota Guard troops have helped keep the peace in the former Yugoslav republics.

Following the September 11, 2001, attacks by the terrorists on our country, the Minnesota National Guard provided airport security and the 148th Fighter Wing flew F–16 security patrols over United States cities for a longer time than any other air defense unit.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Minnesota National Guard troops are serving in the war on terror in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. More than 3,000 citizen soldiers just recently were called to service in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, and our thoughts and prayers are with each of those Minnesota troops. In addition, Minnesota National Guard troops are serving in national defense missions in numerous other countries as well.

Off the battlefield, Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota National Guard has provided countless services to our communities, assisting citizens devastated by natural disasters and maintaining law and order.

Mr. Speaker, great moments and triumphs in American history require valor, bravery, and selfless service, and the brave men and women of the Minnesota National Guard have led the charge for 150 years.

To the men and women of the Minnesota National Guard, congratulations on your 150th anniversary, and thank you. Thank you for your service to Minnesota and your service to our Nation.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I join my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating our Minnesota National Guard on its 150th anniversary. As my colleagues from Minnesota and our floor manager on the Democratic side have mentioned, this Minnesota National Guard has had a great and distinguished career of service to the Nation.

There is no greater public service than that of military duty. There is no longer a tradition than that of the citizen soldier. It goes back to the very beginnings and foundation of our Nation and of our fight in the Revolutionary War for independence.

Our National Guardsmen served in the Civil War, Gettysburg. They served in the Spanish-American War and World War I, World War II, at Wood Lake, Philippines, Meuse-Argonne in France, and Bataan, North Africa, Sicily, in Korea, in Vietnam, in Kuwait, in Iraq. They have served in Bosnia and Kosovo. And after September 11 it was our Minnesota Air National Guard that flew cover for months over our Nation's capital. Our Guard unit from my district, from Duluth, put in endless and wearying hours. We could hear those aircraft in the wee hours of the morning, protecting us against the foe unknown or terrorist attack that we could not imagine, and they did it without complaint but with enormous professionalism.

This coming Saturday Cloquet E Battery, the 216th Air Defense Artillery Unit, will return safely from their duty in Saudi Arabia and in Iraq.

Over 11,000 of our Minnesota Guardsmen have served some two and three tours of duty in the gulf. We salute them, congratulate them for their extraordinary service.

I have been, as many of my colleagues have already attested in their own experience, to both send-off and return ceremonies. The most impressive is the open arms, the love with which our citizen soldiers are received on their return, the grateful hearts, the admiration of friends and family for the service that they have performed so selflessly, the tears that are shed, the joy of relief at coming home, but also the anxiety about returning to their job, their place of employment.

After two or three displacements, some have had concerns. Fortunately, employers in most cases have been responsive to their duty to our National Guard, and as they return home and continue their citizen soldier service to America, as we provide for those in the field the necessary body armor, equipment, support services to carry out their duties in the field, we must provide for them as they eventually become veterans and assure that they are treated with the respect of our World War II vets, our Korea vets. And we have learned a great deal from the Vietnam veterans. They too have taught us great lessons, and those lessons must not be lost upon this body nor upon the American public as we welcome home the Iraqi veterans and incorporate them again into society and accord them the support services that they will need and that they deserve and have truly earned.

I join my colleagues in the delegation in saluting our Minnesota National Guard on its 150th anniversary, and I join my colleague, Ms. MCCOLLUM, in congratulating our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, manager of the bill on the floor, for his service to our country in the Marine Corps.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

I would like now to yield 4 minutes to a real historian of this famous Minnesota National Guard, my colleague from the First District of Minnesota, Mr. GUTKNECHT.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am very pleased to be here and join my colleagues from Minnesota. I want to thank my colleague from North Carolina for his kind remarks as well.

Like the mighty Mississippi River, the tradition and pride of the Minnesota National Guard is long and deep. For 150 years Minnesotans have proudly taken their places in that long line of citizen soldiers, that long line that has never failed us.

Much has been said already today and I will try not to be redundant, but I do want to share some of the history of this very historical Guard. As has been mentioned, they were organized before Minnesota even became a State. Now, 150 years is a long time and many things have changed in our State, in our Nation, in our world. But there has been one constant, and that is the professionalism and the sense of service that we take for granted from our own National Guard.

As was mentioned, in April of 1861, it just so happened that the Governor of

the State of Minnesota, Governor Ramsey, was here in Washington, D.C. on other business when we heard of the firing on Fort Sumter. And President Lincoln put out a call for troops, and Governor Ramsey became the first Governor in the Union to rush over to the White House and volunteer troops to serve to defend the Union. And it then fell upon the Minnesota 1st Infantry to be the first regiments volunteered to serve in that battle for the Union. And the story has been told that when they marched off to war, they were 1,066 strong, but by the end of the day of fighting of July 2, 1863, only 47 could answer the call. They suffered on the late afternoon of July 2, 1863, the highest percentage of casualties of any unit that fought in that tragic war. But they held the line that day. And to this day many people believe that they deserve to be called the saviours of our country because of their sacrifices.

Many years later the colonel who led that regiment, Colonel William Colville, was asked what he thought about as they charged down that hill that day, and he said, ''Gad, I thought of Washington.'' They knew what the stakes were, and they knew that they had to hold that line.

Earlier in the day that pivotal battle was fought, General Hancock rolled by and he asked Colonel Colville, ''How long can you hold your position?''

And he responded with a sentence which made military and political history and survives to this day as the motto of the 1st Infantry. He said, ''General, to the last man.'' And as we know, it became no idle boast.

Since the Civil War, the Minnesota National Guard has honorably served in the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Operation Desert Shield, Desert Storm. These soldiers helped defend the border against Pancho Villa and maintain the peace in Bosnia, Croatia, and Kosovo.

Today more than 600 National Guardsmen from Minnesota have been deployed to Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom. More than 2,600 Minnesota citizen soldiers are serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. In January I saw firsthand the courage and dedication of the Minnesota National Guard at Camp Shelby. Awaiting their deployment to Iraq, these volunteer men and women maintain the historic spirit and tradition of the Minnesota National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise in support of this resolution, and I congratulate and recognize the Minnesota National Guard's 150 years of dedicated service. Because of their sacrifices, our Nation and our State are more secure and millions around the world can look forward to a future of peace and freedom.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague from Minnesota, the ranking member of the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as well today to congratulate the Minnesota National Guard for their 150th anniversary, which I believe is officially on April 17. And it is with great pride that I do this because, as people have said, we have great shoulders in the Minnesota National Guard.

As has been mentioned by other speakers, they have a rich history, 2 years older than the State of Minnesota. They have participated in every military action that we have been involved in in this country. And as was mentioned today, we have over 2,600 soldiers that have recently been deployed, some of them yesterday, I believe, to Operation Iraqi Freedom. Many of those soldiers are from my district. Soldiers, too, of the 136th Infantry, called the Bearcats, they were also deployed in Bosnia. I had an opportunity to visit them there. I was as well in Camp Shelby a couple times to visit those folks. And typical of the Minnesota tradition, the Bearcats racked up the highest scores in the training that was done in Mississippi, higher than a lot of our regular Army forces. So we are very proud of them, and they believe in their mission. They are ready to go, and I am sure they are going to uphold the fine tradition of the Minnesota National Guard.

I would also like to recognize and thank their families, their loved ones, and their communities and their employers because those are the folks that probably have got the toughest job in this whole situation, especially with these people that have been deployed two or three times in the last 5 years, which a lot of these soldiers have. So we want to recognize them as well.

I also would like to recognize and thank the Guard and the members that are currently deployed to my communities in the Seventh District of Minnesota along the Red River in the north. We are again having another flood event up there that we seem to have every once in a while. We had a very serious one in 1997, where events very similar to what happened in New Orleans happened in the Red River Valley. The Guard did an outstanding job during that particular event. And today we have 136 Guardsmen that have been deployed up to the Red River Valley, and they are helping us get through this event again today.

I also want to applaud the State of Minnesota, which has undertaken a conscientious policy of providing pay differential to State employees that serve in the National Guard.

□ 1500

Of the approximately 12,000 Guard members in the State, about 500 of them work for the State of Minnesota, and their lives and the lives of their families, during this difficult time of activation, have been made easier by Minnesota's pay differential policy.

Mr. Speaker, I am also a cosponsor and strong supporter of legislation that would allow the Federal Government to follow Minnesota and provide pay differential for Federal employees activated in the Guard and Reserve. I hope that this body will pass this legislation soon, because it has worked well in Minnesota, and I know it will work well for the rest of the country.

So, once again, I rise to congratulate the men and women of the Minnesota National Guard on their 150th anniversary, and thank all of them for their service to the State of Minnesota and their service to the country. I know that they will make us proud, as they always have.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to take a few seconds to extend my thanks to the gentleman from North Carolina and my colleagues from Minnesota for their support today of the Minnesota National Guard and their very kind remarks. I would urge all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 371 and say happy birthday to the Minnesota National Guard.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution. I am proud of the Minnesota National Guard and its rich history. The First Minnesota Infantry regiment answered President Lincoln's call to duty in April 1861 and those Minnesota soldiers set the tone for the tenacity and bravery that has become the ingrained ethic of the Minnesota Guard.

The people who make up the Minnesota Guard are some of the brightest our state has to offer. Today, more than 2600 Minnesota National Guard members are in or en route to Kuwait for final preparations before they head to Iraq. The 1st Brigade Combat Team will be deployed to Iraq and is expected to be the only National Guard Brigade Combat Team in Iraq—all others are from active duty Army. This is the largest deployment of the Minnesota Guard since World War II.

While these brave men and women are serving our State and our country in a dangerous place, it is extremely important that we do our part to support them and their loved ones during and after the mission in Iraq. We must provide a strong network of support for families of deployed soldiers, and assist those families and soldiers during the difficult transition period following deployment.

I rise today in support of this resolution, in recognition of the Minnesota Guard's rich history, and in gratitude to those Minnesotans who have answered the federal call to duty.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 371.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 513, 527 REFORM ACT OF 2005

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 755 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 755

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 513) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify when organizations described in section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 must register as political committees, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend from Fort Lauderdale (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 755 provides 60 minutes of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration, modified by the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of H. Res. 755 and the underlying bill, H.R. 513, the 527 Reform Act of 2005.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of working on the lobbying and ethics reform effort currently underway in the House. Having worked so closely with so many Members on both sides of the aisle, I am very confident that there is a shared goal to protect the integrity of Congress and to uphold the public trust by implementing bold reform.

The Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act is moving, as Speaker HASTERT directed, through regular order, and it is being considered by five different committees. One way or another, many of the provisions of the bill focus on outside sources of influence, which have rightly been the targets of good government reform for decades, and I am very proud that we have provided leadership in that effort over the years.

As Members know very well, the current reform process has looked at everything from travel rules, to gift limits, to lobbying disclosure, a wide range of things. However, this entire good faith effort and the bipartisan effort that we are working on would come up woefully short if we did not address an area where outside influence in the form of unlimited contributions continues to play an enormous role. So today we are considering H.R. 513, the 527 Reform Act.

Congress has tried to limit big money in campaigns for many, many years. In fact, I will tell you, I wrote my senior thesis in college on the issue of campaign finance reform on the 1974 act, which was the first big Campaign Reform Act implemented in the post-Watergate era.

As colleagues who were here in 2002 will remember very well, we had a very spirited debate on the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. Among other goals that were put forward, this bill aimed to get rid of soft money. That was the goal that was stated by those who were champions of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. They wanted to do everything possible to ban soft money contributions from political parties, getting it out of the political process altogether.

Along with many of my colleagues, I expressed very strong reservations about banning soft money from parties. I voted against the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. I was very concerned about it. I worried that by limiting contributions and dictating who could give how much to whom, that we would be violating the first amendment.

I also seriously doubted that banning soft money from parties would effectively get that money out of the system itself. As many pointed out at the time, BCRA left an obvious and easy loophole to exploit because it did not, in fact, ban unlimited money from being raised and spent by political groups called 527s.

And make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, 527s are political organizations. The purpose of 527s under the law is to influence elections. The Supreme Court has written that 527 groups ''by definition engage in partisan political activity.''

527s were the natural recipients of the soft money that the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act denied to political parties expressly because they are defined by law as political organizations. In fact, many of these 527s were set up only after the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act passed just so they could be the recipients of the soft dollar contributions.

Now, as our colleague, Mr. LINDER, pointed out during that 2002 debate on BCRA, he said, ''By eliminating the role of parties, corporations and labor unions could become increasingly reliant on loopholes, allowing them to spend funds from their general treasuries to influence elections.'' Mr. LINDER went on to say, ''activities that would be undertaken without Federal regulation.''

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what has happened. Mr. LINDER was absolutely right when he portended this. Nonetheless, supporters of BCRA promised that it would indeed get big money out of politics. That, as one colleague said during those debates, would ''end the influence, the undue influence of big money in the political process.''

Where does this leave us today? For starters, the issue of free speech as it relates to limiting campaign donations is no longer a theoretical argument that many of us engaged in. Campaign limits are allowed, and BCRA is the law of the land, even though so many of us opposed it.

So while many of us did oppose those limits in contributions, we realize that we are governed by laws. We regularly talk about the rule of law. We are not simply governed by our principles, but, in fact, we are governed by the laws, and now every Member's duty, regardless of how we voted on the 2002 act, is to ask ourselves, is the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act working as it was intended?

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the answer is a resounding no, it is not. Soft money still dominates the political landscape. A handful, a very small handful of wealthy people, still funnel money to organizations involved in campaigns. But now it is going to 527s instead of to political parties.

Mr. Speaker, the money involved is enormous. In the 2003–2004 election cycle, 527 committees raised $425 million, nearly half a billion dollars. That is $273 million more than before the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act was enacted. As predicted, the soft money that used to go to political parties found its home in the so-called 527s. In fact, the top 25 individual donors gave more than $146 million in 2004. As I said, it is a very small group of people, from my perspective, exercising their first amendment rights. But with limits that the court has upheld, I think we have no response other than to respond. Twenty-five individuals, 25 individual donors, again, $146 million in 2004.

During the current election cycle, Mr. Speaker, that trend has already continued, and we have already seen more than $58 million expended by the 527s.

Now, we are not talking about a leaky roof here where just a little soft money is dripping into the system. We

are talking about half the roof missing, and money is literally pouring in to this political system.

Since the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act failed to take soft money out of politics, as even the bill's original authors concede, it is our duty to correct a flaw in the 2002 law. After all, if we are going to have Federal regulation of campaign finance, it better be fair, it better be consistent and it better be effective.

H.R. 513, the 527 Reform Act, restores balance and fairness to the system by making 527s register with Federal Election Commission and by subjecting them to the same Federal campaign finance laws as political parties, political committees and other political organizations. They would be allowed to raise a maximum of $25,000 per year for their non-Federal accounts and $5,000 for their Federal accounts.

Under this bill, 527s will still be able to engage in their political activities, such as Get Out the Vote and voter registration drives. They will just be subject to the hard dollar requirements for their spending. For instance, they will be required to spend only hard money for ads that refer to Federal candidates, and at least 50 percent hard money for ads that refer to a political party.

Mr. Speaker, I have offered an amendment to H.R. 513 that removes the limit on the amounts parties can spend in coordination with their own candidates. This was a bipartisan effort that was put together. Parties and their candidates should be free to work together to promote the issues they believe in and the arguments that they support. This change will increase transparency in campaign spending by allowing them to work together, rather than continuing the charade that the two entities don't know each other. There is no danger of corruption when a political party supports its own candidate.

527 reform has the backing of Democracy 21, Campaign Legal Center, the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, Public Citizen and U.S. PIRG.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not revolutionary; it is common sense. We are simply closing an enormous loophole by extending existing Federal campaign laws to 527s.

Opponents of this legislation claim that soft money now going to 527s would simply be funneled to other groups, such as the 501(c)s, yet there is a huge difference under the Tax Code and in real life between 527s and the 501(c) groups, namely, 527s are organized for political purposes. They exist for the purpose of influencing campaigns. 501(c)s are not established for that purpose. In fact, as a matter of Federal law, 501(c)s are not allowed to engage in political activity as their primary mission.

If, as opponents contend, soft money is funneled to 501(c)s and if politics becomes their major purpose, they will be in violation of the law.

□ 1515

I will add, if it becomes clear that further reforms are needed, Congress will act. Just as we are taking action now to tighten the existing law, we will be ready to act again. We all know, we have said it time and time again, reform is an ongoing process, and we are very proud to lead the effort for reform.

As long as the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act remains the law of the land, we must ensure that its provisions are applied fairly to all groups engaged in political campaigns. Now, some opponents of H.R. 513 also argue that subjecting 527s to campaign finance regulations limits free speech. I have to ask, where was this first amendment devotion during the 2002 debate? When I and others were making the point in 2002 that free speech would be violated, supporters of BCRA were awfully quiet on that issue.

Regardless of how one feels about that issue, the United States Supreme Court has ruled on numerous occasions that limiting political donations is constitutional. Most recently, they did it when they upheld the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act in McConnell v. FEC. So critics of this bill, Mr. Speaker, the very same people who predicted the demise of our democracy if soft money was allowed to flow to parties, now seem to have no trouble opposing a bill that allows soft money to flow to the 527s.

Just to be clear, some Members on the other side of the aisle want the very groups that spent more than $320 million on behalf of their candidates and policies in 2004 to be the only ones that can influence elections without dollar limits.

To be consistent, opponents of this bill would have to also oppose the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act ban on soft money going to parties. You cannot just pick and choose who is worthy of soft money. If it is bad, if it corrupts the system, if it silences the average voter, if it allows the wealthy to buy influence, all things that they argued in 2002, then it is not who receives soft money that is the issue; soft money itself is the issue.

Are my friends on the other side of the aisle saying they made a mistake in 2002? Have they reversed their position? Do they now support the utilization of so-called soft money? Do they wish to repeal the soft money provisions that were included in the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act? I suspect not.

I would urge my colleagues to be consistent with their past positions on campaign finance reform and oppose any dual system for free speech where one group has more protections than another.

Mr. Speaker, as with our entire reform effort, we are simply seeking to attain the proverbial level playing field, to make rules fair, to make them effective, and to make sure that they are enforced. We have an opportunity to patch a hole in the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act that would go a long way toward getting big money out of campaigns, as The Washington Post editorialized just this morning, to close the biggest remaining loophole in the campaign finance system. This is something that supporters in the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act believed strongly in in 2002. They have a chance to reaffirm their support today with this up or down vote on this simple issue. And for Members like myself who opposed BCRA back in 2002, we can support H.R. 513 because the legal challenges to the original reforms have been settled, and the shortcomings that we predicted have in fact come to pass.

Mr. Speaker, altogether, this should result in a strong bipartisan vote for transparency, disclosure, accountability, and reform.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, my very good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this closed rule, which blocks every single Member in this body from offering an amendment to the 527 Reform Act of 2006. This bill would amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, and require, among other things, certain political organizations involved in Federal election activities to register with the Federal Election Commission.

Yesterday, during the Rules Committee hearing, the majority on the committee reported out a closed rule. In doing so, this limited any opportunity for the House to fully vet this important issue. If Congress is the place for true deliberation of all points of view, then I ask, why are the Republicans so hasty to ramrod this bill through without opportunities to amend? Surely the majority realizes that abolishing spending limits is a move that intentionally pushes aside the interests of women, minorities, and other voters who may not be a part of the Republican base and therefore apparently are not worthy of regard. Or is it simply a maneuver to deny us serious debate about viable alternatives, such as one from Massachusetts offered by Representative TIERNEY? Representative TIERNEY's amendment, had it been made in order, would have completely eliminated the ability of industries and interest groups to unduly influence elections. His idea? The full public financing of elections. This proposal, which Republicans have blocked from consideration, is the only one that I have heard to date that completely protects the integrity of our elections and public policymaking process.

I am equally disappointed that my very good friends, Representatives

WYNN and PENCE, were denied an opportunity to offer their bipartisan proposal before the House. Let us force candidates to get themselves elected based on the merits of their argument rather than the depth of their campaign accounts, which have been padded heavily by the richest of U.S. industries.

One can only imagine what the Medicare bill would have looked like if the pharmaceutical industry hadn't contributed the hundreds of millions in campaign contributions to the President and Republican candidates. What about the energy bill, reeking with billion dollar tax breaks for energy companies? What would that bill have looked like if it weren't for campaign contributions to Members of Congress?

If we want to get serious about corruption in Congress, then we have to get serious about corruption in our elections. For those in America, myself included, who believe that outside influences have too much control in the political process, I say take them out of the process. Make it illegal for them to write campaign checks and support publicly financed congressional elections.

Seats in this and the other body are for sale to the highest bidder. But the majority of the American people do not have enough money to buy them.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have us to believe that this legislation, among other things, protects the integrity of campaign finance because it brings 527s out of secrecy. This is a false claim that could not be further from the truth.

My good friend, Representative DREIER, cited Common Cause. I guess it is about time for me to cite a former colleague of his and mine, Pat Toomey, the president of the Club for Growth; or John Berthoud, the president of the National Taxpayers' Union; or David Keene, the chairman of the American Conservative Union; or Grover Norquist, the president of Americans for Tax Reform. All of these peoples are opposed to this measure.

It is kind of interesting to me in Congress how up gets to be down and down gets to be up. But 527s are far from the clandestine operations that some may want us to believe. 527s do not operate behind closed doors. If you think they do, ask JOHN KERRY. Their work combines social awareness, advocacy, and political activities that provide everyone with tools for political knowledge.

Receipts and expenditures from 527s must be publicly disclosed and made available. In fact, 527s are already required by law to register with and report to the Internal Revenue Service. Their name is actually derived from the section of the United States Tax Code that regulates their financial activities. I think that we would all agree that it is difficult to have much more oversight than the Internal Revenue Service.

The administration and their friends in the Republican majority also intend for this new legislation to simultaneously stamp out free speech, voter outreach and the free flowing exchange of ideas. Unfettered political speech, be it at issues in the mail, by phone, on TV, on the radio, and especially over the Internet, is the basis for why our Founding Fathers fought so hard to make it a part of the very first amendment in our Constitution.

These are the tools Americans use to make informed decisions on the political issues before them. These are the activities that register people to vote, bring them to the polls, and engage them in necessary debate.

We should take heed from those who are only now establishing free and fair elections in some parts of the world. They found out the hard way that once freedom of speech eroded, it began a slippery slope that soon crushed their liberties as well as their governments.

Any time the majority wants to get serious regarding campaign finance and the influence of campaign dollars in the House, Democrats stand ready to have that discussion. And I am having a hard time understanding if way out there in America that people really do know the difference between soft money and hard money. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues for the sake of free speech and for the sake of a campaign process in which we all believe to oppose this closed rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a very able member of the Rules Committee and a great champion and understander of the issue of campaign finance and campaigns in general.

(Mr. COLE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the 527 Reform Act. This legislation will strengthen our political parties while subjecting 527s to the same regulations as other actors under our campaign finance system.

One of the most important provisions in this bill is the elimination of the limit on expenditures coordinated between party committees and candidates. That limit as it currently exists is unquestionably one of the worst features of our campaign finance system. It creates a needless barrier between parties and their candidates. The first step towards a better, cleaner campaign reform system that places candidates in control of their own campaigns is repealing of that provision as this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, political parties, other than perhaps the candidates themselves, are the most accountable actors in our campaign finance system. They have to answer to their members, to their donors, to the media, and most importantly of all, to the voters. Their activities are disclosed and well documented. National parties in particular seldom violate either the letter or the spirit of the law. They are responsible participants in the political process, unlike many 527s.

Additionally, parties serve a very useful role in our political process. One essential thing they have historically done is to rechannel factions of narrow special interests into broader, more public-spirited coalitions. Although not foreseen by our Founders, it is impossible to imagine the success of our democracy without the vital role parties have played.

As Clinton Rossiter, the scholar of American politics, once put it, No America without democracy, no democracy without politics, and no politics without parties.

Past efforts at reforming the campaign finance system often have had the unintended consequence of weakening political parties. The understandable desire of citizens to influence the outcome of elections does not go away with campaign restrictions.

□ 1530

Instead, the money they contribute sometimes flows from candidates and parties to unaccountable actors like 527s. This bill will help impede that process.

In 2004, after the passage of the McCain-Feingold bill, there was more money in politics than ever before, with just 25 wealthy individuals accounting for $146 million raised by 527 groups to influence that year's elections. That is not removing big money from politics. That is the manipulation of the political process by a wealthy elite.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word to those who spoke so eloquently in favor of the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act of 2002. If that law was not intended to limit the influence of money from unaccountable actors like 527s, then what was its purpose? And yet, many who voted for the McCain-Feingold bill will today vote against reforming 527s. That is, to put it politely, inconsistent.

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase a fine American, many of the opponents of 527 reform are effectively saying: ''I voted for campaign finance reform before I voted against it.'' Today, the supporters of the McCain-Feingold bill have an opportunity to pass real reform in a bipartisan way. McCain-Feingold supporters can choose between the principles they profess to hold or they can vote for what many believe is to their own short-term, partisan political advantage. And if they vote for the latter, after previously claiming to vote for the former, they will set off a political finance ''arms race'' that will flood the American political system with tens of millions of dollars from a few fabulously wealthy individuals.

That is an outcome we should all seek to oppose.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip, my very good friend.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

At a time when this Congress is embroiled in the most serious scandal in a generation, when a culture of corruption has swept over this body with no sign the Ethics Committee is addressing it, this body should be devoting the precious few days it has here to reforming its own culture and practices.

Today, the Republicans are doing what they so often do. They are trying to gag their opponents and further empower their supporters. They again abuse their legislative power to assault their adversaries. This is not reform. It is retaliation.

It is ironic that so many of the Republican leadership in opposing campaign finance reform argued so strenuously against campaign expenditure limits but now advocate limitations, not because of principle but because of political power and the abuse of that power.

The Republican leadership has chosen to take on political organizations in a cynical attempt to appear serious about reform and divert attention from its own ethical failures.

Mr. Speaker, the problem confronting our polity is not independent groups whose political activities are legal and are disclosed regularly to either the IRS or the FEC. We know who spends this money. The public can make a judgment.

Rather, it is the degree to which the Republican leadership has sacrificed the public interest, good public policy, and its own ethical conduct in order to amass, consolidate and perpetuate power through unseemly and unethical alliances with special interests like Jack Abramoff.

If this body were serious about reform, we would be debating the best way to eliminate the culture of corruption, not restrict the first amendment rights of political organizations.

Now, the previous speaker mentioned campaign finance reform. Let me quote some debate during the course of that consideration of that bill. The gentleman who brings this bill to the floor today, Mr. DREIER, I always like to quote Mr. DREIER because they are such different points of view that are reflected; you can almost get the whole spectrum of thought.

''Mr. DREIER: So we have these attempts being made by some to impose extraordinary, onerous regulations on the American people, jeopardizing their opportunity to come together and pursue their political interests that they have, that a shared group has; and I believe that is wrong,'' says Mr. DREIER. ''I believe it is wrong,'' Mr. DREIER said on February 13, 2002, ''to impose those kinds of regulations.''

We then had a vote on campaign finance reform by the same folks who are offering this bill to reform, and Mr. HASTERT voted ''no,'' Mr. BOEHNER voted ''no,'' Mr. BLUNT voted ''no,'' Mr. DELAY voted ''no,'' and, yes, my friend and my colleague from California (Mr. DREIER) voted ''no.''

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, very, very briefly, not to get into the issue of the dueling quotes, but let me quote from 1998 in the debate on this issue from my friend Mr. HOYER, who loves to carry in his pocket Dreier quotes. I do not regularly carry this one, but this was just provided to me.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 19, 1998, my friend said, ''In my view, genuine reform must purge from Federal elections unregulated soft money which has become so pervasive. The issue ads, which are so clearly intended to influence elections, must be covered.'' That was the statement made.

Let me say also, I completely stand by exactly what I said in that 2002 debate and I stand by that vote as my colleagues stand by that vote.

If the gentleman had heard my opening statement, I refer to the fact that we were not supporters of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. We were concerned about first amendment rights. We still are concerned about first amendment rights, but across the street, the United States Supreme Court upheld BCRA when they chose in McConnell v. FEC—

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if you will yield yourself some time, I will be glad to have some debate with you.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to have a debate with you but you need to yield some of the time.

Mr. DREIER. I think the gentleman still has time.

Mr. HOYER. I still have time, thank you very much.

Mr. DELAY said in another quote, ''Those who want to regulate through government the participation in the political process, I respect them trying to do that; I disagree with it.'' That is the way he voted, as you have pointed out. ''We ought to let the voters decide through instant disclosure to be able to tell and see while people are collecting their money and spending it to decide.'' In other words, disclosure. These are disclosed.

My view is, in light of the fact they are disclosed, you will vote ''no'' on this bill. My obvious supposition is you are not going to do that.

Today, this bill is about politics. You have changed your principle, in my opinion. You have changed your point of view. That is why you are voting differently than you did on campaign finance reform.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I respond by saying, we stand by our commitment to first amendment rights. We stand by our position of the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act, but that is the law of the land. We live with it today. We are simply trying to implement exactly what you said on June 19, 1998, when you said there should be even-handed regulation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what the gentleman has just said, he stands by what he said but he is going to adopt what I said to support this legislation. As usual, we have somewhat of an Alice in Wonderland approach.

This bill is about politics. This bill is about getting opponents that they presumed who have outraised them in the last election, but until the last election they did not want regulation. Why? Because their premise was they would raise more money, but when they found out that their opponents who disagreed with their failed policies for this country were communicating with the American public, then they said, oh, my goodness, we have to do something about that. They had this included in lobbying legislation, which we need to reform, as I have said, but guess what, they have taken it out, for political reasons, not for principle, I tell my friend from Massachusetts, not for principle, but for political reasons to try to undermine their opponents.

Today, we are missing an opportunity to look inward and expose ugly truths about the devolution of the legislative process from the one that the Framers had in mind when they created Article I of the Constitution.

I challenge the other side to explain to me why, 15 months into the 109th Congress, nothing, nothing has been done by this House to come to terms with the culture of corruption.

I challenge the other side to explain how H.R. 513 will increase the public's faith that elected representatives are addressing and adhering to the strictest ethical code and will pay an appropriate price if they veer from it.

I would suggest that today's debate underscores the extent to which a party that came to power 12 years ago, promising a bold new direction, has become insensitive to the issues that really matter in our Nation in 2006.

This bill is about politics. This bill is about a fear of losing power. This bill is about trying to undermine the voice of opposition in this country. This bill results from a fear that those who are opposing policies bad for the United States, bad for our people, bad for our families, undermining the security here at home and around the world will somehow be communicated correctly to the American people.

It was not until the last election, not until then, did those 176 people who on principle said we should not constrain this speech, this constitutional right that we have, and testified before the House Administration Committee, including Speaker Gingrich at one point

in time, and said that it was disclosure that was the issue, not constraint. It was not until the last election that that opinion was changed, that this bill came to the floor to undermine and gag those who oppose the policies being pursued.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself such time as I might consume to respond to some of the arguments of my friend Mr. HOYER.

First of all, let me make it very clear, our position has not changed one iota from what it was. We still believe in transparency and disclosure. We stand by the testimony that was provided before the House Administration, our concern, our opposition to the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. So the gentleman is wrong in concluding that we somehow have changed.

What we are saying with this legislation is that we should not in any way allow loopholes to exist. All we are trying to do is close a loophole which addresses the concern that my colleague raised when he talked about the need to get unregulated soft money out of the process. We know that every single one of us in our individual campaigns and political parties is forced to comply with the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, and yet we have seen $425 million, almost a half a billion dollars, expended in unregulated ways, providing an opportunity for them to influence Federal elections.

That is a complete contravention of the goal of campaign reform, and that has been argued by the people who were the greatest proponents of campaign reform, Democracy 21, Common Cause, a wide range of groups, which worked closely and tried to implement the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act.

On this issue of our having taken no action, on this very day, the House Rules Committee has actually been scheduled in the last hour to be marking up our bill H.R. 4975, the Lobbying Accountability Transparency Act. The Judiciary Committee today marked it up. As the gentleman knows, we at the very early part of this year passed legislation designed to get at the access that registered lobbyists had to the House floor.

□ 1545

So we have taken action, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are continuing to focus attention on reform and our quest for the proverbial level playing field.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to my very good friend from Michigan, a former Secretary of State, Mrs. MILLER.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to support the rule and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, it was just 4 years ago that the Congress passed a Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act, and the purpose of that legislation was to ''eliminate'' hundreds of millions of dollars of unregulated soft money and the influence that wealthy donors had on the electoral process. However, the 2004 election cycle clearly demonstrated that BCRA was unable to deliver on what it promised.

In fact, the great irony of all of this is that while soft money to political parties was eliminated, wealthy donors found a new avenue to fund their candidates and to have more influence than they had ever had under the old rules. In 2004, we saw George Soros and Peter Lewis inject more than $20 million each, each of them injecting more than $20 million into the election process. So, so much for eliminating soft money.

Overall, federally focused 527s raised and spent over $550 million. Now, by contrast, George W. Bush and John Kerry combined to spend $655 million on their entire Presidential campaigns. The numbers are strikingly similar. The only difference is the Presidential candidates had to file with and abide by the rules of the FEC. The 527s did not.

The Presidential campaigns were accountable to the voters. The 527s were not. And instead of the political parties providing key support for their candidates, 527s began to act as surrogate political parties. Essentially what happened here is the political parties were outsourced. Political parties were outsourced. The 527s ran TV ads, they operated Web sites, they ran phone banks, they mobilized the get-out-the-vote efforts, all with money not regulated by the FEC.

In fact, the 527s proved so significant that MoveOn.org actually sent an e-mail to all of their supporters after the 2004 election and said this about the Democratic Party. This is what MoveOn.org said: ''Now it's our party. We bought it. We own it, and we're going to take it back.'' So, so much for eliminating the big dollars and big money.

Often I hear my Democratic colleagues complaining about the Swift Boat Veterans For Truth, another 527. Well, today, my Democratic colleagues have an opportunity to strike back. All of this activity was conducted with less oversight than when the political parties were able to accept soft money. And it is abundantly clear that something must be done. We need to do something to level the playing field that has shifted in favor of the unaccountable 527s. Right now, we have numerous groups operating under the cover of shadows, moving money back and forth in hopes of convincing voters to support a particular candidate.

Mr. Speaker, prior to my service in this House, I had the great honor and privilege of serving for 8 years as Michigan Secretary of State, and I was responsible for enforcing the campaign finance act in my State and increasing voter participation. My administration was very honored with the highest grade in the entire Nation by the NAACP for being on the forefront of campaign reform. We were honored with the Digital Sunshine Award for our program to provide voters with more information on who was trying to influence the outcome of the election process.

So I have had some experience with this issue, and I believe transparency is always the key. It is always the critical element.

I do believe that if we do not act now, the nauseating ugliness, negativity and hyperpartisanship that we saw in 2004 will only intensify in 2006 and 2008. We must protect our democratic electoral process and keep those who seek to influence our votes accountable. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be good enough to tell both sides of the remaining amount of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). The gentleman from Florida has 12½ minutes remaining and Mr. DREIER has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, my friend, (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, although I have been listening to the debate. This will be an amusing, if not interesting, debate as those who supported campaign finance reform are opposed to 527 reform, and those who opposed campaign finance are for campaign finance reform. I guess everyone is changing around their positions, so we should have a very good time. Actually, I want to compliment the chairman of the Rules Committee. At least the debate is only going to last an hour, so it won't be too tough on all of us.

Just for the record, this is basically a legal issue. 527s are political committees that are designed to influence an election, either the election or defeat of a candidate. The legal basis for regulation by the FEC comes from the reform act that was passed not in 2000 but after Watergate. That is where the legal basis is to regulate 527s.

The Federal Election Commission decided not to regulate 527s, hence there was a lawsuit that was filed in Federal District Court in Washington. There was a decision by Judge Sullivan recently in that case basically saying that the FEC did not have justification to not promulgate rules and regulations with regard to 527s. So regardless of what happens here today, ultimately, I think the court is clearly going to instruct the FEC to promulgate rules and regulations relevant to 527s.

In any event, I think we should have an open debate on this and discuss the merits of 527s and campaign finance reform. I am particularly troubled that this rule also allows the repeal of coordinated contribution limits, or a vote

on coordinated contribution limits. I believe a repeal of coordinated spending limits may make it easier for wealthier individuals to use donations to the political parties in order to evade campaign finance laws. I also think we should have had an open debate on this and been allowed to offer other amendments that would strike this controversial provision.

Furthermore, there are a number of Democrat amendments that had been offered in the Rules Committee. RAHM EMANUEL, who has been active on this, had two amendments related to this debate but, unfortunately, those amendments were ruled out of order.

In any event, for this reason I believe that the rule should be defeated. But, Mr. Speaker, I really look forward to this interesting, if not amusing, debate we are about to have on 527s.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again exactly how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. DREIER, you have 4½ minutes, and I believe the gentleman from Florida has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers at this time and I am prepared to go forward.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to Mr. SHAYS, who wanted to respond and then you can close your debate and we will do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Connecticut, the great champion of campaign finance reform (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. There is nothing funny about this debate. Nothing funny at all.

The vast majority of my colleagues to my right voted for campaign finance reform. The vast majority of my colleagues to my left voted against it. The difference is my colleagues to the right, once it passed, looked for loopholes behind the law; and my colleagues here, my Republican colleagues who voted against the law said we will abide by it.

The problem is there is one loophole and the loophole is 527s. When we passed the law, we banned corporate money, union dues money and unlimited sums from individuals. We enforced the 1907 law, the 1947 law, and the 1974 law. That is what we did, we enforced it. But the FEC refuses to abide by the law as it relates to this one issue, 527s. We want to close the loophole.

Now, the reason is, if we are going to have the law, it better work. So my own Republican colleagues have been very consistent. They opposed the law. But if you are going to have the law, it should be consistent and work. And my colleagues, with all due respect, are being extraordinarily inconsistent. You voted for the law and now you want loopholes to it and you do not want to fix the loopholes. That is an outrage, and I plead with you to remember your rhetoric when you spoke. When you spoke, you supported the law. Now abide by it and make sure the loopholes are taken care of.

My colleague, Mr. MEEHAN, is right. We will win in court. The court has said that the 527s are primarily a campaign expense, and therefore need to abide by the law. So eventually, someday, I think they will be forced to write a rule to do what this bill does, but we are taking care of it now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Apparently my good friend, and he is my good friend, from Connecticut was not mindful that there were 100 Members of the House of Representatives who wrote to the FEC asking that the McConnell v. FEC decision be upheld.

But I don't want to get bogged down in all of these legal mores. The simple fact of the matter is that if we intend to do something that would make a difference, we could all support public financing. I challenge any of you to tell me that that would not cure the problems that we continue to talk about.

I also would urge my friend from Connecticut, who argues about loopholes, to ask the chairman what I say about laws that we pass here. You show me a law and I will show you a loophole. I have been involved in politics as long as anybody in this room, and for the 41 years that I have been involved, we have continued to reform campaign finance by calling it campaign finance reform. Every time we reform it, the Republicans or the Democrats, the majority or the minority, somebody comes up with a way to get around the law.

So make this one, if you will, Mr. Chairman, and be mindful of all of the people that have spoken with reference to the myth that I think that you perpetuate. One of the biggest myths, the National Review says, is that this bill would level the playing field. That is language you used earlier, Mr. Chairman, ending the ability of the wealthy to fund propaganda. This is completely false, according to the National Review. Wealthy individuals would still be free to say whatever they want, whenever they want. The proposal would end only the ability of individuals of lesser means to pool their money to independently speak out on issues.

The simple fact is when you cite to the law, my recollection is you didn't say anything at all about Buckley v. Valeo, which simply said in its holding that money is speech, and that is ultimately what winds up happening here.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question, so I can amend the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, if it does, it will bring H.R. 4682, the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2006 to the House floor for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before we go reforming campaign finance laws and telling those on the outside what they can and cannot do, I think we need to fix up our own house. H.R. 4682 is a comprehensive reform package introduced by Leader PELOSI that is designed to clean up this Congress and show the American people we are serious about our roles as legislators and that we put the people we represent first.

This bill does many things. It curbs the abuses of power by stopping the practice of keeping votes open to twist arms and lobbying Members on the floor of the House. It shuts down the K Street Project by making it a criminal offense and violation of the House rules to take or withhold official action or threaten to do so with the intent to influence private employment decisions. It ends the practice of adding special interest provisions to conference reports in the dead of night and behind closed doors. It imposes strict and enforceable new disclosure requirements on lobbyists. It curbs abuses of power and it blocks cronyism and corrupt contracting practices that endanger our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and around the world.

It is important for Members to know that defeating the previous question will not, I repeat, will not, block the underlying bill. H.R. 513 will still be considered by the House. But by voting ''no'' on the previous question, we will be able to consider the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act under a completely open rule that gives all Members of this body the opportunity to be heard on this matter.

I urge all Members of this body to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

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

□ 1600

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just say that my friend is correct in saying we should look at loopholes and do everything we can to close them. The Republican Party is the party of reform. We are very proud of the fact that we have been and continue to be the party of reform.

This is a loophole that needs to be closed so we can get to the kind of fairness that Mr. SHAYS, the great champion of campaign finance reform, talked about. He and I still disagree to this moment about the issue itself. I believe these kind of limits undermine first amendment rights, but the Supreme Court has upheld the Campaign Reform Act, and I believe if you look at the great champions of campaign reform, Common Cause, Democracy 21, and a wide range of other groups, they

are strongly supportive of this measure. I believe we should support this.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DREIER:

On page 2, line 6, strike ''printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution'' and insert ''numbered 1 for printing in the Congressional Record pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII''.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 755, THE RULE PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 513, 527 REFORM ACT OF 2005

At the end of the resolution add the following new sections:

''SEC. 2. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4682) to provide more rigorous requirements with respect to disclosure and enforcement of ethics and lobbying laws and regulations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution of the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of Rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.''

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution * * * [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule * * * When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes, if ordered, on amending the resolution and adopting the resolution, as amended (or not).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 198, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—198

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Evans
Hoekstra
Ros-Lehtinen
Schakowsky
Tanner
Watson

□ 1626

Ms. BERKLEY and Messrs. ROTHMAN, KUCINICH and CROWLEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HUNTER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 199, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—223

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—199

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Evans
Hoekstra
Pitts
Ros-Lehtinen
Schakowsky
Tanner
Watson

□ 1635

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION REQUIRING ETHICS INVESTIGATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS INVOLVED IN JACK ABRAMOFF SCANDAL

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I rise in regard to a question of the privileges of the House, and I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas, on March 31, 2006, Tony Rudy, a former top Republican Leadership staff person, pleaded guilty to charges that he conspired with Republican lobbyist Jack Abramoff to bribe public officials, including accepting money, meals, trips, and tickets to sporting events from Mr. Abramoff in exchange for official acts that included influencing legislation to aid Mr. Abramoff's clients;

Whereas The Washington Post has stated that Mr. Rudy's plea bargain is an admission of a ''far-reaching criminal enterprise operating out of'' the Republican Leader's office, ''an enterprise that helped sway legislation, influence public policy, and enrich its main players.'' (The Washington Post, April 1, 2006)

Whereas the press has reported that ''court papers point out official actions that were taken in (the Republican Leader's) office that benefited Abramoff, his clients or (the

former Republican Leader's Chief of Staff Ed) Buckham.'' (Roll Call, April 3, 2006);

Whereas, according to Mr. Rudy's plea agreement, his crimes involving illegal favors and lobbying activity lasted from 1997 through 2004;

Whereas on March 31, 2006, Assistant U.S. Attorney General Alice S. Fisher stated, ''The American public loses when officials and lobbyists conspire to buy and sell influence in such a corrupt and brazen manner. By his admission in open court today, Mr. Rudy paints a picture of Washington which the American public and law enforcement will simply not tolerate.''

Whereas Mr. Rudy is the second former high-ranking Republican Leadership staff person, in addition to Michael Scanlon, to admit wrongdoing in the corruption investigation centered on Mr. Abramoff;

Whereas, on March 29, 2006, Mr. Abramoff was sentenced to five years and ten months in prison after pleading guilty to conspiracy and wire fraud;

Whereas it is the purview of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate allegations that relate to the official conduct of a Member or a staff person, the abuse of a Member's official position, and violations of the Rules of the House, and to take disciplinary action in cases of wrongdoing;

Whereas, the fact that cases are being investigated by the U.S. Justice Department does not preclude the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct from determining investigative steps that must be taken;

Whereas, in the first session of the 109th Congress, for the first time in the history of the House of Representatives, the rules of procedure of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct were changed on a partisan basis, the Chairman of the Committee and two of his Republican Colleagues were dismissed from the Committee, the newly appointed Chairman of the Committee improperly and unilaterally fired non-partisan staff, and the Chairman attempted to appoint supervisory staff without a vote of the Committee in direct contravention of the intent of the bi-partisan procedures adopted in 1997;

Whereas, because of these actions, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conducted no investigative activities in the first session of the 109th Congress;

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall immediately initiate an investigation of the misconduct by Members of Congress and their staff implicated in the scandals associated with Mr. Jack Abramoff's criminal activity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies as a question of the privileges of the House.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 198, answered ''present'' 5, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—218

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—198

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—5

Doyle
Green, Gene
Mollohan
Paul
Roybal-Allard

NOT VOTING—11

Allen
Butterfield
DeLay
Evans
Hoekstra
Nussle
Ros-Lehtinen
Schakowsky
Tanner
Watson
Whitfield

□ 1656

Mr. GORDON changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## 527 REFORM ACT OF 2005

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 755, I call up the bill (H.R. 513) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify when organizations described in section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 must register as political committees, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 755, the bill is considered read.

The text of H.R. 513 is as follows:

H.R. 513

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''527 Reform Act of 2005''.

**SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF SECTION 527 ORGANIZATIONS.**

(a) DEFINITION OF POLITICAL COMMITTEE.—Section 301(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(4)) is amended by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ''; or'' and by adding at the end the following:

''(D) any applicable 527 organization.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE 527 ORGANIZATION.—Section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(27) APPLICABLE 527 ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of paragraph (4)(D)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'applicable 527 organization' means a committee, club, association, or group of persons that—

''(i) is an organization described in section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and

''(ii) is not described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) EXCEPTED ORGANIZATIONS.—Subject to subparagraph (D), a committee, club, association, or other group of persons described in this subparagraph is—

''(i) an organization described in section 527(i)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986,

''(ii) an organization which is a committee, club, association or other group of persons that is organized, operated, and makes disbursements exclusively for paying expenses described in the last sentence of section 527(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or expenses of a newsletter fund described in section 527(g) of such Code, or

''(iii) an organization which is a committee, club, association, or other group of persons whose election or nomination activities relate exclusively to—

''(I) elections where no candidate for Federal office appears on the ballot, or

''(II) one or more of the purposes described in subparagraph (C).

''(C) ALLOWABLE PURPOSES.—The purposes described in this subparagraph are the following:

''(i) Influencing the selection, nomination, election, or appointment of one or more candidates to non-Federal offices.

''(ii) Influencing one or more State or local ballot initiatives, State or local referenda, State or local constitutional amendments, State or local bond issues, or other State or local ballot issues.

''(iii) Influencing the selection, appointment, nomination, or confirmation of one or more individuals to non-elected offices.

''(D) SECTION 527 ORGANIZATIONS MAKING CERTAIN DISBURSEMENTS.—A committee, club, association, or other group of persons described in subparagraph (B)(ii) or (B)(iii) shall not be considered to be described in such paragraph for purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii) if it makes disbursements aggregating more than $1000 during any calendar year for any of the following:

''(i) A public communication that promotes, supports, attacks, or opposes a clearly identified candidate for Federal office during the 1-year period ending on the date of the general election for the office sought by the clearly identified candidate occurs.

''(ii) Any voter drive activity (as defined in section 325(d)(1)).''.

**SEC. 3. RULES FOR ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES BETWEEN FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**''SEC. 325. ALLOCATION AND FUNDING RULES FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES RELATING TO FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any disbursements by any separate segregated fund or nonconnected committee for which allocation rules are provided under subsection (b)—

''(1) the disbursements shall be allocated between Federal and non-Federal accounts in accordance with this section and regulations prescribed by the Commission, and

''(2) in the case of disbursements allocated to non-Federal accounts, may be paid only from a qualified non-Federal account.

''(b) COSTS TO BE ALLOCATED AND ALLOCATION RULES.—Disbursements by any separate segregated fund or nonconnected committee for any of the following categories of activity shall be allocated as follows:

''(1) 100 percent of the expenses for public communications or voter drive activities that refer to one or more clearly identified Federal candidates, but do not refer to any clearly identified non-Federal candidates, shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, without regard to whether the communication refers to a political party.

''(2) At least 50 percent of the expenses for public communications and voter drive activities that refer to one or more clearly identified candidates for Federal office and one or more clearly defined non-Federal candidates shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, without regard to whether the communication refers to a political party.

''(3) At least 50 percent of the expenses for public communications or voter drive activities that refer to a political party, but do not refer to any clearly identified Federal or non-Federal candidate, shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, except that this paragraph shall not apply to communications or activities that relate exclusively to elections where no candidate for Federal office appears on the ballot.

''(4) At least 50 percent of the expenses for public communications or voter drive activities that refer to a political party, and refer to one or more clearly identified non-Federal candidates, but do not refer to any clearly identified Federal candidates, shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, except that this paragraph shall not apply to communications or activities that relate exclusively to elections where no candidate for Federal office appears on the ballot.

''(5) At least 50 percent of any administrative expenses, including rent, utilities, office supplies, and salaries not attributable to a clearly identified candidate, shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, except that for a separate segregated fund such expenses may be paid instead by its connected organization.

''(6) At least 50 percent of the direct costs of a fundraising program or event, including disbursements for solicitation of funds and for planning and administration of actual fundraising events, where Federal and non-Federal funds are collected through such program or event shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, except that for a separate segregated fund such costs may be paid instead by its connected organization.

''(c) QUALIFIED NON-FEDERAL ACCOUNT.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified non-Federal account' means an account which consists solely of amounts—

''(A) that, subject to the limitations of paragraphs (2) and (3), are raised by the separate segregated fund or nonconnected committee only from individuals, and

''(B) with respect to which all other requirements of Federal, State, or local law are met.

''(2) LIMITATION ON INDIVIDUAL DONATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A separate segregated fund or nonconnected committee may not accept more than $25,000 in funds for its qualified non-Federal account from any one individual in any calendar year.

''(B) AFFILIATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, all qualified non-Federal accounts of separate segregated funds or nonconnected committees which are directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by the same person or persons shall be treated as one account.

''(3) FUNDRAISING LIMITATION.—No donation to a qualified non-Federal account may be solicited, received, directed, transferred, or spent by or in the name of any person described in subsection (a) or (e) of section 323.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) VOTER DRIVE ACTIVITY.—The term 'voter drive activity' means any of the following activities conducted in connection with an election in which a candidate for Federal office appears on the ballot (regardless of whether a candidate for State or local office also appears on the ballot):

''(A) Voter registration activity.

''(B) Voter identification.

''(C) Get-out-the-vote activity.

''(D) Generic campaign activity.

Such term shall not include any activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 316(b)(2).

''(2) FEDERAL ACCOUNT.—The term 'Federal account' means an account which consists solely of contributions subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act. Nothing in this section or in section 323(b)(2)(B)(iii) shall be construed to infer that a limit other than the limit under section 315(a)(1)(C) applies to contributions to the account.

''(3) NONCONNECTED COMMITTEE.—The term 'nonconnected committee' shall not include a political committee of a political party.''.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 304(e) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(e)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FROM QUALIFIED NON-FEDERAL ACCOUNTS.—In addition to any other reporting requirement applicable under this Act, a political committee to which section 325(a) applies shall report all receipts and disbursements from a qualified non-Federal account (as defined in section 325(c)).''.

**SEC. 4. CONSTRUCTION.**

No provision of this Act, or amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(1) as approving, ratifying, or endorsing a regulation promulgated by the Federal Election Commission,

(2) as establishing, modifying, or otherwise affecting the definition of political organization for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(3) as affecting the determination of whether a group organized under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is a political committee under section 301(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

**SEC. 5. JUDICIAL REVIEW.**

(a) SPECIAL RULES FOR ACTIONS BROUGHT ON CONSTITUTIONAL GROUNDS.—If any action is brought for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, the following rules shall apply:

(1) The action shall be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and shall be heard by a 3-judge court convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) A copy of the complaint shall be delivered promptly to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate.

(3) A final decision in the action shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Such appeal shall be taken by the filing of a notice of appeal within 10 days, and the filing of a jurisdictional statement within 30 days, of the entry of the final decision.

(4) It shall be the duty of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of the action and appeal.

(b) INTERVENTION BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—In any action in which the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act is raised (including but not limited to an action described in subsection (a)), any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress) or Senate shall have the right to intervene either in support of or opposition to the position of a party to the case regarding the constitutionality of the provision or amendment. To avoid duplication of efforts and reduce the burdens placed on the parties to the action, the court in any such action may make such orders as it considers necessary, including orders to require intervenors taking similar positions to file joint papers or to be represented by a single attorney at oral argument.

(c) CHALLENGE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Any Member of Congress may bring an action, subject to the special rules described in subsection (a), for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) INITIAL CLAIMS.—With respect to any action initially filed on or before December 31, 2006, the provisions of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to each action described in such subsection.

(2) SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS.—With respect to any action initially filed after December 31, 2006, the provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to any action described in such subsection unless the person filing such action elects such provisions to apply to the action.

**SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date which is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill, modified by amendment No. 1 for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is adopted.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 513

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

***SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.***

*This Act may be cited as the ''527 Reform Act of 2006''.*

***SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF SECTION 527 ORGANIZATIONS.***

*(a) DEFINITION OF POLITICAL COMMITTEE.—Section 301(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(4)) is amended—*

*(1) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ''; or''; and*

*(2) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(D) any applicable 527 organization.''.*

*(b) DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE 527 ORGANIZATION.—Section 301 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:*

*''(27) APPLICABLE 527 ORGANIZATION.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (4)(D), the term 'applicable 527 organization' means a committee, club, association, or group of persons that—*

*''(i) has given notice to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 527(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that it is to be treated as an organization described in section 527 of such Code; and*

*''(ii) is not described in subparagraph (B).*

*''(B) EXCEPTED ORGANIZATIONS.—A committee, club, association, or other group of persons described in this subparagraph is—*

*''(i) an organization described in section 527(i)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;*

*''(ii) an organization which is a committee, club, association or other group of persons that is organized, operated, and makes disbursements exclusively for paying expenses described in the last sentence of section 527(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or expenses of a newsletter fund described in section 527(g) of such Code;*

*''(iii) an organization which is a committee, club, association, or other group that consists solely of candidates for State or local office, individuals holding State or local office, or any combination of either, but only if the organization refers only to one or more non-Federal candidates or applicable State or local issues in all of its voter drive activities and does not refer to a Federal candidate or a political party in any of its voter drive activities; or*

*''(iv) an organization described in subparagraph (C).*

*''(C) APPLICABLE ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(iv), an organization described in this subparagraph is a committee, club, association, or other group of persons whose election or nomination activities relate exclusively to—*

*''(i) elections where no candidate for Federal office appears on the ballot; or*

*''(ii) one or more of the following purposes:*

*''(I) Influencing the selection, nomination, election, or appointment of one or more candidates to non-Federal offices.*

*''(II) Influencing one or more applicable State or local issues.*

*''(III) Influencing the selection, appointment, nomination, or confirmation of one or more individuals to non-elected offices.*

*''(D) EXCLUSIVITY TEST.—A committee, club, association, or other group of persons shall not be treated as meeting the exclusivity requirement of subparagraph (C) if it makes disbursements aggregating more than $1,000 for any of the following:*

*''(i) A public communication that promotes, supports, attacks, or opposes a clearly identified candidate for Federal office during the 1-year period ending on the date of the general election for the office sought by the clearly identified candidate (or, if a runoff election is held with respect to such general election, on the date of the runoff election).*

*''(ii) Any voter drive activity during a calendar year, except that no disbursements for any voter drive activity shall be taken into account under this subparagraph if the committee, club, association, or other group of persons during such calendar year—*

*''(I) makes disbursements for voter drive activities with respect to elections in only 1 State and complies with all applicable election laws of that State, including laws related to registration and reporting requirements and contribution limitations;*

*''(II) refers to one or more non-Federal candidates or applicable State or local issues in all of its voter drive activities and does not refer to any Federal candidate or any political party in any of its voter drive activities;*

*''(III) does not have a candidate for Federal office, an individual who holds any Federal office, a national political party, or an agent of any of the foregoing, control or materially participate in the direction of the organization, solicit contributions to the organization (other than funds which are described under clauses (i) and (ii) of section 323(e)(1)(B)), or direct disbursements, in whole or in part, by the organization; and*

*''(IV) makes no contributions to Federal candidates.*

*''(E) CERTAIN REFERENCES TO FEDERAL CANDIDATES NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraphs (B)(iii) and (D)(ii)(II), a voter drive activity shall not be treated as referring to a clearly identified Federal candidate if the only reference to the candidate in the activity is—*

*''(i) a reference in connection with an election for a non-Federal office in which such Federal candidate is also a candidate for such non-Federal office; or*

*''(ii) a reference to the fact that the candidate has endorsed a non-Federal candidate or has taken a position on an applicable State or local issue, including a reference that constitutes the endorsement or position itself.*

*''(F) CERTAIN REFERENCES TO POLITICAL PARTIES NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraphs (B)(iii) and (D)(ii)(II), a voter drive activity shall not be treated as referring to a political party if the only reference to the party in the activity is—*

*''(i) a reference for the purpose of identifying a non-Federal candidate;*

*''(ii) a reference for the purpose of identifying the entity making the public communication or carrying out the voter drive activity; or*

*''(iii) a reference in a manner or context that does not reflect support for or opposition to a Federal candidate or candidates and does reflect support for or opposition to a State or local candidate or candidates or an applicable State or local issue.*

*''(G) APPLICABLE STATE OR LOCAL ISSUE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'applicable State or local issue' means any State or local ballot initiative, State or local referendum, State or local constitutional amendment, State or local bond issue, or other State or local ballot issue.''.*

*(c) DEFINITION OF VOTER DRIVE ACTIVITY.—Section 301 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 431), as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:*

*''(28) VOTER DRIVE ACTIVITY.—The term 'voter drive activity' means any of the following activities conducted in connection with an election in which a candidate for Federal office appears on the ballot (regardless of whether a candidate for State or local office also appears on the ballot):*

*''(A) Voter registration activity.*

*''(B) Voter identification.*

*''(C) Get-out-the-vote activity.*

*''(D) Generic campaign activity.*

*''(E) Any public communication related to activities described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).*

*Such term shall not include any activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 316(b)(2).''.*

***SEC. 3. RULES FOR ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES BETWEEN FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.***

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

***''SEC. 325. ALLOCATION AND FUNDING RULES FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES RELATING TO FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.***

*''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any disbursements by any political committee that is a separate segregated fund or nonconnected committee for which allocation rules are provided under subsection (b)—*

*''(1) the disbursements shall be allocated between Federal and non-Federal accounts in accordance with this section and regulations prescribed by the Commission; and*

*''(2) in the case of disbursements allocated to non-Federal accounts, may be paid only from a qualified non-Federal account.*

''(b) COSTS TO BE ALLOCATED AND ALLOCATION RULES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Disbursements by any separate segregated fund or nonconnected committee, other than an organization described in section 323(b)(1), for any of the following categories of activity shall be allocated as follows:

''(A) 100 percent of the expenses for public communications or voter drive activities that refer to one or more clearly identified Federal candidates, but do not refer to any clearly identified non-Federal candidates, shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, without regard to whether the communication refers to a political party.

''(B) At least 50 percent, or a greater percentage if the Commission so determines by regulation, of the expenses for public communications and voter drive activities that refer to one or more clearly identified candidates for Federal office and one or more clearly identified non-Federal candidates shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, without regard to whether the communication refers to a political party.

''(C) At least 50 percent, or a greater percentage if the Commission so determines by regulation, of the expenses for public communications or voter drive activities that refer to a political party, but do not refer to any clearly identified Federal or non-Federal candidate, shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, except that this paragraph shall not apply to communications or activities that relate exclusively to elections where no candidate for Federal office appears on the ballot.

''(D) At least 50 percent, or a greater percentage if the Commission so determines by regulation, of the expenses for public communications or voter drive activities that refer to a political party and refer to one or more clearly identified non-Federal candidates, but do not refer to any clearly identified Federal candidates, shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, except that this paragraph shall not apply to communications or activities that relate exclusively to elections where no candidate for Federal office appears on the ballot.

''(E) Unless otherwise determined by the Commission in its regulations, at least 50 percent of any administrative expenses, including rent, utilities, office supplies, and salaries not attributable to a clearly identified candidate, shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, except that for a separate segregated fund such expenses may be paid instead by its connected organization.

''(F) At least 50 percent, or a greater percentage if the Commission so determines by regulation, of the direct costs of a fundraising program or event, including disbursements for solicitation of funds and for planning and administration of actual fundraising events, where Federal and non-Federal funds are collected through such program or event shall be paid with funds from a Federal account, except that for a separate segregated fund such costs may be paid instead by its connected organization. This paragraph shall not apply to any fundraising solicitations or any other activity that constitutes a public communication.

''(2) CERTAIN REFERENCES TO FEDERAL CANDIDATES NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a public communication or voter drive activity shall not be treated as referring to a clearly identified Federal candidate if the only reference to the candidate in the communication or activity is—

''(A) a reference in connection with an election for a non-Federal office in which such Federal candidate is also a candidate for such non-Federal office; or

''(B) a reference to the fact that the candidate has endorsed a non-Federal candidate or has taken a position on an applicable State or local issue (as defined in section 301(27)(G)), including a reference that constitutes the endorsement or position itself.

''(3) CERTAIN REFERENCES TO POLITICAL PARTIES NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a public communication or voter drive activity shall not be treated as referring to a political party if the only reference to the party in the communication or activity is—

''(A) a reference for the purpose of identifying a non-Federal candidate;

''(B) a reference for the purpose of identifying the entity making the public communication or carrying out the voter drive activity; or

''(C) a reference in a manner or context that does not reflect support for or opposition to a Federal candidate or candidates and does reflect support for or opposition to a State or local candidate or candidates or an applicable State or local issue.

''(c) QUALIFIED NON-FEDERAL ACCOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified non-Federal account' means an account which consists solely of amounts—

''(A) that, subject to the limitations of paragraphs (2) and (3), are raised by the separate segregated fund or nonconnected committee only from individuals, and

''(B) with respect to which all requirements of Federal, State, or local law (including any law relating to contribution limits) are met.

''(2) LIMITATION ON INDIVIDUAL DONATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A separate segregated fund or nonconnected committee may not accept more than $25,000 in funds for its qualified non-Federal account from any one individual in any calendar year.

''(B) AFFILIATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, all qualified non-Federal accounts of separate segregated funds or nonconnected committees which are directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by the same person or persons shall be treated as one account.

''(3) FUNDRAISING LIMITATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No donation to a qualified non-Federal account may be solicited, received, directed, transferred, or spent by or in the name of any person described in subsection (a) or (e) of section 323.

''(B) FUNDS NOT TREATED AS SUBJECT TO ACT.—Except as provided in subsection (a)(2) and this subsection, any funds raised for a qualified non-Federal account in accordance with the requirements of this section shall not be considered funds subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act for any purpose (including for purposes of subsection (a) or (e) of section 323 or subsection (d)(1) of this section).

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—

''(1) FEDERAL ACCOUNT.—The term 'Federal account' means an account which consists solely of contributions subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act. Nothing in this section or in section 323(b)(2)(B)(iii) shall be construed to infer that a limit other than the limit under section 315(a)(1)(C) applies to contributions to the account.

''(2) NONCONNECTED COMMITTEE.—The term 'nonconnected committee' shall not include a political committee of a political party.

''(3) VOTER DRIVE ACTIVITY.—The term 'voter drive activity' has the meaning given such term in section 301(28).''.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 304(e) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(e)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FROM QUALIFIED NON-FEDERAL ACCOUNTS.—In addition to any other reporting requirement applicable under this Act, a political committee to which section 325(a) applies shall report all receipts and disbursements from a qualified non-Federal account (as defined in section 325(c)).''.

**SEC. 4. REPEAL OF LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF PARTY EXPENDITURES ON BEHALF OF CANDIDATES IN GENERAL ELECTIONS.**

(a) REPEAL OF LIMIT.—Section 315(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law with respect to limitations on expenditures or limitations on contributions, the national committee'' and inserting ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law with respect to limitations on amounts of expenditures or contributions, a national committee'',

(B) by striking ''the general'' and inserting ''any'', and

(C) by striking ''Federal office, subject to the limitations contained in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection'' and inserting ''Federal office in any amount''; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (4).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) INDEXING.—Section 315(c) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking ''(d),''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B)(i), by striking ''subsections (b) and (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''.

(2) INCREASE IN LIMITS FOR SENATE CANDIDATES FACING WEALTHY OPPONENTS.—Section 315(i) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(i)(1)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C)(iii)—

(i) by adding ''and'' at the end of subclause (I),

(ii) in subclause (II), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period, and

(iii) by striking subclause (III);

(B) in paragraph (2)(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking '', and a party committee shall not make any expenditure,'';

(C) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii), by striking ''and party expenditures previously made''; and

(D) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''and a party shall not make any expenditure''.

(3) INCREASE IN LIMITS FOR HOUSE CANDIDATES FACING WEALTHY OPPONENTS.—Section 315A(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a—1(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by adding ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A),

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period, and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(B) in paragraph (3)(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking '', and a party committee shall not make any expenditure,'';

(C) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking ''and party expenditures previously made''; and

(D) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ''and a party shall not make any expenditure.''

**SEC. 5. CONSTRUCTION.**

No provision of this Act, or amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(1) as approving, ratifying, or endorsing a regulation promulgated by the Federal Election Commission;

(2) as establishing, modifying, or otherwise affecting the definition of political organization for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

(3) as affecting the determination of whether a group organized under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is a political committee under section 301(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

**SEC. 6. JUDICIAL REVIEW.**

(a) SPECIAL RULES FOR ACTIONS BROUGHT ON CONSTITUTIONAL GROUNDS.—If any action is brought for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, the following rules shall apply:

(1) The action shall be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and shall be heard by a 3-judge court convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code.

*(2) A copy of the complaint shall be delivered promptly to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate.*

*(3) A final decision in the action shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Such appeal shall be taken by the filing of a notice of appeal within 10 days, and the filing of a jurisdictional statement within 30 days, of the entry of the final decision.*

*(4) It shall be the duty of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of the action and appeal.*

*(b) INTERVENTION BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—In any action in which the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act is raised (including but not limited to an action described in subsection (a)), any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress) or Senate shall have the right to intervene either in support of or opposition to the position of a party to the case regarding the constitutionality of the provision or amendment. To avoid duplication of efforts and reduce the burdens placed on the parties to the action, the court in any such action may make such orders as it considers necessary, including orders to require intervenors taking similar positions to file joint papers or to be represented by a single attorney at oral argument.*

*(c) CHALLENGE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Any Member of Congress may bring an action, subject to the special rules described in subsection (a), for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act.*

*(d) APPLICABILITY.—*

*(1) INITIAL CLAIMS.—With respect to any action initially filed on or before December 31, 2008, the provisions of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to each action described in such subsection.*

*(2) SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS.—With respect to any action initially filed after December 31, 2008, the provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to any action described in such subsection unless the person filing such action elects such provisions to apply to the action.*

***SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.***

*The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 513, the 527 Reform Act of 2006. Today we have an opportunity to right one of the wrongs of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002. All my friends on the other side of the aisle who voted for BCRA because they believed we needed to get soft money out of politics must support this legislation today because it does indeed get the soft money out of politics.

Just a word of explanation. I have used the term ''BCRA.'' That is the acronym for Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, which we worked on very, very hard a few years ago to get the soft money out of politics. What do we mean by soft money? That is money that is unregulated, both in quantity and disclosure to the Federal Election Commission.

While BCRA was supposed to curtail the influence of soft money in Federal elections, it did not achieve that goal. In the 2004 election cycle, the first conducted under the rules imposed by BCRA, over a half a billion dollars in soft money was spent to influence the outcome. Just four individuals alone spent over $73 million total.

□ 1700

While BCRA was supposed to reduce the influence of special interests, it actually empowered these ideologically driven outside groups. The power these outside groups gained came at the direct expense of political parties which saw many of the activities they had traditionally performed limited by BCRA, and thence taken over by these new organizations, the 527s. Again, let me explain, the term 527 refers to the section of IRS Code which governs their operation, and we simply use that designation for them.

We now have a system where soft money continues to thrive. Our political parties, especially those at the State and local level, are increasingly unable to carry out core functions such as voter registration activities. We now have a system where the influence of billionaires is greatly enhanced. In some cases, representatives of 527s have made boasts about taking over the party. For example, Eli Pariser of MoveOn.org sent an e-mail to supporters after the 2004 elections stating, ''Now it's our party. We bought it, we own it, and we're going to take it back.'' What more evidence do we need of the corruption that has appeared here? This does not represent progress. Today we have an opportunity to reverse this negative trend, and this bill will help restore some balance to our system.

H.R. 513 would require 527 groups spending money to influence Federal elections to register as Federal political committees and comply with Federal campaign finance laws, including limits on the contributions they receive. Thus, 527 groups would be subject to the same contribution limits and source restrictions that are applicable to Federal political action committees. There would be no more $23 million soft money contributions allowed from a lone, extremely wealthy donor. When this bill passes, individuals will be limited to $30,000. In other words, soft unregulated money will be replaced by hard regulated money which will be reported to the Federal Elections Commission.

Those 527s that engage exclusively in State or local elections or in ballot initiatives would not be restricted by this bill. However, if they decide to engage in Federal election activity such as making public communications that promote, support, attack, or oppose a Federal candidate during the year prior to a Federal election, or conduct voter drive activities in connection with an election in which a Federal candidate appears on the ballot, they will be restricted by this bill. In other words, State and local activities would be free to continue as they have in the past. Those dealing with Federal candidates or issues will be restricted by the bill, and will have to use hard money.

H.R. 513 would also impose new allocation rules on 527 groups regarding expenses for Federal and non-Federal activities. For instance, 100 percent of expenses for public communications or voter drive activities that refer only to a Federal campaign would have to be paid for with hard money. If both Federal and non-Federal candidates were mentioned, then at least 50 percent of such expenses would have to be paid for with hard money. In addition, under H.R. 513, at least 50 percent of a 527 group's administrative overhead expenses would have to be paid for with hard money.

This bill, H.R. 513 has been endorsed by the reform community and rightfully so. Common Cause, Democracy 21, the Campaign Legal Center, and other like-minded reform groups have sent several letters to House Members asking them to support H.R. 513. In a letter sent just this week, these groups argued that H.R. 513 is needed in order to ''close the loophole that allowed both Democrat and Republican 527 groups to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in unlimited soft money to influence the 2004 presidential and congressional elections.''

Mr. Speaker, I will be including a copy of the letter for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I know many of my friends on the other side of the aisle are usually interested in what The New York Times has to say on these issues, so I would like to include some editorials from The Times as well; and an editorial from today's Washington Post also calls on the House to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will include these editorials in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I expect many of my friends on the other side of the aisle would be arguing that BCRA should not be applied to 527s because they are independent organizations and have no connection to officeholders. The claim will be that we have already severed the link between large donors and Federal officeholders. This is nonsense; this is bunk. The 527s that have soaked up all the soft money were, in many cases, set up and staffed by former party operatives and congressional staffers. In some cases, Federal officeholders attend fundraising events for these 527s in an attempt to grant an official stamp of approval and signal to their donors where soft money donations should be steered. I do not intend to name names, but I will include in the RECORD a number of articles that describe how 527s have been set up by people who used to work for Federal officeholders or national parties.

The soft money shell game we spawned 4 years ago is clearly demonstrated in these articles. They demonstrate that these so-called ''independent'' 527s are, in many cases, independent in name only. In reality, they

have been set up by people who used to work for our parties. They left to organize 527s to escape the restrictions BCRA placed on the parties. Had their candidate for the presidency won, many of them would be working in the administration. Would not they feel indebted to the millionaire donors who helped put them in office? Is not that what BCRA was supposed to stop? Let us stop pretending that these 527s are anything other than campaign organizations established to influence our Federal elections.

This is not the first time Congress has dealt with the 527 issue. In fact, some time ago, 6 years ago to be exact, Roll Call reported on the debate that was going on at the time and included a quote from a powerful congressional leader of the time. In 2000, 527s did not have any disclosure requirements, and a bill was pending to require them to disclose their donors. At an event held to rally support for the bill, this leader was quoted as saying, ''Now more than ever, we need to assure the American people that we are not willing to let our system of government be put in jeopardy by wealthy special interests, unregulated foreign money, and, most importantly, a system of secrecy. It is time for disclosure.'' The leader who said these words was Minority Leader Richard Gephardt. We passed a disclosure bill then, but the problem of wealthy special interest money jeopardizing our system of government has only gotten worse in the ensuing 6 years, and I suspect the minority leader would say the same thing today.

Not extending the contributions restrictions in BCRA to all 527s was a terrible mistake that we are today seeking to rectify. Today we can restore some sanity to our system. The status quo allowing 527 groups to raise unlimited amounts of soft money while our parties continue to lose power and influence is unacceptable. It threatens the health of our democracy.

We must subject 527s to the same regulatory restrictions that are applicable to all other parties, candidates and committees. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 513.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 513, the so-called 527 Reform Act of 2005 and the restriction that they are placing on the first amendment rights of Americans. 527s are named after a section of the Internal Revenue Code that specifies certain political organizations as tax exempt for tax exempt purposes under the Federal law.

Added to the Tax Code in 1975, 527 organizations have been legally recognized as operating entities for over 30 years. The Federal Election Commission has recently implemented additional regulations of these groups, which are subject to rigorous Federal reporting and disclosure requirements. Anyone with a computer can go online and see that millionaire Bob Perry gave $4.5 million to bankroll the Swift Boat Veterans.

How do I know this? 527 organizations regularly submit detailed financial information to the IRS. They have to disclose where they get their money and how they get it. In fact, just last week, a Federal court remanded part of a case back to the FEC to present a more reasoned explanation for its decision that 527 organizations are more effectively regulated through case-by-case adjudication rather than general law.

I believe that FEC should be given a chance to review this matter before further legislation is introduced in this House. The Senate is providing leadership in this area. They set out to do what they wanted to do and that was lobby reform, unlike this House, which is just bringing up this type of legislation to circumvent their lobbying reform bill that they do not have, and downplaying groups that had more voters than ever before in history outside demonstrating their democracy and getting the vote out. This is what the BCRA bill was all about.

I voted for BCRA because it would sever the connection between Members of Congress in raising non-Federal funds, so-called soft money, and to ensure that there were limits on what we did in terms of money. BCRA was necessary to cut the perceived corruption link between Members of Congress, the formation and adoption of Federal policy and soft money.

However, BCRA was not passed to impede legitimate voter registration and Get Out the Vote by those 527 community groups which did just that, but this bill impedes that democratic process. It impedes the 527 organizations.

This bill is not needed, Mr. Speaker. It is very interesting listening to the majority speak in favor of campaign finance reform after they did everything possible to stonewall the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002. Also interesting is watching the Republicans avoid any discussion about the activities of 501(c)6s and those organizations that have no disclosure requirements, and yet are running television ads designed to directly reelect a Senator from Pennsylvania. Unfair and impartial regulating 527s is a step in the wrong direction for political speech.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put in the RECORD a statement by the National Review magazine, which is a conservative magazine, and the National Review states, One of the biggest myths about this bill is that it would level the playing field ending the ability of the wealthy to fund propaganda. This is completely false. Wealthy individuals will still be free to say whatever they want and whenever they want. This proposal would end only the ability of individuals of lesser means to pool their money to independently speak out on issues and speak and criticize Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I will include this statement in the RECORD as follows:

> Advocates of this bill have yet to identify the problem they hope to correct with this misguided proposal. 527s wield no corruptive influence over parties or candidates, which is the only constitutional justification for restricting free expression.
>
> One of the biggest myths about this bill is that it would ''level the playing field,'' ending the ability of the wealthy to fund ''propaganda.'' This is completely false. Wealthy individuals would still be free to say whatever they want whenever they want. The proposal would end only the ability of individuals of lesser means to pool their money to independently speak out on issues.
>
> America needs the First Amendment and the ability of individual citizens to form groups precisely for speech that is controversial. To suppress views of those we dislike will inevitably risk suppression of our own.
>
> We who oppose such a proposal want to continue to freely debate our ideas in the public arena. We want Americans to hear all sides—and to decide for themselves who's right.
>
> When you were sworn into office, you took an oath to ''support this Constitution.'' We ask you to faithfully uphold that oath by rejecting H.R. 513, S. 1053, and any other bill that restricts political free speech.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Pat Toomey, President, Club for Growth; John Berthoud, President, National Taxpayers Union; Thomas A. Schatz, President, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; David Keene, Chairman, American Conservative Union; Grover Norquist, President, Americans for Tax Reform; Paul M. Weyrich, National Chairman, Coalitions for America; Matt Kibbe, CEO and President, Freedom Works; James Bopp, Jr., General Counsel, James Madison Center for Free Speech; Bradley A. Smith, Professor of Law, Capital University Law School, and former Chairman, Federal Election Commission; Fred Smith, President, Competitive Enterprise Institute.

Mr. Speaker, unfairly regulating 527s is a step in the wrong direction for political speech. I believe this legislation will have a negative impact on the voter participation bill silencing segments of the population that we need to hear from. Of particular concern is that the fundamental rights and the needs of all Americans including the voices of women, the elderly, and the poor not be left out of the political dialogue just because of the perceived notion that a few millionaires are funding all 527s.

In fact, thousands of Americans gave to 527s through small donations of $25, $50 and the like because they believe, Mr. Speaker, in the message of 527 organizations.

□ 1715

Through the first amendment, Americans are playing an ever increasing role in holding public officials accountable for their actions, through the debate of public policy, and the shaping of this American democracy. Their voices should not be silenced.

In fact, I would like to put in the RECORD again the statement by Assistant U.S. Attorney General Alice S. Fisher when she stated upon the plea

agreement of Mr. Rudy of his crimes involving illegal favors and lobbying activities which lasted from 1997 to 2004, and she says, ''The American public loses when officials and lobbyists conspire to buy and sell influence in such a corrupt and brazen manner. By his admission in open court today, Mr. Rudy paints a picture of Washington which the American public and law enforcement will simply not tolerate.''

The American public, Mr. Speaker, will not tolerate what is about to happen here with this elimination of 527 organizations, transferring them into 501(c)s, not allowing them to work independently of Members of Congress and having to deal with any congressional campaign committees.

In fact, this bill sharply curtails the ability of individuals and groups to associate in the pursuit of political and policy goals, and I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the unjust shade of Federal policy holders, which are us, the Members of Congress, this bill will allow the public to not criticize or even ask for accountability because they want to outlaw those groups who engage in the type of public speech, the public speech that might criticize us or ask for accountability.

This is what they are trying to muffle. They are trying to muffle the voices of the American people who spoke through 527s. They are independent groups. The majority should not be in the business of legislating for partisan gain at the expense of the American people.

I will vote in opposition of this bill.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, legislating for partisan gain is all that campaign finance regulation has ever been about. Who are we kidding?

Let us go back to 1974. Watergate, Republicans are under heavy fire. Democrats took advantage of that, demanded reform, and one of their reforms was the Federal Election Commission Act amendments. Those amendments were quite far-reaching, and many of them became the law, and when it went to the Supreme Court, the Court finally struck out many of them. What was left was the campaign finance law until we passed BCRA in 2002.

It is interesting, though, to talk about that because eventually the Republicans made up for their disadvantage, and actually the Republicans were the leaders with soft money in 2002. This is very upsetting to the Democrats, who developed votes off soft money. It was a wonderful tool they could take advantage of, and they were a little behind. So they came up with BCRA in 2002. BCRA, of course, was going to take the money out of politics.

Now, going back to 1974 for a minute, let us remember that President Nixon was much criticized by the Democrats when he took a campaign contribution from one wealthy individual of $2 million. Fast forward to 2004, after BCRA is passed, and at that point, having taken the big money out of politics, you will note with interest that one man, George Soros, gave $27 million to efforts to elect JOHN KERRY President of the United States. So we went from 1974 with $2 million to Richard Nixon to 2004 to $27 million to JOHN KERRY. I do not think we got the money out of politics. We just sort of reshuffled the deck chairs to the partisan advantage of the Democrats.

We are charged with partisan advantage today in trying at least to give full effect to the Democrats' several years ago stated intent, which was to take the big money out of politics and put 527s within the rule that applies to donations to political parties. I do not think that is unreasonable.

I have got to tell you, as someone who is obviously a participant but also as an observer of the political process, what advantage does it serve to move political speech farther and farther away from the candidate? Third party groups, whether they are 527, 501(c)(4)s, whatever, do not have the same vested interest in currying favor with the public. There is no sense of self-restraint whatsoever. Therefore, the more we move speech away from the candidate into somebody else doing the speaking, the less accountable your campaigns become and the more negative they become.

I am constantly fascinated how the left uses the negativity of campaigns as justification for yet further campaign regulation when, in fact, their regulations are creating the very negativity they claim to oppose.

This bill is a reasoned bill, it is a balanced bill, and it is one that we should adopt. Will it eliminate the problems? Of course it will not because we have the monstrosity of Federal regulation of political speech, something the first amendment to the United States Constitution expressly would seem to prohibit. It certainly seems clear to me when it says in the first amendment Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech, and yet marvelously the Supreme Court or at least a majority of it managed to find that these provisions did not violate the first amendment.

So my point is we have got to deregulate political speech and quit tinkering and turning about here and a dial here and trying to get partisan advantage won over the other. Wipe this whole monstrous system out, give full effect to the first amendment, repeal all the limits and have full and timely disclosure. That is the solution long term. In the meantime, short term today, please support this legislation, recognize there is great language about coordination that promotes responsibility, accountability and allows parties to help their candidates rather than running an independent expenditure.

I urge support for this bill.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the last speaker, he has a bill that wants to repeal all hard money limits, and this is what this bill is all about, the flow of unregulated amounts of money. This is what the American people do not want, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN).

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday former majority leader TOM DELAY announced that he is resigning from the House. His former aides, Michael Scanlon and Tony Rudy, have pled guilty to crimes for their involvement in the Jack Abramoff corruption affair, and other aides to Mr. DELAY and even other current Members of this body remain under investigation.

Last November, Republican Congressman Duke Cunningham resigned from Congress for taking over $2 million in bribes from a defense contractor. He is now serving an 8-year prison sentence for his crimes.

The House Ethics Committee is broken and has done no work in the past 15 months. The committee managed to have its first meeting of the 109th Congress last week. On Sunday, The Washington Post said, ''The panel's inactivity in the face of scandal is itself scandalous.''

Today's bill is characterized as important campaign finance reform by the House Republicans. The question is, what effect would this bill have on the countless scandals that are currently engulfing Washington? The answer is nothing.

This bill does nothing to address those very serious charges of corruption. It would do nothing to prevent another Jack Abramoff or Duke Cunningham scandal.

Further, in addition to doing nothing, the bill actually makes it easier for scandals to occur by opening up the flood gates and removing all limits on State and national party committee spending in the Federal races.

Since this bill does nothing to reverse the Republican culture of corruption, let us look at this bill on the merits to see what it actually does.

What this proposal would do is curtail the free speech rights of millions of Americans. The bill would limit the ability of average citizens to band together and speak out about issues, both during and beyond election. It limits participation in the electoral process.

In 2004, 527 organizations helped to educate and register voters across the country. Now in 2002, the Shays-Meehan-McCain-Feingold bill actually was real reform with a clear purpose. It took Members of Congress out of the business of asking lobbyists and special interests for large, unregulated donations.

527 organizations, however, are not made up of elected officials. In fact, 527s are barred from coordinating with

office holders, candidates or public officials. By law, these groups are independent, and I am not aware of any allegations that there was any illegal coordination between 527s and political parties in 2004. If there is, I would urge people with that knowledge to go to the Attorney General or to the FEC and report on this conduct. If there is some, there are mechanisms for enforcement, but the remedy to a nonproblem in that area is not to shut down free speech.

In fact, in Buckley v. Valeo, the Supreme Court upheld limitations on contributions as appropriate legislative tools to guard against the reality or appearance of improper influence stemming from candidates' dependence on large campaign contributions. Buckley also invalidated limitations on independent expenditures, on candidate expenditures from personal funds, and on overall campaign expenditures. The Court ruled that these provisions placed direct and substantial restrictions on the free speech rights guaranteed in the first amendment.

This bill directly contradicts the Buckley ruling. It violates the first amendment and will not withstand scrutiny by the Court.

Why are we considering this bill today? I suspect this is a last ditch effort for Republicans to keep their hold on power. They have read the polls. They know that most Americans are going to support Democrats this November, and the Republicans are losing on issue after issue. So they are going to try and change the rules which will keep them in power against the wishes of a majority of Americans.

Let me finish by reviewing the ethics rules that this Congress has passed this year. At the beginning of the year, shortly after Jack Abramoff pled guilty, House Republicans boldly pushed through their reform plan for Congress. What did their plan to crack down on ethics do? It banned former Members from lobbying in the House gym and on the House floor. So America, you can rest easy knowing that at least the cesspool of corruption at the Stairmaster is no more.

Today's bill is really a travesty. It is a joke. The country really should be embarrassed by the efforts this Congress is making, by the corruption that has been shown and I fear the corruption that is yet to be exposed in this body.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

If this bill becomes law, let us speculate about exactly what will happen. What would elections and politics be like if the Federal Election Commission regulated 527s? Let us see. There might be some honesty. For example, candidates and elected officials would not be able to rely on partisan political groups like moveon.org to do their dirty work.

Let us see, they might be a lot cleaner because billions of dollars in soft money contributions would stop, and so would the false and misleading message campaigns that take place in various districts almost daily.

One of my colleagues said if they are aware of any misuse of the 527s in the political area, let me just state but one. The ACORN Group, which is a political front for a liberal 527 group called America Votes, has also been implicated in political escapades. A former ACORN worker admitted to deliberately throwing out Republican registration forms and paying gatherers only to collect Democrat registration forms in 2004. Actually, in at least one State this is being investigated.

□ 1730

Is this fairness? What about those who chose not to register in the Democrat Party? They may have been Republican; they may have decided to be an independent. Do they not have a right to have their registrations turned into the local election commissioner?

You know, allowing groups to hide behind faulty, arcane and outdated FEC and IRS rules is not an option. Congress must move forward and reform the laws that allow these 527s to spew their lies and fraudulent tactics on the American people. Regularly in my district, I get the 527 calls. My constituents are wise to the fact that this is an unregulated entity.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Jack Abramoff scandal, we have seen multiple indictments, Members of Congress resigning under a cloud of scandal, congressional approval at an historic low, and a public demand for reform. You would think that the Republican leadership would want to get these scandals behind them, but it is clear they do not.

What is the first stage of grief? Denial and isolation. So here we are today discussing a bill that doesn't do anything to address the problems of the scandals facing this Congress, this institution, which require an institutional solution to an institutional problem.

Nope, this bill doesn't do anything to stop the pay-to-play policies of the party in power. Nope, it doesn't. Doesn't do anything to shut down the K Street Project, rewarding lobbyists who show party loyalty, or to slow the revolving door. Nope, it doesn't do that.

Many of you will recall our former colleague, Mr. Tauzin, who negotiated a million dollar lobbying job with the pharmaceutical industry at the same time that he was rewriting the Medicare prescription drug bill. This legislation doesn't affect that.

Now, take a hypothetical for a moment. What if a Member just resigned, middle of a term, and was thinking of working for companies and sitting on boards. This legislation doesn't change what would happen. It happened when Mr. Tauzin was out here on the floor. And if you had a hypothetical, the Member resigned, maybe just a hypothetical, 2 months left on his tenure here, this legislation doesn't affect who he meets with, who he talks with, how he negotiates and how he votes while he is negotiating.

Why, to do that, you would have to have a desire for reform, and I wouldn't want to impose on the majority party in any way. All the while, while they are voting on this legislation, they are negotiating jobs and they have no responsibility to report to the public of their conduct. It is just business as usual here in Washington.

And then what are they trying to do; take the legislation regarding the 527s, and my colleagues on the other side voted the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform of past years. Well, that reform leveled the playing field for both parties. This legislation does not intend to do that. This legislation intends to do a very partisan thing to the campaign finance laws affecting 527s.

Now, I introduced legislation to affect 501(c)6s. Right now, in the State of Pennsylvania, one of those organizations is actually running ads. I say, you want the same rhetoric, you want 527s to report, well, I suggest 501(c)6s report. That amendment was not allowed. Why? Because it would actually have leveled the playing field. It would have applied to both parties, not one party. So in the name of reform, once again, we have partisan tactics.

Now, all the while, you are going to go home and wonder why the American people have such low esteem for the Congress. It is quite obvious why they have such low esteem: College costs at a record high, 38 percent and going up; health care costs are up 58 percent, $3,600 in 4 years; energy costs are up 70 percent; medium incomes are down. All that Congress hasn't paid attention to.

So as we have scandals swirling around this institution, Members resigning, Members pleading guilty, you once again go whistling past the graveyard on the chance to do real reform and play partisan politics. I do not know what tune you are singing right now, but you will come to know that tune this November.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3¾ minutes to my colleague from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS).

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I find it such an ironic message that my colleague from Illinois chose about his remarks. As he talks about so many problems in Washington, he failed to mention any on his side of the aisle. We kind of nicknamed that the culture of hypocrisy. It is a hypocrisy of attack the Republicans, slash and burn, no debate, no real issues, just the party

of ''no'' from the Democrats on the other side of the aisle.

When you look at some of the discussions he talked about, with lobbying reform and others, he must remember that the colloquy between the majority leader and the minority would also show clearly that the majority leader fully intends to bring reform legislation to this body for debate and for final solution.

I also think about hypocrisy when I think about some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle addressing so many things about the majority, except they forgot that our leaders step down when they are indicted, because that is what our party rules say. Our chairman stepped down because that is what our party rules say. And in the 10 years while you have been reflecting, your rules don't say the same. Your leaders can get indicted, or the ranking members can get indicted and you don't have to step down because you haven't even recognized that as a basic element of your own party, let alone your quick criticisms of this institution.

I also want to say that while I confess I did not think that BCRA was the solution for campaign finance reform, and voted that way on both the House Administration Committee and on this floor, I accepted it as the law of the land. It was legislation passed by both bodies, signed by the President, affirmed by the Supreme Court. But as I was listening to those who are pro-BCRA, that wanted this law as it sits today, they found a loophole, called 527s.

And all the debate on leveling the playing field was get the big money out of politics. Well, four individuals on the Democratic side had over $80 million; four Republicans had over $23 million as they were engaged in obscene, big money, unregulated in campaigns influencing Presidential, congressional, and referendum votes.

So when we look at some common sense, I think the American people are going to, quite frankly, think this makes sense. Let us get unregulated big money out of the campaigns by having a level playing field across the system, universal, in the money you give to your political party.

As we level the playing field, all we are asking is that rich individuals who want to be in the process have the same rights extended to them that individuals who want to give to the political party, whether it is the Democratic National Committee or its subordinate parties or the Republican National Committee and its subordinate parties, the same amount of money to 527s as they invest in the opportunity to express themselves however they want, with the same reviewed Supreme Court aspect of having a level playing field across the entire system.

Anyone who doesn't vote for this that supported BCRA is a hypocrite. Anyone on the other side that doesn't recognize that this is a loophole in the law, and they have a chance to at least level the field under the law we are going to live under, misses the point. I urge that you support this legislation that is before us today.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois for a response.

Mr. EMANUEL. There must be something in the water here in Washington.

To remind my colleague and my friend from Buffalo, the first vote of this Congress by the majority party was to strip the Ethics Committee that investigates Members of its authority to do that, which is why after 15 months in this Congress, the Ethics Committee has not met until last week.

Since that time, one Member stepped down with a guilty plea, another Member stepped down with a cloud of ethics, and others are under Federal investigation at this point. And why? Because the first vote by the Republican majority was to strip the Ethics Committee of its authority.

The second thing. In fact, the majority party did vote this Congress that when a Member of their party was indicted, they were allowed to hold their party position. You have that vote. You stripped your party of that authority and that moral voice when you cast your vote to allow the majority leader to retain his position when indicted.

Now, maybe there is a rampant disease called short-term memory over there, but two votes in this Congress: one, if you got indicted, in fact, you are allowed to keep your position. You cast those votes on your side. And this Congress, when it opened up, rather than address the scandals, this Congress, under the majority, not with any Democratic support, stripped the bipartisan Ethics Committee from its ability to hold investigations, which is why not a single Member to date, with all these scandals, some reported by others, congressional historians, as the worst scandals in the history of the Congress, still the Ethics Committee has failed to do its job because you have stripped it of its abilities to do its job.

That will be the moral stain on this Congress. Your votes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York to respond.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when, in our Ethics Committee, the Democrats will give the tools to a bipartisan five-five Ethics Committee to begin reviewing both Democrats and Republicans who need to go before that committee to have resolution of stuff that has been stalled for the entire 2005 year by the Democratic leadership.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 seconds to respond to the gentleman.

Mr. EMANUEL. My good friend from Buffalo, you may not get health care legislation done this year, you may not get educational reform this year, and for sure, you won't balance the budget. But this Congress will be remembered as the Congress that Jack and Tom built. Because the scandals continue to swirl around this institution.

Until you do serious lobbying reform and close the loopholes, close the revolving door, have real transparency, real enforcement, this Congress, when that gavel comes down, which is intended to open the people's House, not the auction House, and you have allowed it to become an auction house, then this is the House that Jack built.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from California has 11½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Michigan has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't the first time the Congress has debated the effects of public campaign discourse. Let me take you back to 1798, when about 20 or so independent newspapers aligned with Thomas Jefferson started openly criticizing the policies of John Adams, the President. Adams used his power and influence to have Congress pass the Alien and Sedition Acts, which declared that the publication of false, scandalous, and malicious writing was punishable by fine and imprisonment. By virtue of this legislation, 25 editors were arrested and their newspapers were forced to shut down.

The first amendment was established to ensure that citizens are able to protect themselves from government, not so that government can protect itself from the people. If this bill passes, we will be standing here having the same debate in a couple of years on how to regulate 501(c)4 organizations. 501(c)4s require no disclosure and have no contribution limits. They will surely become the 527s of 2008 if this legislation passes.

This legislation, H.R. 513, simply compounds an existing problem. Loopholes will always exist, because there will always be money in politics. Instead of stifling speech and forcing it to go underground, we ought to be lifting up other players in the political system and provide more freedoms with greater transparency and more accountability.

Where will this lead? That is the question. If Republicans happen to lose in November, lose the majority, what happens when Democrats try to level the playing field by applying the so-called fairness doctrine to radio talk shows? Surely the Democrats will make the same arguments about Rush Limbaugh that Republicans are making about George Soros.

□ 1745

Back to the implications of the Alien and Sedition Acts. Americans were smart enough to realize what President Adams was using. He was using the powers of government to stifle free speech and they reacted accordingly. Public opposition to the Alien and Sedition Acts was so great that was a large reason Adams was defeated by Thomas Jefferson a few years later. This is history worth remembering, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the author of this legislation.

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

This is a surreal debate because it is a debate that has consequences and yet it seems to almost be like a game. When we passed campaign finance reform, it passed primarily with Democratic support and there wasn't any talk about free speech because Democrats made the proper argument. They made the argument that this was about letting people have their speech and not being drowned out by the wealthy.

That is what the Democrats said: Don't let the wealthy drown out people who don't have a lot of resources.

So what the Democrats are now arguing is that for instance 25 individual donors should be able to contribute $142 million, or 56 percent of all of the individual contributions to 527 groups in the 2004 election. That is what Democrats are saying. They are saying we want the wealthy to be able to dominate. But that was not their argument when they voted for campaign finance reform, and it was not my argument.

Our argument was that we wanted to have a level playing field. Our argument was we wanted to enforce the 1907 law that banned corporate treasury money, we wanted to enforce the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act that banned forced union dues money, and we wanted to support the 1974 campaign finance law that said you could not make unlimited contributions to federal campaigns. That is what Democrats argued for and supported. And they blamed Republicans for being against campaign finance reform.

The amazing thing is once the campaign finance reform bill passed Democrats immediately started to break the law. They were looking to get around the very law they voted for. And when Mr. Soros, who helped fund the campaign finance movement, argued that he should be able to contribute unlimited funds to 527s and that he should be able to bring his $20-plus million to the table, just this one individual, Democrats wanted to protect him and allow him to do that. And Republicans who were against the law said this is the law, we are going to abide by it.

The amazing thing is the very people who did not vote for the law were willing to abide by it, and the very people who voted for the law are trying to get around the law. That is what I find so amazing about this debate.

So what this amendment does is it just enforces the law that you, my fellow colleagues on the other side of the aisle, voted for. It enforces the Campaign Finance Act, the McCain-Feingold bill, the bill you all supported.

Now why do we have to pass this bill before us? Because unfortunately when we gave it to the Federal Elections Commission, the FEC, who does not believe in the law, decided not to enforce the law. They are happy to have loopholes. They are the ones who introduced the whole soft money issue in the first place.

So what do we have? We have a loophole that needs to be closed, and the way you close it, is to pass this bill that requires 527s to come under the campaign finance law. This is because their primary activity, in fact their only activity, is campaigns.

And the law is clear. Mr. MEEHAN and I brought forward a case against the FEC. We threw out 14 of their regulations because they did not abide by the law, and then we proceeded to take a court action against them on enforcing the law and put 527s under their jurisdiction.

The court made a decision that Mr. MEEHAN and I were right, that 527s should be under the law. In fact, the judge said not putting them under the law circumvented the law. So what we are doing is simply making the law consistent. And frankly, this talk of (c)(3)s, (c)(4)s and (c)(5)s, is not on point. Their primary responsibility and activity is not campaigns. And because of that, you are not going to have the same problem that you have with 527s. If in fact their primary activity becomes campaigns, then they will come under it.

This bill is consistent to the law. It is imperative it passes. It is consistent with what my colleagues voted for, and I applaud my side of the aisle for, in spite of the fact of not voting for the law, be willing to live by the law.

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

I would say to the gentleman who just spoke, this is not what we voted for. We did not vote to transfer 527s to 501(c)s. That is dishonesty. I oppose those who say this is an obscene bill, 527s are not obscene.

What they are trying to do now here with this bill would provide each national and State party committee to be free from any limits in spending on behalf of its candidates and the spending would take place at any time for the primary or general elections.

This is the flow of money that the American people are saying take out of campaigns.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify that the 527s have been and must always file with the Internal Revenue Service. They have to do quarterly reports. Unlike what has been said, that they do not have disclosure and they do not have reporting, that is not true, and I include for the RECORD the IRS filing dates so that can be placed in the RECORD.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE—UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

FORM 8872 FILING DATES (FOR 2006)

During an election year, a political organization has the option of filing on either a quarterly or a monthly schedule. The organization must continue on the same filing schedule for the entire calendar year.

OPTION 1.—QUARTERLY FILING SCHEDULE

| Report | Filing Date |
|---|---|
| 1st Quarter (January 1–March 31). | April 17, 2006 |
| 2nd Quarter (April 1–June 30) | July 17, 2007 |
| 3rd Quarter (July 1–September 30). | October 16, 2006 |
| 12-Day Pre-General Election* | October 26, 2006 (October 23, is posting report by certified or registered mail) |
| 30-Day Post-General Election | December 7, 2006 |
| Year-End | January 31, 2007 |
| 12-Day Pre-Election* | 12 days before the election (Varies according to date of election. See pre-election reporting dates chart) |

*A political organization files a 12-day pre-election report(s) prior to a federal election (primary, convention, and/or general election) if the political organization makes or has made contributions or expenditures with respect to a federal candidate(s) participating in that election. Therefore, if the organization supported a federal candidate in a primary election, it files a 12-day pre-election report prior to that candidate's primary election. If the organization made contributions or expenditures in connection with a federal candidate(s) in the general election, the organization also files the 12-day pre-general election report.

OPTION 2.—MONTHLY FILING SCHEDULE

| Report | Filing Date |
|---|---|
| January | February 21 |
| February | March 20 |
| March | April 20 |
| April | May 22 |
| May | June 21 |
| June | July 20 |
| July | August 21 |
| August | September 20 |
| September | October 20 |
| 12-Day Pre-General Election* | October 26 (October 23, if posting report by certified or registered mail) |
| 30-Day Post-General Election*. | December 7 |
| Year-End | January 31, 2007 |

*A political organization files a 12-day pre-election report(s) prior to a federal election (primary, convention, and/or general election) if the political organization makes or has made contributions or expenditures with respect to a federal candidate(s) participating in that election. Therefore, if the organization supported a federal candidate in a primary election, it files a 12-day pre-election report prior to that candidate's primary election. If the organization made contributions or expenditures in connection with a federal candidate(s) in the general election, the organization also files the 12-day pre-general election report.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 513, will have a chilling effect on tax exempt 501(c) organizations. Despite a provision exempting nonprofit charities and social service organizations, this bill, H.R. 513, regulates the same activities that such entities are permitted to engage in.

Should this bill become law, a precedent may be set that all nonprofit activities should be heavily regulated leading to significant new restrictions on 501(c)3s. H.R. 513 thus may represent a trend with chilling implications for the nonprofit sector.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a statement from the CATO Institute, a conservative think tank.

CATO INSTITUTE—Free Speech and the 527 Prohibition

(By Stephen M. Hoersting—April 3, 2006)

LIMITING THE SPEECH OF INDEPENDENT SPEAKERS IS UNWISE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL

*Forcing PACs on citizens is a matter for courts, not just Congress*

To constitutionally regulate campaign finance, the government must demonstrate that the ''harms it recites are real,'' not ''mere speculation or conjecture.'' Proposals to subject section 527 organizations to political committee status, with scant regard to their activities, effectively impose an ''any purpose'' test in brazen disregard of the ''major purpose'' test the Supreme Court established in Buckley v. Valeo. Such proposals presume that any communication mentioning a candidate that promotes, supports, attacks, or opposes that candidate at any time of the year—or any ''voter drive activity,'' even if totally non-partisan—is sufficient to trigger political committee status. If such proposals were in effect during the last cycle, any mention of President Bush's or Senator Kerry's policies from November 2, 2003 to November 2, 2004, or any attempt to identify voters, would have turned the 527 organization into a federal political committee. In FEC v. Beaumont, the Court noted that a non-profit corporation entitled to the MCFL exemption of federal campaign law—which exempts certain non-profit corporations from FECA's registration requirement—would have to register as a political committee to make contributions to federal candidates, though it would not have to register to make independent expenditures. The direct nexus to a federal candidate and the entity's enjoyment of the corporate form were ample reason to require it to register. There is no such connection here, however, or existing 527 organizations would already be covered.

Establishing and maintaining a PAC, however, is not a minor administrative task, and it has become more onerous with each new round of restrictions on PACs and those who run them. Gone will be the ability of citizens to adapt quickly and associate freely in support of a position when issues arise. The various funding source, amount, and disclosure requirements of PAC compliance make it difficult to raise the quantities of money for broadcast communications. New or small organizations may have a hard time, given the limited number of employees or members from whom they can solicit at all: not just anyone may contribute to a PAC; you have to belong to the organization, or work for the company or union that sponsors it. That has practical consequences of which courts are aware. The Swift Vets' communications would have been impossible, for example, without the modest seed money that would become illegal under current 527 proposals. Or if the PAC were wildly successful, however unlikely, it would come at the expense of other right-leaning PACs or party committees, all of which rely on individual contributors bound by biennial aggregate limits on their contributions to all political committees during an election cycle. In other words, the question of who will join your PAC in time to raise enough funds at a maximum of $5000 per person for advertising is a very real constraint on an organization's ability to run advertising—independent advertising, no less.

*Independent voices can't be limited*

Forcing political committee status on the organizations is only one question in assessing constitutionality. The ''key question is whether individual contributions to any political committee—527 or not—that does not make contributions to a candidate but instead makes only expenditures can be subject to limitation.'' In Buckley v. Valeo, the Supreme Court stated that the First Amendment permits the government to regulate campaign spending to prevent the corruption of officeholders or its appearance. The Court has not recognized any interest in ''equalizing'' speech. Contributions and funds spent in coordination with a candidate can be limited to protect against legislative quid pro quos. The Court has also said that contributions to an organization that in turn makes both contributions and independent expenditures (defined constitutionally as ''express advocacy'') can also be limited to make regulatory oversight feasible; to prevent the possibility that unlimited funds would flow to candidates. But independent spending lacks the necessary connection to officeholders, is not corrupting, and cannot be limited. The ''absence of prearrangement and coordination of an expenditure with the candidate or his agent not only undermines the value of the expenditure to the candidate, but also alleviates the danger that expenditures will be given as a quid pro quo for improper commitments from the candidate.'' Independent spending is not corrupting. Likewise, contributions to organizations that engage in independent spending are also not corrupting. The Court has already granted constitutional protection to an individual's independent spending. George Soros may buy all the advertising he wants. That right extends also to an individual's donation to an organization that engages in independent spending. ''The independent expenditure ceiling fails to serve any substantial governmental interest in stemming the reality or appearance of corruption in the electoral process . . . and ''heavily burdens core First Amendment protection.''

As stated by Professor Richard Briffault, ''[t]wo Supreme Court decisions provide support for the argument that if an independent expenditure does not present a danger of corrupting or appearing to corrupt officeholders, then contributions to a political committee that makes only independent expenditures cannot be limited.'' The first case is California Medical Ass'n v. FEC, a case involving limits on contributions by a trade association to its own PAC. In the plurality was Justice Blackmun, who wrote in concurrence that although the limit on contributions to a political committee is valid ''as a means of preventing evasion of the limitations on contributions to a candidate[,] . . . a different result would follow [if the limit] were applied to donations to a political [organization] established for the purpose of making independent expenditures, rather than contributions,'' because ''a committee that makes only independent expenditures . . . poses no threat'' of corruption. Professor John Eastman has noted that contributions to a committee that does not give to candidates, such as most section 527 organizations contemplated by current proposals, are deserving of even more constitutional protection because ''the principal message expressed by a contribution to a noncandidate committee is agreement with and furtherance of that committee's views,'' unlike the message expressed by contributions to a candidate committee or a committee that in turn gives to candidates. This approach is bolstered by the second case, Citizens Against Rent Control, which invalidated a contribution limit to a ballot proposition committee because the lack of a nexus to a candidate made corruption inapplicable. Similarly, where the nexus to an officeholder is not present, the anti-circumvention rationale of McConnell is also not furthered by a limit on contributions to organizations that engage in wholly independent activity.

Even though the contribution limit applies to the independent spending of political committees that also contribute to candidates or make coordinated expenditures, it is not clear that the Court would approve limits on organizations that engage in wholly independent activity. As noted by Professor Briffault, the McConnell Court's treatment of this issue related to BCRA's application of contribution limits to the activities of political parties.''[47] But the section 527 organizations Congress appears interested in and political party committees are not alike. ''[F]ederal candidates and officeholders enjoy a special relationship and unity of interest'' with their political party, said the McConnell Court.[48] ''The national committees of the two major parties are both run by, and largely composed of, federal officeholders and candidates.''[49] The ''close connection and alignment of interests'' between candidates and their political parties means that ''large soft-money contributions to national parties are likely to create the actual or apparent indebtedness on the part of federal officeholders, regardless of how those funds are ultimately spent,''[50] and the same is true of ''the close ties between federal candidates and state party committees.''[51]

The same cannot be said of 527 organizations. There is no record that candidates or party committees coordinated their spending with the 527s. Section 527 organizations simply have no comparable ties to candidates, thus making the anti-circumvention rationale of McConnell far too tenuous and unsuitable. Spending by section 527 organizations does not corrupt the legislative process because there is no nexus to lawmakers. It does not corrupt the balloting process. And spending by section 527 organizations does not corrupt the process of information exchange in the run up to the election. Indeed, spending by section 527 organizations is an integral part of the process of information exchange. And the information exchange needs to be open, robust and uninhibited.

*More speech is what is needed, not less*

Studies indicate that campaign spending diminishes neither trust nor involvement by citizens in elections. Indeed, spending increases public knowledge of candidates among all groups in the population. ''Higher campaign spending produces more knowledge about candidates,'' whether measured by name identification, association of candidates with issues, or ideology; and setting a cap on spending would likely produce a less informed electorate.[52] Unlimited spending does not confuse the public,[53] and the benefits of campaign spending are broadly dispersed across advantaged and disadvantaged groups alike. That is, as incumbents are challenged by spending, both advantaged and disadvantaged groups gain in knowledge.[54] And so-called negative advertising campaigns do not demobilize the public, as many have alleged.[55]

*Razing speech to the same level*

Yet many persons inside the beltway believe that 527s should be regulated on egalitarian grounds. Republican Party chairman Ken Mehlman is outspoken in support of 527 regulation, declaring that Congress ''must reform 527s, so that everyone plays at the same level, and billionaires can't once again use loopholes to try to buy elections.''[56] Democratic Party chairman Howard Dean signed expenditure limit legislation as Governor of Vermont and had the DNC file an amicus brief to the Supreme Court in support of the legislation.[57] Senator John McCain ''said that lawmakers should support the bill out of self-interest, because it would prevent a rich activist from trying to defeat an incumbent by diverting money into a political race through a 527 organization. 'That should alarm every federally elected Member of Congress,' he said.''[58] Senator Trent Lott

has called for limits on 527s to ''level the playing field.''[59] That these candidates and party chairs notice the spending and how it may benefit or hurt them is also a tenuous justification for regulation. Dissenting in McConnell, Chief Justice William Rehnquist wrote that benefit—even benefit expressed in gratitude—is not enough to justify restrictions, otherwise this rationale could serve as a basis to regulate ''editorials and political talk shows [that] benefit federal candidates and officeholders every bit as much as a generic voter registration drive conducted by a state party,''[60] a position adopted by the McConnell majority.[61] Preventing circumvention of applicable contribution limits and source prohibitions was the rationale employed by the Court in McConnell. The rationale was not to foster egalitarianism.[62]

Buckley long ago rejected the argument that ''equalizing the relative ability of individuals and groups to influence the outcome of elections''[63] is a compelling interest, adding that ''the concept that government may restrict the speech of some elements of our society in order to enhance the relative voice of others is wholly foreign to the First Amendment.''[64] The Court has said elsewhere that trying to manipulate groups' relative ability to speak ''is a decidedly fatal objective.''[65] And there is good reason to be suspicious of the motives of incumbent legislators and party chairmen seeking egalitarianism in campaign spending. After a certain level of spending, the utility of further spending declines, and incumbents hit the point of marginal utility earlier than opponents.[66] Political free trade is both the norm and normative prescription for a healthy and constitutional political system in America. And ''[p]olitical 'free trade' does not necessarily require that all who participate in the political marketplace do so with exactly equal resources.''[67]

Mr. Speaker, the CATO Institute writes that limiting the speech of independent speakers is unwise and unconstitutional. In fact, forcing PACs on citizens is a matter for courts and not Congress. To constitutionally regulate campaign finance, the government must demonstrate that the harms it recites are real, not just mere speculation or conjecture. Proposals to subject section 527 organizations to political committee status with scant regard to their activities effectively imposes an any-purpose test in brazen disregard for the major purpose test of the Supreme Court established under Buckley v. Valeo.

Mr. Speaker, conservative groups are saying this is not good policy, that this policy is shutting down those groups that were independent, free of Congress, free of the Members of Congress, and this bill influences the outcome of elections and in fact money will be flowing all over the place as it is doing right now. Money will be flowing all over the place as we are speaking today.

This is a bad bill. The American people do not want more money into these campaigns. They want less money. I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), the other sponsor of the bill from the minority side.

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

Mr. Speaker, basically this is a legal issue. 527s are legally established because their primary purpose is to influence the election or defeat of a Federal candidate. They have to file with the FEC because after Watergate in 1974 this Congress passed a law that said if you are going to have a political committee whose primary purpose is to influence an election, then they have to register with the FEC.

The FEC ignored 30 years of congressional actions and Supreme Court jurisprudence in allowing 527s to evade the law. In short, the FEC failed to do its job and regulate 527s as required under the Watergate statute. So in September of 2004, Congressman SHAYS and I filed a suit against the FEC for failing to enforce the regulations.

You know what is interesting, just last Wednesday the U.S. District Court Judge Sullivan ruled in favor of our position that the FEC had failed to present a reasonable explanation for its decision in 2004 not to regulate 527s. Judge Sullivan remanded the case back to the FEC and said either you articulate a reason for not regulating 527s or promulgate a new rule. A new rule that regulates 527s is called for under the law. That is all we are seeking to do here. That is all we are seeking to do. One way or the other, the court is going to rule in favor. This is one way for us to do it quickly.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I just have to say, I am a little disappointed in this debate. In fact, I am greatly disappointed in this debate. I am just a simple person who grew up in a small town, and I grew up in an area where we said what we meant, and we meant what we said.

I have heard so much diversionary discussion on this topic from the minority today, it is very disappointing to me.

The proposition of the bill is very simple: unlimited spending of soft money was intended to be banned under BCRA. A diversionary tactic has developed which allows the expenditures of huge amounts of money, unregulated soft money, and this bill today is an attempt to stop that practice which is being carried out by people who are violating the intent of a law we passed a few years ago. That plain and simple is the issue here.

I urge the body to adopt the bill and stop the abominable practice of huge amounts of unregulated, unreported money influencing elections. Let's get back to the original intent of BCRA and put it in place and enforce it.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the material I previously referred to.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 29, 2004]

THE SOFT MONEY BOOMERANG

It's encouraging to see signs of life in Washington, particularly on the Republican side of the aisle, over the obvious need to plug the newest subterranean pipe for unregulated campaign funds from big labor, big corporations and just plain big money.

Of all the subplots in the presidential election, none were as sorry as the Democrats' pioneering ''527'' groups—named for the section of the tax code that governs them. The 527's were intended to circumvent the law's strictures against having unlimited soft money flood into political races. The Democrats built these new shadow-party advocacy groups to attack the president early in the campaign season and build voter-turnout machines. Then they watched Bush partisans adapt the same financing device to float the campaign's most notorious and devastating attack ads, the Swift boat assaults on John Kerry's heroic war record and his antiwar activities after he returned from Vietnam.

Dollar-wise, the Democrats proved better at milking the 527 strategy, spending more than three times as much as the Republicans in stealth-party ads favoring their presidential ticket. But the Republicans wielded their ads like a rapier once the Federal Election Commission, true to its track record, shirked its responsibility by deciding that the new breed of advocacy groups should not be controlled under the campaign finance reform laws.

A commission majority endorsed the fiction that the 527's are independent. The truth is that they were strategically linked to the candidates and perfect targets for aggressive F.E.C. regulation and spending limits. The 527 fund-raisers were the V.I.P. toast of the party conventions last summer, raising money in luxury suites with a wink and a grin.

After this year's election drubbings, you would think the Democrats would now see the folly of the 527 committees. But, no, ranking Democrats are determined to make them a permanent campaign weapon, with no dollar caps on the corporations, labor unions and fat-cat partisans who spent more than $550 million on such committees in this year's races.

President Bush condemned the 527's and promised a crackdown when the Democrats first exploited them and caught the G.O.P. short. But later in the campaign, he failed to condemn the Swift boat ads when Senator John McCain did so and pointedly asked for the president's support. Now Mr. Bush has another chance to put his considerable political weight behind Mr. McCain, who is determined to use the coming Congressional session to pass legislation that would force this blowzy lucre-genie back into the bottle.

Senator McCain overcame whatever past bad feeling there was between himself and the president and became a dogged Bush campaigner this year. We hope the president repays him by explicitly backing the McCain fight to stop the 527 gamesmanship as an abuse of fair elections. And it's equally important for the president to enlist in the senator's campaign to overhaul the election commission. The F.E.C. is a transparent extension of hack party politics, beholden to members of Congress who are more concerned with their own incumbency than the public interest.

---

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 5, 2006]

CLOSE THE 527 LOOPHOLE

CONGRESS SHOULD BEACH THE SWIFT BOATS AND GEORGE SOROS, TOO

The House plans to take up legislation today that would close the biggest remaining loophole in the campaign finance system. It would require the political groups known as 527s to play by the same rules as other committees that aim to influence federal elections. The House ought to pass the measure, sponsored by Reps. Christopher Shays (R-

Conn.) and Martin T. Meehan (D-Mass.), and shut down the kind of 527 ''soft money'' operation that flourished during the 2004 campaign, like Democrats' America Coming Together and Republicans' Swift Boat Veterans for Truth.

These committees, named after the section of the tax code under which they're established, are by definition ''organized and operated primarily'' to influence elections. When those elections are for federal office, it makes no sense to let such groups collect six-, seven- and even eight-figure checks to elect or defeat candidates, while candidates, political parties and political action committees are limited to receiving contributions a small fraction of that size. Similarly, corporations and labor unions—barred by law from contributing directly to federal candidates or parties—shouldn't be allowed to write checks to 527s, which exist for the same purpose.

The usual politics of campaign finance reform—Democrats for (at least publicly), Republicans against—are upside down this time around. The reason is that Republicans do better than Democrats at raising the (relatively) small donations known as ''hard money,'' while Democrats took the lead in the past election cycle in raising soft money for 527 groups. Connoisseurs of hypocrisy should enjoy this spectacle, but the partisan calculations are probably overstated. Democrats, with the rise of the Internet, have been improving their hard-money fundraising. Republicans are bound to draw even in the 527 race if it continues.

There are concerns that regulating money to 527s would drive spending further into the shadows, to nonprofit groups and trade associations that, unlike 527s, don't even have to disclose their donors and spending. But there are restrictions on the partisan activity of such groups, and if a problem develops with the misuse of such organizations, that could be addressed in future legislation. It's not a reason for inaction now.

---

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 11, 2003]

SOROS'S DEEP POCKETS VS. BUSH; FINANCIER CONTRIBUTES $5 MILLION MORE IN EFFORT TO OUST PRESIDENT

(By Laura Blumenfeld)

NEW YORK.—George Soros, one of the world's richest men, has given away nearly $5 billion to promote democracy in the former Soviet bloc, Africa and Asia. Now he has a new project: defeating President Bush.

''It is the central focus of my life,'' Soros said, his blue eyes settled on an unseen target. The 2004 presidential race, he said in an interview, is ''a matter of life and death.''

Soros, who has financed efforts to promote open societies in more than 50 countries around the world, is bringing the fight home, he said. On Monday, he and a partner committed up to $5 million to MoveOn.org, a liberal activist group, bringing to $15.5 million the total of his personal contributions to oust Bush.

Overnight, Soros, 74, has become the major financial player of the left. He has elicited cries of foul play from the right. And with a tight nod, he pledged: ''If necessary, I would give more money.''

''America, under Bush, is a danger to the world,'' Soros said. Then he smiled: ''And I'm willing to put my money where my mouth is.''

Soros believes that a ''supremacist ideology'' guides this White House. He hears echoes in its rhetoric of his childhood in occupied Hungary. ''When I hear Bush say, 'You're either with us or against us,' it reminds me of the Germans.'' It conjures up memories, he said, of Nazi slogans on the walls, Der Feind Hort mit (''The enemy is listening''). ''My experiences under Nazi and Soviet rule have sensitized me,'' he said in a soft Hungarian accent.

Soros's contributions are filling a gap in Democratic Party finances that opened after the restrictions in the 2002 McCain-Feingold law took effect. In the past, political parties paid a large share of television and get-out-the-vote costs with unregulated ''soft money'' contributions from corporations, unions and rich individuals. The parties are now barred from accepting such money. But non-party groups in both camps are stepping in, accepting soft money and taking over voter mobilization.

''It's incredibly ironic that George Soros is trying to create a more open society by using an unregulated, under-the-radar-screen, shadowy, soft-money group to do it,'' Republican National Committee spokeswoman Christine Iverson said. ''George Soros has purchased the Democratic Party.''

In past election cycles, Soros contributed relatively modest sums. In 2000, his aide said, he gave $122,000, mostly to Democratic causes and candidates. But recently, Soros has grown alarmed at the influence of neoconservatives, whom he calls ''a bunch of extremists guided by a crude form of social Darwinism.''

Neoconservatives, Soros said, are exploiting the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, to promote a preexisting agenda of preemptive war and world dominion. ''Bush feels that on September 11th he was anointed by God,'' Soros said. ''He's leading the U.S. and the world toward a vicious circle of escalating violence.''

Soros said he had been waking at 3 a.m., his thoughts shaking him ''like an alarm clock.'' Sitting in his robe, he wrote his ideas down, longhand, on a stack of pads. In January, PublicAffairs will publish them as a book, ''The Bubble of American Supremacy'' (an excerpt appears in December's Atlantic Monthly). In it, he argues for a collective approach to security, increased foreign aid and ''preventive action.''

''It would be too immodest for a private person to set himself up against the president,'' he said. ''But it is, in fact''—he chuckled—''the Soros Doctrine.''

His campaign began last summer with the help of Morton H. Halperin, a liberal think tank veteran. Soros invited Democratic strategists to his house in Southampton, Long Island, including Clinton chief of staff John D. Podesta, Jeremy Rosner, Robert Boorstin and Carl Pope.

They discussed the coming election. Standing on the back deck, the evening sun angling into their eyes, Soros took aside Steve Rosenthal, CEO of the liberal activist group America Coming Together (ACT), and Ellen Malcolm, its president. They were proposing to mobilize voters in 17 battleground states. Soros told them he would give ACT $10 million.

Asked about his moment in the sun, Rosenthal deadpanned: ''We were disappointed. We thought a guy like George Soros could do more.'' Then he laughed. ''No, kidding! It was thrilling.''

Malcolm: ''It was like getting his Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval.''

''They were ready to kiss me,'' Soros quipped.

Before coffee the next morning, his friend Peter Lewis, chairman of the Progressive Corp., had pledged $10 million to ACT. Rob Glaser, founder and CEO of RealNetworks, promised $2 million. Rob McKay, president of the McKay Family Foundation, gave $1 million, and benefactors Lewis and Dorothy Cullman committed $500,000.

Soros also promised up to $3 million to Podesta's new think tank, the Center for American Progress.

Soros will continue to recruit wealthy donors for his campaign. Having put a lot of money into the war of ideas around the world, he has learned that ''money buys talent; you can advocate more effectively.''

At his home in Westchester, N.Y., he raised $115,000 for Democratic presidential candidate Howard Dean. He also supports Democratic presidential contenders Sen. John F. Kerry (Mass.), retired Gen. Wesley K. Clark and Rep. Richard A. Gephardt (Mo.).

In an effort to limit Soros's influence, the RNC sent a letter to Dean Monday, asking him to request that ACT and similar organizations follow the McCain-Feingold restrictions limiting individual contributions to $2,000.

The RNC is not the only group irked by Soros. Fred Wertheimer, president of Democracy 21, which promotes changes in campaign finance, has benefited from Soros's grants over the years. Soros has backed altering campaign finance, an aide said, donating close to $18 million over the past seven years.

''There's some irony, given the supporting role he played in helping to end the soft money system,'' Wertheimer said. ''I'm sorry that Mr. Soros has decided to put so much money into a political effort to defeat a candidate. We will be watchdogging him closely.''

An aide said Soros welcomes the scrutiny. Soros has become as rich as he has, the aide said, because he has a preternatural instinct for a good deal.

Asked whether he would trade his $7 billion fortune to unseat Bush, Soros opened his mouth. Then he closed it. The proposal hung in the air: Would he become poor to beat Bush?

He said, ''If someone guaranteed it.''

---

APRIL 4, 2006.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House is scheduled to consider this week H.R. 513, legislation sponsored by Representatives Chris Shays (R–CT) and Marty Meehan (D–MA) to require that 527 groups spending money to influence federal elections comply with federal campaign finance laws.

Our organizations support H.R. 513, which is necessary to close the FEC-created loophole that allowed both Democratic and Republican 527 groups to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in unlimited soft money to influence the 2004 presidential and congressional elections.

The organizations include the Campaign Legal Center, Common Cause, Democracy 21, the League of Women Voters, Public Citizen and U.S. PIRG.

Under H.R. 513, the 527 political groups would be able to continue to undertake activities to influence federal elections, but would do so under the same campaign finance laws that apply to candidates, political parties and other political committees whose major purpose is to influence federal elections. Enclosed is a Q and A on H.R. 513.

Much of the soft money contributed to 527 groups to influence the 2004 federal elections came from a relatively small number of very wealthy individuals. According to campaign finance scholar Anthony Corrado, just 25 individuals accounted for $146 million raised by Democratic and Republican 527 groups that spent money to influence the 2004 federal elections.

In order to qualify as a 527 group under the Internal Revenue Code and receive tax-exempt status, Section 527 groups must be ''organized and operated primarily'' to influence elections. They are, by definition, ''political organizations,'' not ''issue groups,'' and they should not be operating outside federal campaign finance laws when they are spending money to influence federal elections.

As the Supreme Court stated in the McConnell case upholding the constitutionality of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, Section 527 groups ''by definition engage in partisan political activity.'' The Court stated in McConnell that 527 groups ''are, unlike §501(c) groups, organized for the express purpose of engaging in partisan political activity.''

Section 527 groups are treated differently under campaign finance laws than Section 501(c) groups because they are fundamentally different entities than 501(c) groups.

Section 527 groups, by definition, are organized and operated ''primarily'' to influence elections. This standard has long been used to define political groups that are covered by and must comply with federal campaign finance laws. Section 527 groups have the same organizing principle as candidate committees, political party committees and PACs—their primary purpose is to influence elections—and should be subject to the same campaign finance laws.

Section 501(c) groups, by contrast, are prohibited by their tax status from having a primary purpose to influence elections. Although Section 501(c) groups (except for charitable groups) are permitted to spend some money for political purposes, tax laws impose constraints on the political activity they can engage in, while similar constraints are not imposed on 527 groups.

The 2004 election demonstrated widespread soft money abuses by 527 groups, which spent hundreds of millions of dollars to influence the presidential and congressional elections without complying with the federal campaign finance laws. H.R. 513 addresses this demonstrated problem.

As we noted in our letter yesterday, an amendment may be offered by Representative Mike Pence (R–IN) to repeal the existing aggregate limit on the total contributions that an individual can give to all federal candidates and political parties in a two-year election cycle. The Pence amendment would repeal an essential Watergate reform that was enacted to prevent corruption and the appearance of corruption, and was upheld as constitutional on this basis by the Supreme Court.

We strongly oppose the Pence proposal, which would allow a President, Senator or Representative to solicit, and a single donor to contribute, a total of more than $3,000,000 for the officeholder's party and the party's congressional candidates in a two-year election cycle.

We urge you to vote against the Pence ''poison pill'' amendment and also urge you to vote against H.R. 513 if it includes the Pence proposal or any variation of it.

Another proposal may be made to repeal section 441a(d) of the campaign finance laws, a provision which imposes limits on spending by political parties in coordination with their federal candidates.

We oppose repealing the limits on coordinated party spending with candidates.

Under Supreme Court rulings, a political party can spend an unlimited amount of hard money in a federal candidate's race, independently of that candidate, even if the party has reached its limit on coordinated spending with that candidate in the race.

Thus, repeal of the limits on coordinated spending will not change the total amount of money a political party can spend in a given race, but rather will change the amount that can be spent in coordination with the party's candidate in the race.

Supporters of repealing the limit argue that this is a more effective way for parties to assist their candidates. We oppose repeal of the coordinated spending limit, however, since it provides a constraint on parties serving as a vehicle for individual donors to evade the limits on contributions from individuals to candidates.

H.R. 513 is based on the simple proposition that a 527 group that spends money to influence federal elections should abide by the same set of rules that apply to other political groups whose purpose is to spend money to influence federal elections. There is no basis for allowing a 527 group to claim the advantage of a tax exemption as a ''political organization'' under the tax laws, while at the same time failing to comply with the federal campaign finance laws on the claim that it is not a ''political committee.''

We strongly urge you to vote for H.R. 513, provided it does not include the Pence ''poison pill'' proposal to repeal or undermine the aggregate limit on individual contributions.

CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER
COMMON CAUSE
DEMOCRACY 21
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
PUBLIC CITIZEN
U.S. PIRG

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, April 4, 2006.*

Hon. VERNON J. EHLERS,
*Chairman, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN EHLERS: In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 513, the ''527 Reform Act of 2005,'' the Committee on the Judiciary hereby waives consideration of the bill. There are provisions contained in H.R. 513 that implicate the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. Specifically, section 5 provides for judicial review of certain constitutional challenges to the legislation. This provision implicates the rule X(1)(l)(1) jurisdiction of the Committee over ''the judiciary and judicial proceedings, civil and criminal.''

The Committee takes this action with the understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 513, the Committee on the Judiciary does not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 513 on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
*Chairman.*

---

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, April 4, 2006.*

Hon. JAMES SENSENBRENNER,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SENSENBRENNER: Thank you for your recent letter regarding your Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 513, the 527 Reform Act of 2006, scheduled for floor consideration this week.

I acknowledge your committee's jurisdictional interest in Section 5 of the bill, and agree that your decision to forego further action on it will not prejudice the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record when the legislation is considered by the House.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

VERNON J. EHLERS,
*Chairman.*

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, throughout my career, I have consistently and strongly supported sensible campaign finance reform. As introduced, H.R. 513, the 527 Reform Act, was a measure I could have supported. In the long run, it would have been politically neutral; not giving an advantage to either Republicans or Democrats.

However, with the changes that have been made to the bill by the Republican leadership, this bill would needlessly allow unlimited contributions from party committees to coordinate with campaigns and thereby dramatically raising the amount of money spent on elections, not reduce it. This provision alone would dramatically undermine the campaign finance reforms we worked so hard to put in place in 2002. The bill is neither necessary nor fair and would increase the role of money in campaigns and elections.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against H.R. 513, the ''527 Reform Act of 2005'' introduced by Congressmen SHAYS and MEEHAN. As a strong and long-term supporter of the Shays-Meehan/McCain-Feingold campaign reform legislation, I want to take this opportunity to explain my decision to vote against H.R. 513 today.

On the surface, H.R. 513 appears to be simple. It would require ''527 groups,'' which represent individuals or groups that are not directly affiliated with political party organizations, to register and report with the Federal Election Commission in the same manner as political committees. I support that part of this bill.

However, the Republican Leadership inserted a poison pill into the bill. In the dark of night, the Republican-controlled House Rules Committee added an amendment to roll back current limits on Congressional campaign committee spending in supporting a candidate in a House general election. In 2006, Congressional committees are limited to spending a maximum of $79,200 in a Congressional race. This amount is set by law and adjusted for inflation. Under current law, Congressional campaign committees possess the authority to spend unlimited amounts on a campaign. Congressional committees must currently borrow and use the limits assigned by law to each party's national committee and each state party committee. The amended bill will lift current caps and upset the balance of spending.

A second killer amendment eliminates Congressional campaign committee limits on party spending for Congressional candidates. This bill allows each party to accept transfers from other committees within the party structure when spending for a candidate. This change will enable the National Republican Congressional Committee to accept unlimited transfers from the Republican National Committee for use in spending on any Congressional campaign. It is not a coincidence that Republicans outspend Democrats 5:1.

We have just seen the former Republican Majority Leader resign from Congress in disgrace. Another prominent member of the majority party sits in jail for accepting tawdry bribes while selling his office. Prominent administration officials have been arrested or are under indictment. This is not a time to be playing parliamentary games with the ethical process.

And that is why I voted against this shamefully amended version of H.R. 513 today.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in strong support of H.R.

513, the 527 Reform Act of 2006. H.R. 513 takes an important step in closing a ''soft-money'' loophole by requiring 527 groups to comply with the same federal campaign laws that political parties and political action committees must follow.

In fact, the Federal Election Commission should have already done this. A federal district judge in Washington recently called for action, ruling that the Federal Election Commission had ''failed to present a reasoned explanation'' for not requiring 527 groups to register as political committees.

H.R. 513 will close this FEC-created loophole that has allowed 527 groups, of both parties, to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in unlimited soft money to influence presidential and congressional elections without complying with campaign finance laws.

During the last election cycle, 527 groups raised $426 million. Likewise, much of the soft money came from a relatively small number of very wealthy individuals. According to campaign finance scholar Anthony Corrado, just 25 individuals accounted for $146 million raised by Democratic and Republican 527 groups that spent money to influence the 2004 federal elections. And, we are already seeing an increase in the rate at which 527s are raising money this election cycle.

If the primary role of 527 groups is to influence federal elections, which it clearly is, they must play by the same set of rules that apply to other political groups whose purpose is to spend money to influence federal elections. There should be no exception.

At a time when the public is calling for transparency and accountability, no longer can we tolerate a loophole that allows this type of money from the wealthy few to unfairly influence the political process.

If you voted for the Shays-Meehan/McCain-Feingold Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform bill in 2002—and 240 of us did—it would be wholly out of step to not support H.R. 513.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 513.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the efforts of my colleagues CHRIS SHAYS and MARTY MEEHAN to strengthen elections in this country. However, I oppose the measure they offer today because it seeks to address the wrong problem, and as a result, this proposal squelches participation by individuals and small donors in the electoral process. For that reason, and because there are First Amendment implications as well, I will vote against this measure.

On my first day as a Member of Congress in 1999, I joined the fight for campaign finance reform. I did so because we needed to curtail the influence of money in politics. The Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act (BCRA) was critical to that effort because it eliminated corporate money and capped the size of donations that could be made to political candidates and political parties. These steps made it less likely that elected officials will be beholden to large donors instead of to their constituents.

The critical distinction between BCRA and the proposal before us today is that BCRA limited the amount of money that could go toward political candidates and parties. Today's proposal limits donations to organizations that advocate for a policy or a point of view. That is a radically different approach. Let's remember something: Elected officials are supposed to hear from their constituents at election time. A group of citizens speaking loudly through the collective action of a 527 is a democracy behaving as it should.

Organizations that attain 527 status under the Internal Revenue Code are dedicated to specific ideals and legislative objectives that they believe are best for America. Some 527s want more investment in education. Some want lower taxes. Some support the right to choose. Others oppose it. None of these organizations, however, may be dedicated to a specific person or party. They may not advocate for or against a specific candidate, nor coordinate their activities with a candidate's campaign. By definition, their involvement is the stuff of political discourse.

As a strong, early, and vocal supporter of the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act, I agree with the ban on raising and spending unregulated ''soft'' money by candidates and political parties. BCRA helps prevent elected Members of Congress from developing a ''second constituency,'' one that is different from their actual constituency, which is the people they represent. However, BCRA did not intend to prohibit robust debate of political ideals, values, and proposals for the betterment of our country. Doing so not only stifles political discourse, it runs afoul of the First Amendment right to speak freely. In February of 2004, I joined several of my colleagues in writing to the Federal Elections Commission (FEC) stating my view that while we need to break the link between unregulated contributions and federal officeholders, we need to protect, preserve, and even increase political involvement by ordinary citizens and independent associations.

If this bill passes, it's important to note who would be affected. According to the Institute for Politics, Democracy and the Internet, 527 fundraising and spending increased fourfold between 2000 and 2004, while at the same time, voter turnout reached an unprecedented high of almost 126 million voters in 2004—15 million more than in 2000. This was largely a direct result of voter registration, education, and mobilization activities organized by 527s. Most importantly, although it has been widely reported that certain wealthy individuals made multi-million dollar contributions to 527s, the vast majority of 527 receipts were from individual donations of under $200. The liberal 527 organization ''America Coming Together,'' for example, raised $80 million in 2004, 80 percent of which was from donations of less than $200. Similarly, the conservative 527 organization ''Progress for America'' raised $45 million in 2004, 85 percent of which was from donations of less than $200.

These statistics are in stark contrast to much of the debate on this issue. Supporters of the proposal before us today have pointed to wealthy individuals who contributed large sums to 527s as evidence that 527s should be curtailed. My question is this: Even if this bill passes, what is to stop wealthy individuals from simply paying for the same television ads, mail pieces, and organizational efforts on their own, without 527s? If this bill passes, these same individuals will simply spend their money on their own. It is small donors—who, as I said already, are the majority of donors to 527s—who will be denied the benefit of collective action. Squelching 527s will not curb the involvement of wealthy individuals, it will simply make them towering figures on the playing field of public discourse. This is exactly the wrong outcome.

If we want to tighten issue advocacy, we should do so by enforcing the already existing requirement that 527s remain truly independent of political candidates and parties. Truly independent 527 organizations expand the political debate, increase the public's opportunity to hold elected officials accountable, and increase participation in the political process by ordinary Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 755, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the question of passage will be followed by 5-minute votes on House Resolution 692 and H.R. 3127.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 209, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—218

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aderholt | Coble | Gutknecht |
| Akin | Cole (OK) | Hall |
| Alexander | Conaway | Harris |
| Bachus | Crenshaw | Hart |
| Baker | Cubin | Hastert |
| Baldwin | Culberson | Hastings (WA) |
| Barrett (SC) | Davis (KY) | Hayes |
| Barton (TX) | Davis, Jo Ann | Hayworth |
| Bass | Davis, Tom | Hefley |
| Beauprez | Deal (GA) | Herger |
| Biggert | DeLay | Hobson |
| Bilirakis | Dent | Hostettler |
| Bishop (UT) | Diaz-Balart, L. | Hulshof |
| Blackburn | Diaz-Balart, M. | Hunter |
| Blunt | Doolittle | Hyde |
| Boehlert | Drake | Inglis (SC) |
| Boehner | Dreier | Issa |
| Bonilla | Duncan | Jenkins |
| Bonner | Ehlers | Jindal |
| Bono | Emerson | Johnson (CT) |
| Boozman | English (PA) | Johnson (IL) |
| Boren | Everett | Johnson, Sam |
| Boustany | Feeney | Keller |
| Bradley (NH) | Ferguson | Kelly |
| Brady (TX) | Fitzpatrick (PA) | Kennedy (MN) |
| Brown (SC) | Foley | King (NY) |
| Brown-Waite, Ginny | Forbes | Kingston |
| Burgess | Fortenberry | Kirk |
| Burton (IN) | Foxx | Kline |
| Buyer | Frelinghuysen | Knollenberg |
| Calvert | Gallegly | Kolbe |
| Camp (MI) | Gerlach | Kuhl (NY) |
| Campbell (CA) | Gibbons | LaHood |
| Cannon | Gilchrest | Latham |
| Cantor | Gillmor | LaTourette |
| Capito | Gingrey | Leach |
| Carter | Goode | Lewis (CA) |
| Case | Goodlatte | Lewis (KY) |
| Castle | Granger | Linder |
| Chabot | Graves | LoBiondo |
| | Green (WI) | Lucas |

Lungren, Daniel E.
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—209

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hensarling
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mack
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Evans
Hoekstra
Ros-Lehtinen
Schakowsky
Tanner
Watson

□ 1829

Mr. WATT changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FORBES, OSBORNE, WELDON of Florida, MANZULLO, and POE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMENDING THE PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS FOR THE CONTRIBUTIONS AND SACRIFICES THEY MADE TO THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR TESTING PROGRAM IN THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 692.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 692, 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 424, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt

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

NOT VOTING—8

Diaz-Balart, L.
Evans
Hoekstra
Ros-Lehtinen
Sabo
Schakowsky
Tanner
Watson

□ 1838

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.

## DARFUR PEACE AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3127, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3127, as amended, 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 416, nays 3, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Flake
Kolbe
Paul

NOT VOTING—13

Crenshaw
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Evans
Ford
Herseth
Hoekstra
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Schakowsky
Tanner
Watson

□ 1846

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4297, the tax reconciliation conference report.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move 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—

(1) to agree to the provisions of section 102 (relating to credit for elective deferrals and ira contributions), and section 108 (relating to extension and modification of research credit), of the Senate amendment,

(2) to agree to the provisions of section 106 of the Senate amendment (relating to extension and increase in minimum tax relief to individuals),

(3) to 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, and

(4) to the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, to insist on a conference report which will neither increase the Federal budget deficit nor increase the amount of the debt subject to the public debt limit.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2830, PENSION PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 2830, pension conference report.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move 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. 2830 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in the Senate amendment regarding the prohibition of wearaway in connection with conversions to cash balance plans and the establishment of procedures affecting participants' benefits in connection with the conversion to such plans and not to agree to the provisions contained in title VII of the bill as passed the House.

## 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 tomorrow.

Proceedings on motions to suspend the rules postponed earlier today will also resume tomorrow.

## CONGRATULATING NASA ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST FLIGHT OF THE SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Con. Res. 366) to congratulate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the 25th anniversary of the first flight of the Space Transportation System, to honor Commander John Young and the Pilot Robert Crippen, who flew Space Shuttle *Columbia* on April 12–14, 1981, on its first orbital test flight, and to commend the men and women of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and all those supporting America's space program for their accomplishments and their role in inspiring the American people.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 366

Whereas Space Shuttle Columbia was the first manned, reusable spacecraft that was flown into orbit without benefit of previous unmanned orbital test flights;

Whereas the Space Shuttle Columbia was the first spacecraft to launch with wings, using solid rocket boosters;

Whereas the Space Shuttle Columbia was the first reentry spacecraft to land on a conventional runway;

Whereas the Space Shuttle program has allowed the United States to partner with other nations to build and to inhabit the International Space Station;

Whereas the successful return to flight of the Space Shuttle represents the first leg of the Nation's Vision for Space Exploration;

Whereas the men and women of America's Space Shuttle program have been instrumental in ensuring the Nation's preeminence in space exploration for 25 years;

Whereas the very specialized and highly valued workforce of the Space Shuttle program will contribute greatly to the Vision for Space Exploration as we return to the Moon, and go on to Mars and beyond;

Whereas, like the explorers Lewis and Clark who explored our great Nation, John Young and Robert Crippen opened a new era of human exploration beyond our planet; and

Whereas heroes such as John Young and Robert Crippen are a great inspiration to our next generation of Americans as they stimulate interest in the study of math and science: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) congratulates the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the 25th anniversary of the first flight of the Space Transportation System;

(2) honors Commander John Young and the Pilot Robert Crippen, who flew Space Shuttle Columbia on April 12–14, 1981, on its first orbital test flight; and

(3) commends the men and women of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and all those supporting America's space program for their accomplishments and their role in inspiring the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 366.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the first flight of the Space Shuttle.

On April 12, 1981, Commander John Young and Pilot Robert Crippen launched from the Kennedy Space Center in the Space Shuttle *Columbia*. Their successful 3-day test flight of the manned, reusable spacecraft marked the beginning of a long career for the Space Shuttle that continues today.

Because of the design of the Shuttle, the spacecraft is uniquely qualified to help America build and supply the International Space Station. As we work with our international partners to complete the Space Station, the Shuttle will help us achieve that goal. For 25 years, the men and women of our Shuttle program have done a remarkable job returning the Shuttle to flight year after year to continue America's prominence in space. This resolution not only commends the first flight of the Shuttle, but it also recognizes and honors these dedicated citizens who work every day to this singular goal.

The Shuttle has seen glory and it has seen tragedy. The loss of *Challenger* and *Columbia* remind us that space travel is difficult and dangerous. Astronauts are today's Columbuses and Magellans—and their mission is a fragile and dangerous one. And yet, the Space Shuttle program continued on because of the men and women dedicated to the important work of the space program—work that benefits all sectors of society and improves the quality of all our lives.

America now has a new Vision for Space Exploration. We have already achieved the first step in the new Vision for Space Exploration when the Space Shuttle returned to flight last summer. Commander Eileen Collins and her crew successfully executed the 14-day mission into outer space and delivered more than 6 tons of needed supplies to the Space Station. Like many of my colleagues, I am eagerly anticipating the Shuttle's next flight this summer.

I am also looking forward to our next step in the process—the development of a new vehicle to replace the Shuttle. We need to make sure that the transition between these two spacecrafts is as seamless at possible because we cannot afford to lose the very specialized and highly valued Shuttle workforce. We also need to make sure that the new spacecraft includes a crew escape system because our astronauts deserve to be as safe as possible. I am pleased that NASA will require this system on the new crew exploration vehicle, and I will be continuing to monitor that development.

America leads the world in space exploration, and this is due, in large part, to the men and women of the Space Shuttle program. And this is only the beginning. With astronauts like the ones who traveled over the years on the Space Shuttle, and specialists and staff at NASA, America will continue to push frontiers and lead the world in space exploration and discovery.

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

Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1981, two American heroes, Commander John Young and Pilot Robert Crippen, were strapped into their seats in the Space Shuttle *Columbia* and took off into history, orbiting the Earth for 54 hours, 20 minutes, and 53 seconds. This was the boldest test flight in history.

The space shuttle was the first reusable spacecraft to be flown into orbit without the benefit of previous unmanned orbital test flights, and was the first spacecraft to land on a conventional runway at Edwards Air Force Base in my home State of California.

Like the explorers Lewis and Clark who explored our great Nation and who opened up the West, John Young and Robert Crippen opened a new era of human exploration beyond our planet Earth. Now, as we move forward with the vision for space exploration, the successful return to flight of the space shuttle represents the first step toward going to the Moon, Mars, and beyond.

Today as a Nation, we want to pay tribute to the National Space and Aeronautics Administration on the 25th anniversary of the first flight of the space shuttle. We want to honor Commander John Young and Pilot Robert Crippen, who flew the first Space Shuttle *Columbia*, on April 12–14, 1981, on its first orbital test flight. We want to commend the men and women of NASA and our aerospace industry for the roles they play in inspiring the American people. This is what provides the inspiration to our next generation to study math and science. This is what keeps our Nation competitive.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague and rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 366, a resolution to commemorate the first flight of the Space Shuttle STS–1 and to honor its crew, Commander John W. Young and Pilot Robert L. Crippen.

It is hard to believe now, but 25 years have passed since the Space Shuttle *Columbia* took off on its maiden voyage

on April 12, 1981. The space shuttle was the first and remains the only reusable crewed orbital spacecraft in the world, and its design represented a dramatic step towards human space flight.

Parenthetically, I might say I was talking to some of my younger staff today, and we who have been around for a while remember that flight well. But when you try to explain to young people, or to anybody for that matter, that these people were landing in this enormous and weighty bird that had never been tested, and it had no power, never been tested in this kind of conditions and it had no power, you understand the undertaking that these courageous crew members had set themselves up for.

This vehicle, of course, had the capacity to carry twice the crew members of its predecessors, to launch large scientific instruments such as the Hubble Space Telescope, the Compton Gamma Ray Observatory, as well as interplanetary probes like Galileo and Ulysses.

On that same subject, I must say that, personally, I believe the deep space image of Hubble is something that struck me as powerful as the first images we saw of Earth in the early Apollo days. When that telescope looked off into the heavens at a tiny speck and saw thousands of galaxies, it is an awe inspiring sight that I think the entire world should perhaps contemplate what it means to us.

More recently, of course, the shuttle has served as a workhorse for the assembly of the international space station, and on April 12, 1981 those accomplishments were still in the future.

On that day as the space shuttle crew carried two intrepid astronauts, John Young and Robert Crippen, into the heavens on that courageous journey, we all held our breath because therein lay the future of manned space flight and womaned spaced flight as we would later see on shuttles.

We should not underestimate the magnitude of that task. STS was not the first time that the space shuttle would carry a crew of astronauts; it was the first time the space shuttle would be flown into space, period. The willingness of these brave commanders to accept this mission shows that they certainly had the right stuff and it is entirely fitting that this Congress commemorate their accomplishments on this, the 25th anniversary of the first flight of the space shuttle.

I think it is also appropriate to express our appreciation to all of the individuals, whether civil servants or contractors, who have worked so hard over the many years on the space shuttle program and over, particularly, the last quarter century.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of H. Con. Res. 366. I hope that action will be followed by speedy adoption in the other body.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), a champion of America's space program.

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

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, America and the world were introduced to a new generation of heroes and a new era of human imagination. The moment the Space Shuttle *Columbia* first launched into low-Earth orbit, every other mode of space transportation was rendered obsolete.

The shuttle was then, and remains today, the most dependable and most technologically advanced spacecraft in the world.

In the last quarter century, the shuttle has become a global icon of American ingenuity and American courage. Since Commander John Young and Pilot Robert Crippen took the shuttle's maiden voyage, dozens of men and women, scientists, soldiers and school teachers have followed them in NASA's mission to conquer the unknown. And in that time, 14 shuttle astronauts have been lost in the pursuit of that noble mission, men and women whose names we remember and whose valor we can never forget.

Where I come from, the space shuttle is more than a symbol. It is part of our community. The shuttle's managers, engineers, astronauts, contractors and designers have long called the Houston region their home. They are the people who have made our Johnson Space Center America's ''laboratory of the impossible,'' and for 25 years have stretched both the technological capacity and the collective imagination of the American people.

It is an honor to represent such heroes in this House and it is an honor to cast my vote in favor of this resolution congratulating NASA and America's space community for 25 years of making history and fulfilling dreams. I urge my colleagues to support NASA's heroes and support this resolution.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

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

I rise in support of this resolution honoring the Space Shuttle program at NASA on the anniversary of its test flight.

Commander John Young and Pilot Robert Crippen flew Space Shuttle *Columbia* on its first low-earth orbit flight for 3 days. Such a feat was made possible by the world-class workers and supporters of NASA, who are also commended in this resolution.

The Space Shuttle was remarkable in part because it was the first spacecraft to launch with wings, using solid rocket boosters. It was also the first reentry spacecraft to land on a conventional runway. Notice that both these firsts are visual, if not literal, reminders of the strength of the agency itself: NASA excels in both spaceflight and flight in the atmosphere, or aeronautics. It is proof of the value of having an agency that is strong in both fields.

It is unfortunate, then, that the Vision for Space Exploration, which has the potential to build on the Shuttle successes, has not been adequately funded. Instead, the proposed budget pits the Vision against aeronautics in an internal battle for insufficient funding. In fact, ever since the Vision for Space Exploration was released, there has not been adequate funding for it in the Administration's budget. The result is that other critical NASA programs lose money to the Vision as NASA is forced to pick one important program over another. For example, in FY06, there was a proposed cut in aeronautics of roughly $60 million. In FY07, that number is $179 million, despite Congress' clear support in both the appropriations and authorization bills last year. That is a 20 percent cut in 1 year.

This resolution before us today will send a message that Congress is proud of what NASA has accomplished. I urge my colleagues to prove their reverence by working to fund it.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 366 to congratulate NASA on the 25th anniversary of the inaugural Space Shuttle mission.

Twenty-five years ago on April 12th, all Americans were riveted to the activities taking place at Kennedy Space Center. The excitement was even more palpable in my Congressional District—America's Space Coast.

How proud Americans were that day when, after 2 years of training and preparation, Space Shuttle *Columbia* lifted into space, boosted not only by 7 million pounds of thrust but, more importantly, by the ingenuity and imagination of the American people.

America had selected two incredibly capable astronauts for this first shuttle mission—Bob Crippen, a decorated Naval aviator, and John Young, a veteran of the Gemini and Apollo programs. Our Nation needed the best astronauts for this mission since the risks were immense. As the most complex spacecraft ever built, the Shuttle *Columbia* had countless possibilities for error and serious disaster.

STS–1 served as a 2-day test flight of the first reusable, piloted spacecraft's ability to go into orbit and return safely to Earth. NASA's goal was to herald in a new era of spaceflight and it succeeded.

The astronauts are obviously the most visible face on Space Shuttle missions. And while I, like everyone else, extend the utmost praise to Young and Crippen for their extraordinary talent and boldness, it was the highly skilled and competent NASA and contractor workforce that made this shuttle mission possible. As with the astronauts, America needed its best and brightest to build and launch the Space Shuttle back in 1981 and it remains so today.

From the scientists and engineers to the launch crews and contractor personnel, each Shuttle launch is a manifestation of the pride that the people of the Space Coast have in America's space program.

Each launch lifts the spirits of all Americans and nothing gives those from the Space Coast more honor than serving as America's entryway to space. Today, the people of the Space Coast feel as honored to be America's space launch center as they did 25 years ago.

And as a representative from America's Space Coast, I share in the feelings of pride in past achievements as well as the expectation of success in the new NASA missions that will launch from our community.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con.

Res. 366, legislation honoring the 25th anniversary of the first flight of the Space Transportation System at NASA.

It is hard to believe that 25 years have passed since Space Shuttle *Columbia* took flight. *Columbia* was the first manned, reusable spacecraft that was flown into orbit.

The heroic courage of *Columbia* astronauts and the NASA scientists and engineers on the ground has inspired a generation of future scientists, engineers and mathematicians.

NASA and the Johnson Space Center have had a tremendous impact on the Texas economy. This partnership has led to the development of many new technologies and is an economic powerhouse for our State.

The Johnson Space Center's combined workforce accounts for 16,000 Texas jobs.

The total economic impact of the Space Center on the State of Texas exceeds over 26,000 employees with personal incomes of over $2.5 billion and total spending exceeding $3.5 billion.

NASA also provides $72 million for grants and contracts to Texas universities and colleges, as well as $44 million to Texas nonprofit organizations.

Mr. Speaker, NASA touches every State in our great Nation, and I believe it is fitting to honor this milestone in NASA's history.

My warm congratulations go to NASA and the Space Shuttle *Columbia,* its crew and team on the ground.

I support this bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor all the men and women who have made our space shuttle program possible. I would like to commend Commander John Young and Pilot Robert Crippen for being pioneers in their field. With the lift-off of the Space Shuttle *Columbia* on April 12, 1981, we were launched into a new era of space flight and exploration. The importance of their mission to our Nation cannot be overestimated.

Our desire to explore space, to go beyond this world, is rooted firmly in a human desire that has existed since the first of us stared into the night sky. It is a desire that has been passed down through human history and has found deep roots in America. We live in a land where pioneers stood on the frontier and bravely journeyed beyond what was known. Our space program continues that proud tradition of accomplishments.

When challenged by President Kennedy to put a man on the moon before the decades end, America could not even put a man into earth's orbit, but we answered the call. We've stood on the Moon, and have begun to unlock many of the secrets of Mars. We could not have come so far without the knowledge and experience gained from the shuttle flights.

With our accomplishments, we've also experienced tragedy. The brave men and women who gave their lives in pursuit of knowledge are a constant reminder that no matter how hard we try to ensure safety, exploration always comes with a risk. As a nation, we should not shirk these risks, just as our forbearers did not. We should use them as guideposts to remind ourselves of the challenges and difficulties of exploring space. The men and women of NASA have taken our dreams and made them real. I thank them for their vision, sacrifice, and dedication.

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1981, NASA embarked upon a new mission with an amazing vehicle that would take America's astronauts, satellites and space stations into the next age of man's exploration of the final frontier. Next week we will honor the 25th anniversary of that first Space Shuttle mission and reflect upon the great success of the Space Transportation System.

The Space Shuttle is widely considered the most complex machine ever built, and to date is the only spacecraft capable of putting into orbit large payloads such as the Hubble Telescope and the Chandra X-ray Observatory. It is this capacity that enables NASA and its partners to build the International Space Station, which will pave the way back to the Moon, Mars and beyond.

Accordingly, President Bush has laid out a plan that sets a goal of returning Americans to the Moon within 15 years.

President Bush's "Vision for Space Exploration" is a plan that is again making space exploration an exciting and educational priority for America. He has made it clear, within the next half century America will be the world leader in space exploration.

In this respect, the shuttle program remains an integral part of the President's vision as we continue the return to flight missions, complete the International Space Station and phase in the Crew Exploration Vehicle.

Equally important is the Space Shuttle's role as an icon for manned space flight, a symbol for exploration and an example of man's eternal thirst for knowledge. In this role, the Space Shuttle's mission will never end.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 366.

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. CALVERT. 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.

□ 1900

## HONORING RECIPIENTS OF NOBEL PRIZES IN PHYSICS AND CHEMISTRY FOR 2005

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 541) honoring Drs. Roy J. Glauber, John L. Hall, and Theodor W. Hansch for being awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics for 2005, and Drs. Yves Chauvin, Robert H. Grubbs, and Richard R. Schrock for being awarded the Nobel Prize in Chemistry for 2005, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 541

Whereas on October 10, 2005, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics for 2005 to Drs. Roy J. Glauber, John L. Hall, and Theodor W. Hänsch for their pioneering discoveries in the field of optics;

Whereas their contributions to the quantum theory of optical coherence and development of laser-based precision spectroscopy, including the optical frequency comb technique, has led to improvements in the accuracy of precision instruments such as GPS locators, atomic clocks, and navigation systems;

Whereas John L. Hall recently retired from a long career with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Quantum Physics Division, and was one of the founding fellows of the JILA, a joint Federal lab/university cooperative effort supporting research and post-graduate training;

Whereas the NIST, founded in 1901, and its laboratories and collaborations with academia have contributed to the achievements of present and past Nobel Prize winners by supporting research that strengthens the global economic competitiveness of the United States through the development of technologies, measurement methods, and standards;

Whereas John L. Hall is one of three NIST researchers to have received a Nobel Prize;

Whereas on October 10, 2005, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences awarded the Nobel Prize in Chemistry for 2005 to Drs. Yves Chauvin, Robert H. Grubbs, and Richard R. Schrock for their pioneering discoveries in the field of organic chemistry;

Whereas their research on metathesis reactions and the development of the metathesis method in organic synthesis has resulted in a major advance for "green chemistry" and the development of pharmaceuticals that can be made through methods that are more efficient and generate fewer hazardous wastes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and honors Drs. Roy J. Glauber, John L. Hall, and Theodor W. Hänsch;

(2) recognizes and honors Drs. Yves Chauvin, Robert H. Grubbs, and Richard R. Schrock; and

(3) acknowledges the importance of National Institute of Standards and Technology research and its contributions to United States industry, academia, and government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 541, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I am very pleased that we are considering this resolution honoring the winners of the 2005 Nobel Prizes in chemistry and physics. This is especially a pleasurable experience for me because I

know two of them personally and have worked with one of them rather closely for a period of over a year.

Our Nation has a long, proud history of pushing forward the boundaries of human knowledge, and few awards bestow more recognition and honor on those who devote their lives to this quest than does the Nobel Prize. As a fellow scientist, I offer to each of the laureates my congratulations and heartfelt appreciation for your outstanding contributions to your fields.

I am particularly honored to offer congratulations to Dr. John Hall for his commendable contributions to the field of laser-based precision spectroscopy. His careful and dedicated work has resulted, among other things, in improved accuracy in vital navigation systems such as the GPS. John's long and noteworthy career includes a founding role as a fellow of JILA, formerly known as the Joint Institute of Laboratory Astrophysics, which is a joint research institute of the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the University of Colorado in Boulder.

It was at that institution where I worked with him doing research in atomic physics, a little nuclear physics and also in science education. I am proud to say that Dr. Hall is a wonderful scientist, and I was delighted to work with him.

I am most pleased as the chairman of the Science Committee Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards, where I oversee NIST, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, to offer John congratulations and wishes for many more years of exciting discovery.

I would also like to point out that this is the third Nobel Prize awarded to scientists at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which is basically a standard-setting organization, which includes a lot of research on standards; but in spite of the restriction on the research, three individuals from that outstanding organization have now been awarded Nobel Prizes.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume, and I wish to begin by thanking Dr. EHLERS for his distinguished leadership on the committee, on the subcommittee, and it has been a privilege to serve with him. It is nice to have a fellow scientist on the Science Committee who can speak so eloquently to these matters and actually understand the kind of research that these Nobel Prize winners have conducted.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in strong support of H. Res. 541, a resolution I introduced along with a number of my colleagues to honor the 2005 Nobel Laureates in the fields of physics and chemistry, as well as to acknowledge the importance of National Institute of Standards and Technology, its research and its contributions to the United States industry and the academic world and government.

On October 10, 2005, two of America's finest scientists, Richard H. Grubbs and Richard R. Schrock, along with Yves Chauvin of France, shared in the Nobel Prize in chemistry.

The basic research of these scientists was recognized by the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences as ''a great step forward for 'green chemistry,' reducing potentially hazardous waste through smarter production.''

Their research on metathesis reactions and the development of the metathesis model in organic synthesis has served as an important tool in the creation of new pharmaceuticals, including drugs that will help fight many of the world's major diseases, including cancer, Alzheimer's and AIDS. They also are used to develop herbicides and new polymers and fuels.

Another scientific prize was also conferred on October 10, 2005.

Again, two American scientists, this time Roy J. Glauber and John L. Hall, along with Theodor W. Hansch of Germany, shared the Nobel Prize in physics.

Their pioneering research in the fields of optics and contributions to the quantum theory of optical coherence and development of laser-based precision spectroscopy, including the optical frequency comb technique, has led to improvements in the accuracy of precision instruments such as GPS locators, atomic clocks, and navigation systems.

It is true this year, as in preceding years, that research conducted at such well-respected universities such as MIT, Harvard, and Caltech has produced Nobel Prize-worthy research. However, what is rarely acknowledged is the work of Federal labs and the additional Federal investment that supports and produces such prize-worthy results from such outstanding scientists.

Such is the case with the work of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST. Their collaboration with the University of Colorado at Boulder resulted in the third Nobel Prize awarded to an NIST scientist, John Hall, a scientist emeritus from the NIST Quantum Physics Division.

Interestingly enough, NIST was founded in 1901, around the same time as the Nobel Prize Foundation in 1900. Since that time, both institutions have served a similar purpose in supporting research that produces, in the words of Dr. Alfred Nobel, ''the greatest benefit to mankind.''

NIST, with its laboratories and collaborations with academia, has contributed to the achievements of present and past Nobel Prize winners by supporting research that strengthens the global economic competitiveness of the United States through the development of technologies, measurement methods, and standards.

Today, I am pleased to have the opportunity to honor the work of these scientists representing academia and research labs from across the globe.

It is my hope that the passage of this bill and continued support for the Nobel Prizes in the fields of chemistry and physics will inspire a new generation of students to eagerly pursue careers in math and science.

Additionally, I believe we must continue our investment in our research infrastructure if we hope to take advantage of the innovative potential emerging from our basic research laboratories.

I am happy that the Optical Society of America, the American Chemical Society and other organizations have supported this bill. These organizations provide a vital service in supporting peer collaboration and career development important for scientific advances and innovation.

I would like to particularly thank our chairman, Chairman BOEHLERT, and Ranking Member GORDON for their support and assistance on this bill, as well as my colleagues Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HOLT and Mr. WU for their cosponsorship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H. Res. 541 and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting and honoring the 2005 Nobel Laureates.

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

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

This resolution recognizes and honors Drs. Roy J. Glauber, John L. Hall and Theodor W. Hansch for being awarded the Nobel Prize in physics for 2005, and Drs. Yves Chauvin, Robert H. Grubbs and Richard R. Schrock for being awarded the Nobel Prize in chemistry for 2005.

As I mentioned earlier, John Hall is a personal friend of mine, and I have worked with him. Theodor Hansch was also a colleague of mine for some time many years ago, even though we did not work together, and we were not addressing the same issue.

Additionally, the resolution acknowledges the importance of the National Institute of Standards and Technology research and its contributions to U.S. industry, academia and government.

On October 10, 2005, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences awarded the Nobel Prize in physics for 2005 to Drs. Roy J. Glauber, John L. Hall and Theodor W. Hansch for their pioneering discoveries in the field of optics. Their contributions to the quantum theory of optical coherence and development of laser-based precision spectroscopy, including the optical frequency comb technique, has led to improvements in the accuracy of precision instruments such as GPS locators, atomic clocks, and navigation systems.

I would love to spend another 10, 15 minutes explaining exactly what that means, but I risk boring you, Mr. Speaker, and the rest of the audience, but let me say it is a fascinating field of research. It has led to great improvements, and people who ask me

how can this possibly be of value should simply look at their TV set and remind themselves of years ago when they turned on the TV set and spent 5 minutes adjusting the hue and the color to get everything correct. The type of work done by these individuals created such accurate time standards that everything went automatically now on their TV set.

That was one minor trivial example of all the benefits that arise from basic research.

Continuing, John L. Hall recently retired from a long career with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, better known as NIST, in the Quantum Physics Division, and was one of the founding fellows of JILA, a joint Federal lab/university cooperative effort supporting research and post-graduate training.

NIST was founded in 1901, and its laboratories and collaborations with academia have contributed to the achievement of present and past Nobel Prize winners by supporting research that strengthens the global economic competitiveness of the United States through the development of technologies, measurement methods and standards. Indeed, NIST used to be known as the National Bureau of Standards and received its more modern name somewhat recently.

John L. Hall is one of three NIST researchers that have received the Nobel Prize.

On October 10, 2005, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences awarded the Nobel Prize in chemistry for 2005 to Drs. Yves Chauvin, Robert H. Grubbs and Richard R. Schrock for their pioneering discoveries in the field of organic chemistry. Their research on metathesis reactions and the development of the metathesis method in organic synthesis has resulted in a major advance for ''green chemistry'' and the development of pharmaceuticals that can be made through methods that are more efficient and generate less hazardous waste.

This is an outstanding advancement, and we must concentrate greater efforts on green chemistry, in other words, chemistry that provides results in fewer residuals that endanger the environment. The Science Committee, I might add, has developed a new bill on this topic, and I am very eager to see that passed into law.

This resolution recognizes and honors Drs. Roy J. Glauber, John L. Hall, and Theodor W. Hansch, Yves Chauvin, Robert H. Grubbs and Richard R. Schrock, and acknowledges the importance of National Institute of Standards and Technology research and its contributions to United States industry, academia and government.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Chair and the ranking member for this opportunity to speak and thank them for bringing this resolution forward.

I think it is important that this Congress take a stand and make noteworthy the achievements of many men and women of science who in this case have been accorded the highest award of a Nobel Prize in physics and in chemistry. It is manifestly clear that this country needs to put forth an emphasis on scientific achievement.

It is this emphasis on scientific achievement which characterized the Kennedy administration, which gave America vision to shoot for the stars, and it is an emphasis on scientific achievement which will cause more Nobel Prize winners in future to come forward from the United States, not only in physics and chemistry but in economics and literature.

We need to emphasize our quest for knowledge, and in this resolution we are helping to confirm our belief that the quest for knowledge needs to be recognized nationally.

I want to add one more note. Recently the Nobel Prize winner for economics and peace a few years ago, Joseph Stiglitz, made an assessment of what the economic cost would be of the United States' continued presence in Iraq. I think that we need to look at what our Nobel Prize winners tell us about the world in which we live.

□ 1915

They have achieved a level of excellence which can be communicated to Members of Congress and our constituents. They have achieved the level of credibility which we should give credence to, which we are doing this evening with this important resolution.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would close my comments by sharing with Dr. EHLERS the observation of how important this research is. Our Nation, as a whole, just celebrated the men's and women's Final Four, and I am sure many Americans could list the names of who hit the final jump shot and who the star players were. That is fitting and appropriate. But on a daily basis, our lives are affected far more by the basic research conducted by the individuals we are honoring today, as Dr. EHLERS so eloquently put it.

When the GPS system helps keep an aircraft on track, when radar works more efficiently, when medical devices work more successfully, when environmental applications are more efficient, all of that derives from the kinds of basic research that we are acknowledging and recognizing today. And while I think it is unrealistic to expect most Members of this Chamber, or certainly the general public, to know the names or the accomplishments of these individuals, it is absolutely fitting that this body recognize these individuals, and I think especially because some of them are Federal Government employees who well deserve our recognition and our honor.

And so I join Chairman EHLERS in celebrating them, and I thank him for his support on this and for his leadership in the committee.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Washington for his eloquent comments. He stated it extremely well. And I would like to point out that our basic research programs in the United States have led to incredible discoveries and developments, but also have made incredible contributions to the economy of this Nation.

Just to pick one example, something that happened when I was a graduate student, which is obviously many years ago, about roughly 50 years ago, the development of the laser by a good friend of mine, Charlie Towns. And I did not work with Dr. Towns, but I knew of the experiments, I knew what was going to emerge, I knew that he would discover the laser. And even though I am a scientist, I am in the field, I never envisioned the results of that.

We were all extremely excited at the development of the laser, because it enabled us to do scientific experiments we had only dreamed about doing before. What we didn't realize, or what I didn't realize, is that we would have a world where lasers are ubiquitous; where you would not think of putting in a ceiling tile without having a laser to level the tiles and make it all look good; we would not think of putting in sewer or water mains without lasers to help us align them so that they are in the proper location.

Today, you can go into novelty stores and buy lasers for $15. Children play with them, cat lovers use them to have cats chase the little red dot around. They are ubiquitous. And out of that small investment from the United States Government in that research, which I would estimate was roughly $10 million or less, today we have a multibillion dollar industry in the United States.

The problem this Nation faces is that that research is not being supported by this Nation the way it was in the past and we are in danger of losing our leadership because of that. I deeply, deeply appreciate the leadership of President George Bush in announcing in his State of the Union speech the American Competitiveness Initiative, which will help restore our lead in research in this world. It will help provide the education our children need so that they can be leaders in the world.

I strongly urge this Congress to provide the funding that the President has requested so that we can not only maintain, but increase, our leadership in the world and maintain our economic competitiveness and continue to be the giant in the world that we have been so that our people will have jobs and we won't be shipping them abroad.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today supporting H. Res. 541, legislation honoring the 2005 winners of the Nobel Prizes in Physics and Chemistry.

The Nobel Prize represents the pinnacle of achievement in any academic area.

The 2005 Prize in Physics was awarded to three scientists in the field of optics.

Dr. Roy Glauber was awarded half of the Prize for his theoretical description of the behavior of light particles.

Drs. John Hall and Theodor Haensch share the other half of the Physics Prize for their development of laser-based precision spectroscopy.

The work has enabled the determination of the color of the light of atoms and molecules with great precision.

The 2005 Nobel Prize in Chemistry was shared by Drs. Yves Chauvin, Richard Schrock and Robert Grubbs for their work in the area of metathesis.

Metathesis is important to the chemical industry, mainly in the development of medicines and of certain types of plastic materials.

The Nobel Laureates' work has enabled chemical synthesis to be simpler, more efficient, and more environmentally friendly.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the recipients of the Nobel Prizes in Physics and Chemistry and urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 541.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 541 commends the great American ingenuity and level of excellence represented by our National Laboratories, particularly the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), whose work is so consistently stellar that it is often taken for granted.

American John Hall, who is one of the three scientists sharing the Nobel Prize for Physics, is the third NIST scientist to win a Nobel Prize. He is sharing the Prize for Physics with American Roy J. Glauber and German Theodor W. Haensch. Their studies reversed the earlier belief that the quantum theory of the behavior of particles did not describe the behavior of particles of light. These scientists, in fact, have changed the modern understanding of the behavior of light. Their discoveries could allow better GPS systems, better space navigation, and even better digital animation.

The 2005 Nobel Prize for Chemistry was won by American Robert H. Grubbs, from Southern California's California Institute of Technology, American Richard R. Schrock, and Frenchman Yves Chauvin. They made great breakthroughs in their work with olefin metathesis. This is a chemical reaction describing the changing of bonds between atoms.

Their work has great commercial potential in areas like pharmaceuticals, the biotechnology industry, and the foodstuff industry. The great work that these scientists produce contributes to our competitiveness and to our great standard of living.

I want to commend all of these outstanding scientists for their contributions to physics and chemistry and to the Royal Swedish Academy of Scientists for their recognition of their achievements, and to NIST and its laboratories who have supported research that strengthens our global competitiveness through the development of groundbreaking technologies.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 541.

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.

## COMMUNICATION FROM SENIOR LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT OF HON. SAM FARR, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Troy Phillips, Senior Legislative Assistant of the Honorable SAM FARR, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC., April 5, 2006.*

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

TROY PHILLIPS,
*Senior Legislative Assistant.*

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. J. GRESHAM BARRETT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable J. GRESHAM BARRETT, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC., March 30, 2006.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a civil subpoena, issued by the Court of Common Pleas for Anderson County, South Carolina, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

J. GRESHAM BARRETT,
*Member of Congress.*

## PARTY OF THE 1 PERCENT

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is budget week. Over the past 5 years, the number of Americans falling on hard times has soared. A new analysis of major Federal Government programs by USA Today confirms the gut-wrenching truth.

Republicans in the White House and the Congress have wielded their political power like a club on America's low income and America's middle class. The single largest increase came in Medicaid, which added 15 million Americans on the President's watch from 2000–2005. Medicaid is the health care program for the poor. It speaks volumes about how the Republican Party has treated low and middle income Americans during this administration.

All but the wealthiest Americans have been left behind by the Republican Party and the Republican budget. This is a party of the 1 percent. The Republican Party deals with what is good for the 1 percent at the top, not what is good for everybody else.

This is not conjecture, it is a grim statistic. Despite this administration's watch, the poverty rate has grown dramatically, as has the budget deficit. Over the last 5 years, the very rich got very much richer. At the same time, the Republicans were giving millionaires new $100,000 tax breaks, the poverty rate in the United States was climbing to 12.7 percent.

This is a time to think about what the budget says, about your priorities. Remember, they are the party of the 1 percent.

Republicans love the top one percent. They cater to them. They coddle them. They kow-tow to them. Republicans are the One Percent Party.

The other 99 percent of America does not matter to the Party of One Percent.

You need proof? Look at health care. Over the last five years, another 15 million Americans have been forced onto Medicaid.

And the Republican health care proposal is the One Percent illusion.

Republicans want everyone to have a Health Savings Account, so you can save all the money that Middle America does not have, to pay for all those health care expenses Middle America cannot possibly afford.

That is the Republican Solution to America's health care crisis.

Last year, they wanted to privatize Social Security to destroy the safety net under our most distinguished citizens.

This year, the President and Republican Party want to anesthetize the Middle Class, so they don't know Republicans want to amputate their financial security with a plan meant to benefit only the rich.

The One Percent Party created Health Savings Accounts because these are new tickets to an all expense-paid tax holiday for the wealthy. They get to save tens of thousands of dollars tax free. The Middle Class gets to watch.

It's like standing outside the window looking in, except we are standing in the middle of a country that is losing its Middle Class.

The nation's number one reason for personal bankruptcy is unpaid medical expenses, but the Republican Party of One Percent can't be bothered with providing every American access to affordable health care coverage.

Republicans have middle class Americans on their knees, and they are praying for change this November.

The Republican Party of One Percent can't respond to the other 99 percent of America.

When hurricanes destroy lives and property in the Gulf Coast, Republicans send condolences instead of competent leaders.

While more vulnerable American children and families fall into poverty, Republicans call for more tax holidays for the wealthy.

When distinguished Americans need help paying for prescription drugs, Republicans have drug companies write the legislation, and forbid the federal government from negotiating cheaper prices for distinguished Americans, every American 65 and older, like my Mom.

The Republican Party of one percent has done more to undermine America's financial security than any administration in history. The Republican Party of one percent uses the word security every chance it gets.

But our Ports are not secure, our environment is not secure, our financial future is not secure, our most vulnerable children are not secure, and America's Middle Class is anything but secure.

The Republican One Percent Party has spent the last five years concerned with only one thing—the top one percent of America.

Poverty is up.

Middle Class wages are down in real dollars.

Health care costs are up.

The number of Americans with health care coverage is down.

Every day, America's Middle Class hurts a little more, and every day the top one percent earn a lot more.

That's Republican math. Divide a nation into the very wealthy and nobody else.

That's the Republican Party of One Percent.

Not all of my Republican colleagues think this way, but they have to vote the way they're told by the White House.

Independence is another one percent illusion.

And that is precisely why the Republican One Percent Party has to receive a one-way ticket out of power this November. They're out of touch with 99 percent of America.

## 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.

## H.R. 4808, THE UNFAIR CHINESE AUTOMOTIVE TARIFF EQUALIZATION ACT

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 would like to submit in its entirety for the RECORD a letter from the United States Business and Industry Council at the conclusion of my remarks, but I will be reading from parts of this letter.

Mr. KILDEE and myself have introduced H.R. 4808, the Unfair Chinese Automobile Tariff Equalization Act. I am going to read several paragraphs from this letter that I will submit. It is a letter to me from Mr. Kevin Kearns, President of the United States Business and Industry Council.

''Dear Representative JONES: On behalf of the 1,500 U.S. companies comprising the U.S. Business and Industry Council, I am writing to express our strong support for H.R. 4808, the Unfair Chinese Automobile Tariff Equalization Act.

''Equalizing U.S. and Chinese tariffs on passenger cars, as the bill would require, is an important and greatly overdue step toward restoring equitable competition in both U.S.-China trade and global automobile trade. Such competition in turn is essential to restoring the health of the U.S.-owned automotive sector, which makes us such a large share of our economy and which has undergirded the American middle class for so many decades.''

I am going to skip on with paragraphs, Mr. Speaker. Again, I have asked that this entire letter be submitted for the RECORD.

''In fact, according to the latest data available, imports have grabbed two-thirds of the domestic U.S. auto market in 2004, up from 50 percent just 7 years earlier. Small wonder that Ford and GM are downsizing as fast as they can.

''Much of the blame clearly falls on incompetent trade policies, many of course supported by Detroit itself in a triumph of shortsightedness. Presidents of both parties have signed numerous free trade agreements over the years. But despite the promises made to sell them to an increasingly skeptical public, they have manifestly failed to open foreign markets for U.S. producers, or even to limit predatory foreign commercial practices such as subsidizing, dumping, and exchange rate manipulation.

''In fact, the trade flows clearly shows that the main new accomplishments of these trade agreements have been to help U.S. and foreign-brand automakers alike supply the American market from low-wage export platforms like Mexico.

''As symbolized by the ludicrously unequal auto tariffs left in place by U.S. negotiators of China trade deals, U.S. policy on automotive trade with China is speeding down the same road and will likely produce the same results. The United States still runs a small trade surplus in autos with China, but since 2000, Chinese auto exports to the United States have outpaced the United States vehicle exports to China by a four-to-one ratio.

''The Unfair Chinese Automotive Tariff Equalization Act can begin reversing this process and help put the U.S.-owned auto industry and the domestic manufacturing base as a whole back on the path of high-wage growth not low-wage stagnation. And the time to pass it is now, before the Chinese export drive takes off.''

Mr. Speaker, the close on this letter is, ''We strongly urge prompt House and Senate passage, and we will do everything we can to help make it the law of the land.''

Mr. Speaker, I also want to mention that the Chair of the caucus known as the House Automotive Caucus has urged Members of this House to support 4808 that is signed by Mr. KILDEE and Mr. UPTON, and we are asking just fairness in this trade issue. That is all we are asking, is that the Congress send a message to the trade negotiators that we in this Congress want our manufacturers and our workers to be treated fairly. That is all we are asking in 4808 is to send a message.

If we could get this bill to the floor of the House and pass this legislation, we would say to our trade negotiators that we need you, the trade negotiators, to make sure that we have fair trade as it relates to the American worker and the American manufacturers.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for this time, and I want to close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, and to ask God to please bless the families and to ask God to please bless America.

UNITED STATES BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY COUNCIL,
*Washington, DC, Mar. 9, 2006.*

Congressman WALTER JONES,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JONES: On behalf of the 1,500 domestic U.S. companies comprising the U.S. Business and Industry Council, I am writing to express our strong support for H.R. 4808, Tbe Unfair Chinese Automotive Tariff Equalization Act.

Equalizing U.S. and Chinese tariffs on passenger cars, as the bill would require, is an important and greatly overdue step toward restoring equitable competition in both U,S.-China trade and global automotive trade. Such competition in turn is essential to restoring the health of the U.S.-owned automotive sector, which makes up such a large share of our economy, and which has undergirded the American middle class for so many decades.

For many years, America's trade performance in passenger cars has been nothing less than disastrous. Despite the proliferation of foreign transplant factories throughout the country, the United States ran a $101.8 billion trade deficit in autos and light trucks in 2005. U.S. imports of these products last year, which totaled more than $126 billion, represented fully 84 percent of two-way global U.S. vehicle trade.

In fact, according to the latest data available, imports had grabbed two-thirds of the domestic U.S. auto market in 2004, up from 50 percent just seven years earlier. Small wonder that Ford and GM are downsizing as fast as they can.

Much of the blame clearly falls on incompetent trade policies (many, of course, supported by Detroit itself in a triumph of short-sightedness). Presidents of both parties have signed numerous free trade agreements over the years. But despite the promises made to sell them to an increasingly skeptical public, they have manifestly failed to open foreign markets for U.S. producers, or even to limit predatory foreign commercial practices such as subsidization, dumping, and exchange-rate manipulation.

In fact, the trade flows clearly show that the main new accomplishments of these trade agreements have been to help U.S.- and foreign-brand automakers alike supply the American market from low-wage export platforms like Mexico.

As symbolized by the ludicrously unequal auto tariffs left in place by U.S. negotiators of China trade deals, U.S. policy on automotive trade with China is speeding down the same road, and will likely produce the same results. The United States still runs a small trade surplus in autos with China. But since 2000, Chinese auto exports to the U.S. have outpaced U.S. vehicle exports to China by a four-to-one ratio.

Yet it is vital to realize that the development of China as an automotive export platform has only just begun. Vehicle makers from all over the world (Japan, Europe, the United States, and China itself) are building far more auto production capacity in the People's Republic than the Chinese market can possibly absorb. And since China desperately needs to create jobs to keep politically explosive unemployment in check, Beijing has no interest in preventing or even slowing this production glut. Indeed, to reduce joblessness, it has every interest in encouraging overproduction and exporting the surplus. The United States, the world's largest single national automotive market, and the most open major market by far, is the most promising destination.

Chinese auto makers, who frequently steal U.S. know-how outright or force their U.S. partners to transfer it, have already announced plans to sell hundreds of thousands of vehicles in the United States by 2012. And foreign auto makers in China (including U.S. multinational companies) will jump on the export bandwagon as well.

The bottom line is that, without dramatic changes in U.S. trade policy, China's inevitable emergence as an auto export power will either further undermine U.S.-owned, U.S.-based auto production, or it will permit such production to survive only on a greatly reduced scale, and with a dramatically lower pay structure.

The Unfair Chinese Automotive Tariff Equalization Act can begin reversing this process, and help put the U.S.-owned auto industry and the domestic manufacturing base as a whole back on the path of high-wage growth not low-wage stagnation. And the time to pass it is now, before the Chinese export drive takes off.

We strongly urge prompt House and Senate passage, and we will do everything we can to help make it the law of the land.

Sincerely,

KEVIN L. KEARNS,
*President.*

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 376, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–405) on the resolution (H. Res. 766) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 376) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2011, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–406) on the resolution (H. Res. 767) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## A DYNASTY IS BORN

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, for years, the University of Maryland Terrapin sports fans have advised our opponents that they should ''fear the turtle.'' Well, tonight, in my opinion, we can alter that formulation somewhat. They should ''revere the turtle.''

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to Coach Brenda Frese and her coaching staff and the University of Maryland Women's Basketball Team on winning the national championship last night with an exciting, nail-biting 78–75 victory in overtime over a talented, courageous Duke University team.

Mr. Speaker, there is a deep, longstanding rivalry between University of Maryland, my alma mater, and Duke University. But I think anyone watching that game last night, regardless of who they were cheering for, had to be unbelievably impressed by the athleticism, the teamwork, the sportsmanship, the determination shown by the women of both teams, the University of Maryland and Duke, two great universities.

□ 1930

Quite simply, this was college athletics at its finest, and I might say, at least in the second half for me, the most entertaining. Who could not be impressed by this awesome display of basketball fundamentals, from shooting, to passing, to rebounding, to sound team defense.

In their come-from-behind win, the Terrapins erased a 13-point second-half deficit. The largest deficit that had been overcome, except for a 14-point deficit, and the freshman guard, Kristi Toliver, hit a 3-point shot with 6.1 seconds left to play, and she hit that shot over an extraordinary center who plays for Duke who is 6 foot 7 fully extended, and she got that shot over her outstretched hand. Kristi is not lacking in confidence, you can tell.

Terp Marissa Coleman said, ''We've played like this all year. Nothing gets to us. We never thought we were going to lose this game.'' That positive psychology led to victory.

The Terps win caps a tremendous 34–4 season and makes Maryland only the fourth university in America, and the gentleman from Connecticut is here, and Connecticut is one of those universities who has had both of its men's team win the national championship and its women's team win the national championship. They are two extraordinary programs, both the men and women in Connecticut. Stanford is one of those four, and then there are two ACC schools that fit that category, the University of North Carolina and the University of Maryland. Our men's team won the national championship just a few years ago in 2002.

The Lady Terps' championship quest was not paved with ease, however. Before reaching the final matchup with Duke University, the team defeated Sacred Heart 91–80; St. John's, an outstanding program, 81–74; and defending national champion Baylor 82–63; Utah in overtime 75–65; then perennial powers North Carolina, 81–70. And lastly, for the national championship, the extraordinarily good Duke team.

Mr. Speaker, this was a consummate team win for the most unselfish of teams. In this championship game, for example, three Terps scored 16 points each. One scored 12 points, and another scored 10 points. In other words, all five starters were in double figures.

And, what makes this championship win even more impressive is that the Terps have no seniors on their team. They started two freshmen, two sophomores and one junior so we are going to be around for a little bit of time. The Lady Terps are extraordinary young women, proud today, as they will be tomorrow when I think we are visiting the White House. They are: Charmaine Carr; Marissa Coleman; Shay Doron; Laura Harper, who was voted the most outstanding player of the tournament among a lot of outstanding players; Crystal Langhorne, an All American; Kristi Marrone; Kalika France; Ashleigh Newman; Aurelie Noriez; Jade Perry; Angel Ross; Kristi Toliver and Sa'de Wiley-Gatewood.

The coaching staff, in addition to Head Coach Frese, includes Jeff Walz, Erica Floyd, Joanna Bernabei, and Director of Basketball Operations Mark Pearson.

Let me say that Head Coach Frese deserves extraordinary credit for turning the Maryland women's program around in just 4 short years she has been at Maryland. We got her from Minnesota. I know Minnesota is sorry to have lost her, but what a great gain for us. Brenda arrived in College Park in 2003 from the University of Minnesota after leading the Gophers to a 2–8 record in 2002 and being named the Associated Press National Coach of the Year.

In 2003, the Terps went 10–18 in a rebuilding year, and in both 2004 and 2005, just the next season, Brenda Frese saw her teams advance to the second round of the NCAA tournament with records of 18–13 and 22–10 respectively in those years.

Let me also note the extraordinary leadership and vision of the University of Maryland's athletic director, Debbie Yow, who recruited Brenda Frese to take the head coaching job.

My colleagues will be interested to know that some years ago one of the curmudgeons and one of the real characters, and I think one of the most popular Members of this body came up to me, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and he said to me, You are a friend of the President of the University of Maryland.

I said, Yes, I am.

He said, Well, you have considered a woman for Athletic Director. Her name is Debbie Yow. She is from North Carolina.

Now this curmudgeon does not always impress me as being a feminist, and I thought to myself if Howard Coble thinks this woman can be the Athletic Director, and I had never met her, but I knew she was an impressive lady.

The next day I picked up the phone and called the President of the College Park campus and said I don't know Debbie Yow, but I will tell you this, in North Carolina she has a Congressman who thinks she is absolutely one of the best talents around. I think we ought to hire here. Within a week we hired Debbie Yow to be our Athletic Director. Shortly thereafter she brought Ralph Friedgen to lead our football team, and he had three 10-win seasons back to back, although we have not done too well the last 2 years.

But in closing, let me say that we are extraordinarily proud of the Lady Terps. As the father of three women in particular, I am proud of the extraordinary talent displayed and the courage displayed and the athleticism displayed by not just the Maryland team but by all of the young women who played the NCAA tournament.

•

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

## HONORING NANCY TEMPLE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed at this time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the memory of Nancy Temple. She was born September 20, 1959 to Milton and Pearl Tormohlen in Fort Morgan, Colorado. She was the only girl in a family of three and she was a delight to her family, especially her father.

Nancy was a tenacious spirit who had great love for the Lord. She was a dedicated member of her church and displayed a strong faith in the Lord and a strong commitment to her family. Nancy's commitment to family was manifested in everything she did. She was especially fond of children and treated all of them as if they were her own, and they all adored her.

Nancy taught Sunday school in her church and helped out in 4–H clubs and organized the After Prom and the After Graduation parties. She was a key leader in the booster club for both sports and academics at Fort Morgan High School. She worked at Pioneer Elementary School for almost 15 years, and was a leader in the teen parenting program. She received a scholarship to attend college for her involvement in the teen parenting program.

Her passion for life was often manifested in music. Nancy loved musicals, dancing and singing and she played the flute.

Nancy's activity in the community began during her time in Fort Morgan High School where she participated in the Morgan High Singers and the pompom squad. She also played volleyball, softball and later she continued to play in the city leagues.

She graduated from high school in 1977 with her classmate Keith Temple who would later become her loving husband. Keith Temple met Nancy Tormohlem while she was waiting tables at the Mouse's House in Brush, Colorado, and their first date was dinner at her brother's home. Keith and Nancy married on April 7, 1979. They would have been married for 27 years this year.

She loved all children and she was blessed to have two of her own. Tiffiny was born on June 10, 1983, and Becki was born November 5, 1985. She gained a son-in-law when Tiffiny married Matt Wulf, and on January 6, 2003, her grandson, Eric Alan Wulf was born. She was very close to her daughters and son-in-law and had a very special relationship with her little grandson. She brought a light into his life that will shine well beyond her time with him.

Nancy passed away unexpectedly on January 21, 2006. After she passed, members of the community recognized her commitment and honored her for it. Previously, in 2003, Nancy was one of the first recipients of the community's Crystal Apple Award. One of her students commented that she was ''my second mom.'' Another young man serving in the Navy said ''Nancy was the only one who kept in contact with me while I was out to sea.''

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Nancy Temple's dedication to her community and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the legacy she left behind. She touched the lives of many with her caring spirit. The world was a better place for having known her. We will miss her dearly. We will always remember her zest for life, her loving heart and her inner and outer beauty. May God bless and comfort those who mourn her passing.

## COMMUNICATION FROM EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT OF HON. THADDEUS McCOTTER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Lisa Subrize, Executive Assistant to the Honorable THADDEUS MCCOTTER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*April 5, 2006.*

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

LISA SUBRIZE,
*Executive Assistant.*

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

## THE DELPHI MYTH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of Congress from the Democratic side have come together in a process known as an e-hearing where we have solicited from people across the country their concerns in particular about the auto industry, trade law, labor law and Delphi Corporation filing for bankruptcy.

This evening, a number of us will come before this House to make a presentation on behalf of people who participated in the e-hearing and to make clear the direction this country must go in with respect to our trade law, labor law and with respect to the Delphi case.

I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) who is the ranking member on our committee for his work in helping to organize this hearing, and hopefully he will be here himself to participate,

but you will be hearing shortly from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) as well as other Members with respect to the results of our e-hearing.

Much of the talk surrounding the current crisis facing U.S. automakers revolves around the toll that wages, health insurance and pensions place on companies. A loss of these benefits would be a devastating blow for workers and their families. Consider what my constituent, Betty Payer of Parma, Ohio, said during our committee's recent e-hearing.

She said, ''The way the auto industry is going affects us in so many different ways. If my husband was to lose his job, we would not be able to raise our children properly. I don't even know how we would be able to give them the proper education. We can barely afford to buy them clothes and get them the things they truly need the way it is. My oldest son is getting ready to turn 3 and he needs speech therapy and physical therapy the way it is. Without insurance, we would not be able to take him to those because we cannot afford to pay for them. He has to go once a week until they see an improvement in him.''

That is from Betty Payer of Parma, Ohio.

But the discussion about the auto industry is not served when certain individuals mischaracterize the actual labor costs. There is a myth put forward by the CEO of Delphi about the overpaid auto workers. He is claiming that $65 per hour is a typical wage Delphi pays for blue color labor. The problem is Delphi doesn't pay $65 an hour. Rather, this figure is a creation of Delphi's media consultants and it lumps together all of Delphi's labor costs and payments to unemployed and retired workers, but falsely allocates them only to Delphi's much smaller workforce. That inflates the average labor cost.

□ 1945

Actual average wage for current Delphi workers is about $23 per hour. So whatever Delphi's financial problems, one thing that is not a cause is workers earning $65 per hour. And it is misleading of Delphi's CEO to say otherwise.

But bad faith characterizes the Delphi CEO. It was bad faith that he filed motions in bankruptcy court to break his labor contracts. Negotiations with the union had not reached an impasse. Rather, the opposite was true. GM and Delphi had just reached an agreement with the union on a Special Attrition Program. Don't you think that one agreement could lead to another?

If Delphi's CEO is notorious for his drive to beat down the wages and benefits workers have won through their unions and impose a wage scale that is more in line with that of China, then he has been greatly helped by the official policy of the United States, both in terms of trade law and labor law.

We have a trade policy that actually permits foreign based companies to export an infinite number of goods and services to the United States, with no expectation that goods and services made in the United States will find buyers overseas. So companies locate in low wage countries, such as China, and export without limit to the U.S. Predictably, the U.S. is, in turn, suffering from a record-sized widening trade deficit with China and the world. Our trade deficit is approaching $750 billion. Workers are threatened by plant closures, and plant owners can plausibly threaten they are going to move to Mexico where they can find lower wages, lower legal standards, and export to the U.S. what they used to manufacture in the U.S. What is needed is balance. There should be some kind of a balance between our imports and our exports. What we import from China, for example, should be roughly in line with the value of what we export to China. Our trade policies should be guided by what you could call a principle of reciprocity.

We also have a labor policy that enables foreign-owned companies to threaten and intimidate American workers when they try to organize themselves into unions. The leading foreign automakers have plants in the U.S., but they are all non union, thanks to the anti worker slant of U.S. law. That gives them an unfair advantage over the unionized American auto companies. Why do we tolerate giving Honda and Toyota such an advantage in our own country? If workers were allowed join unions, as they do in Canada, when a majority signed cards attesting that that is their wish, foreign auto companies would be less able to squash an organizing effort. Then GM and Toyota would be on a level playing field as far as labor costs were concerned.

Here in Congress, we cannot compel automakers to design cars people want to buy. We hope that they can find the people to design such vehicles. Clearly, the American automakers have made serious errors. Auto workers didn't make the errors because they are told what cars to make.

But we can make sure that the playing field is level so there is fair competition in the auto industry.

Our trade policy, Mr. Speaker, and I am speaking of NAFTA, CAFTA, WTO, for starters, has had a consistent effect. Know what that effect has been? To deindustrialize the United States. We are losing our industry, not because of the laws of nature or the invisible hand, but due to trade policy established here in Congress.

Our labor law is also responsible. American-owned companies are losing market share to foreign-owned transplants because of the viciously anti-worker environment this Congress has unfortunately established.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing my other colleagues about what we can do to protect American industry and American auto workers.

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

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

## COMMEMORATING THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPTURE OF SERGEANT KEITH MATTHEW ''MATT'' MAUPIN IN IRAQ

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Mr. MCHENRY's time, please.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in special tribute to Sergeant Keith Matt Maupin, an Army reservist from Batavia, Ohio in my congressional district, who has been missing, captured in Iraq since April 9, 2004, 2 years ago this Sunday.

Matt Maupin's convoy came under attack by Iraqi insurgents, and he has been missing ever since. Matt went to Iraq because he believed in the freedom of the Iraqi people, and to make America a safer place. We are proud of him and his enormous commitment to the ideals of freedom and democracy.

I also represent Matt's parents, Keith and Carolyn Maupin. Keith is a veteran, and Matt's brother, Micah is a Marine. They are a tremendous family, and are an extraordinary example to all of us.

To support all families of the many brave servicemembers in harm's way, Keith and Carolyn Maupin lead a nonprofit organization called the Yellow Ribbon Support Network. Offering moral support, helping to raise morale and coordinating communication among families, the Network has literally sent thousands of packages to the military personnel overseas. As I am speaking here tonight, they are working back in Eastgate, Ohio, assembling packages for those brave men and women.

On this second anniversary, we honor Matt Maupin, Keith and Carolyn Maupin, Micah Maupin and the entire Maupin family, and offer our prayers for Matt's safe return home.

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

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

QUOTES FROM OHIO AUTO WORKERS

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. KUCINICH said earlier, we are continuing our Delphi E-hearing here, which we are going to share with the House of Representatives and the American people, stories that have come from families who are being affected by the shake-up in the auto industry in the United States of America.

I come from a district in Northeast Ohio, Youngstown, Akron, Warren, home of the original Packard car, the original Packard Electric Company. I would like to share a few stories and make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, because today not only do we have a concentration of Delphi employees in my district, today the local General Motors plant that has been in Lordstown, Ohio since the late 1960s, there was an announcement that 1,200 third shift employees would no longer be working at that facility, and it is tragic news for many, many families. And so we want to bring attention to the United States Congress and to the American people about the communities that are being affected and how the policies here under the big dome aren't exactly addressing the needs.

Let me share with you, Mr. Speaker, a couple of stories from back home. This is a letter. First of all, thank you for letting me voice my opinion. I hope someone will actually read this. I was hired in at GM, Lordstown, in January of 1971, with the negotiated promise that if I came to work for General Motors, I could retire after 30 years of service. It was always said as GM goes, so goes the country. ''And I challenge all of you to look back and think of when you were young and innocent. My God, what has happened to the USA? You have the chance to stop this injustice, this rape of the American worker in its tracks. I pray that God give you the courage and wisdom to do the right thing. And isn't that what it is all about, doing the right thing? God help us all.''

That is Stephen P. Medici in Lordstown, Ohio.

This is William Ruppel in Cortland, Ohio. ''I was in the infantry in Vietnam in 1968. After going to college for a while, I was hired at Delphi Packard Electric in September of 1973. After working there for a while, we agreed in one of our contracts to an attrition. For every three people who retired, the company only had to replace one. This was to help the company's costs and to afford a decent wage. Next came the movement to Mexico. The jobs would first come to us. We would work out the kinks, and then off to Mexico they would go.

Delphi, Packard Electric's 146,000 employees working for them outside the U.S. is just about exactly how many troops we have fighting in Iraq. Who is more important? Are these men and women who are supposedly fighting for democracy and fairness going to have their wages cut 60 percent, health care and pensions cut, or maybe have no job at all? I was in the infantry in Vietnam in 1968 and I support and sympathize with these brave people.

Do the rich ever get rich enough?''

''I just read where Delphi wants an extension on the reorganizations,'' said Charlie Stowe from Warren, Ohio. ''This is not fair. I want a 30-year extension on my pension.''

''With no support,'' this is Jean Wooler. ''I have worked for Delphi Packard Electric for 38 years. It has allowed me to live a good middle class life and to raise my daughter with no support from her father. My daughter is now 21 and in college. I do not live lavishly. I have a 3-bedroom ranch and a nice car. I don't dress extravagantly. I live paycheck to paycheck as a single mother on the wages that I may make.''

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me just say that data has come out now that the Bush tax cut has lowered the tax burden on the richest people in this country. If you made $10 million a year in 2003, you got $1 million back, Mr. Speaker, from the Bush tax cut. And if your average income in this country was $26 million, you paid the same share in taxes as someone that made $200,000. We need changes, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF GLADEWATER

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 75th anniversary of the town of Gladewater, Texas. Gladewater was incorporated on April 18, 1931. That was 11 days after oil was discovered 1 mile outside of town. With the discovery of oil, the town quickly experienced tremendous prosperity. During the 1930s people began to flock to the small East Texas town with the population swelling from 500 to 8,000 strong.

With the depletion of petroleum reserves in the 1980s, the town was forced to attract and develop alternative forms of commerce. Gladewater, once known for its oil production, is now regarded as the antique capitol, with over 250 antique dealers and 16 antique malls. As a result of the Main Street Project and the downtown revitalization, the charming downtown area is now bustling once again with economic activity. Tourists from all over the southeast have now made this small Texas town a travel destination because of its shopping and its many attractions.

Gladewater is a town of leaders with vision and workers with determination. From the nationally famous Gladewater Rodeo to the Fourth of July boat parade on its city lake, to its local merchants and citizens, Gladewater represents the best America has to offer. I congratulate the town of Gladewater on the remarkable first 75 years, with many more to come. It is a pleasure and an honor to be able to serve the citizens of Gladewater in the United States House of Representatives and to have so many of its citizens that I can call my friend.

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

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

CRISIS FACING THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim Mr. DINGELL's time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Mr. RYAN and Mr. KUCINICH in calling attention to the personal stories and the national hardship that is created by these plans to strip workers of their pensions.

Last December Representative MILLER conducted an on-line hearing so that General Motors and Delphi employees would have an opportunity to send to Congress their words about the meaning of these plans to strip them of their pensions and benefits. And the response was powerful.

Let me read from a few New Jersey constituents. Mr. Paluzzi from East Brunswick writes, ''I have worked for GM Delphi for 34 years. And during the

hiring process I was given a package of benefits that I was entitled to. This included a pension package that the company said they would control and have for me upon my retirement. As I worked for the company, and union contracts were renegotiated, the pension package was still included. Now it seems, Delphi wants to take back the pensions and the contracts that were signed in good faith, while I and thousands like me, worked to make huge profits for the company. I felt my pension and benefits were secure all those years that I worked here.''

Mr. Lauder of Somerset New Jersey wrote, ''I have lived in the same area all my life except for the 4 years I served my country in the U.S. Navy on a military leave of absence from GM. I have worked at this facility for 32 years, starting at age 18. The hazards of these plants are well known. The industrial atmosphere that we work in holds many perils, such as dangerous machinery, extreme temperatures, hazardous chemicals, asbestos, et cetera. We were not always aware of some of the hazards and the effect on our health, but over the years, the unions and more responsible government representatives fought for information and equipment to protect us.

These are the types of jobs the American blue collar workforce took to feed, clothe and educate our family in the hopes of creating a better world for them. The deal was that we would do our part to help the corporations rake in billions made off of our sweat and labor, and when our time was up we could look forward to a modest pension and medical benefits.''

□ 2000

''A living wage was also part of the deal so we could better the lives of our children so they could grow into healthy, educated, and productive individuals, to be contributors and not burdens on our society.

''That used to be the 'American Way,' the basis for the betterment of our great country and the world. Now it seems the Robber Barons are back.''

You can hear the pride and the patriotism that comes through in this testimony from these workers.

Writes another worker: ''I've been on this job for 16 years and have been a loyal and dedicated employee from day one. Over the years there have been changes, but this kind of change is a harsh one to swallow. Delphi would like to take away our negotiated benefits and leave my family and me with nothing. I have a son who would like to start college next year. My wife and I have explained to him that this just may not happen right now because of the bankruptcy proceedings that are under way. Please imagine if this was the situation you were in, how would you feel and what would you do?''

Another, Mr. Hagopian from Somerset, New Jersey, writes: ''This whole bankruptcy was planned. If you let this happen,'' the Delphi deal, ''every other U.S. company will do the same thing . . . ''

You can hear the pride and patriotism. It comes through so clearly. Now, I ask will those who engineer the plans to strip these workers of their pensions and their benefits ever understand what these men and women are going through?

## A NEW BEGINNING FOR THE IRAQI PEOPLE

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to salute tonight the brave men and women who are fighting in Iraq to bring democracy to the Middle East and hopefully help turn around nations, particularly Arab nations, that the U.N. has said when you add up the gross domestic product of all 22 Arab nations, their gross domestic product is smaller than Italy's. This is a U.N. report that pointed out that in the last 10 years these Arab nations collectively have had declining productivity and that they have not brought forward any inventions or innovations to contribute to world prosperity.

We are in Iraq to help the Iraqi people have a new beginning and hopefully change the face of the Middle East.

I have been to Iraq 11 times, and I have had good visits and I have had bad visits. I have had visits where I have had tremendous hope and then the recognition that we have made some mistakes. In April, 2003, there was tremendous hope. But then we proceeded, unfortunately, to disband their army, their police, and their border patrol, and that resulted in the requirement of American troops and British troops and very few coalition forces to defend 24 million people in a country the size of California.

So what I saw when I went back after April, 2003, when I went in August and then in December and then early in the spring of the next year, things were getting worse. But I began to see it turn around in June of 2004 as we transferred power to the Iraqis. A significant decision. It took it away from Defense and gave it to State Department, and State Department had a better sense of how to help this government, not how to fight the war.

The war is still being fought by our own troops. But as well, we started to train their police, their border patrol, and their army, and they have become very confident.

And what I then saw in 2005 were three elections in Iraq. I was there for the first one. I remember asking if I could stick my finger in that ink jar, and this Kuwaiti woman looked up at me and she said, No. She said, You are not an Iraqi.

That gave me a chill because she did not say I was not a Kurd. She was a Kurd. She said I was not an Iraqi.

And then what I saw was another election. I was there a week before, after now creating a government that was elected, creating a constitution and ratifying this constitution. This constitution was ratified with 79 percent favoring it, and then they proceeded to elect a government at the end of last year.

I can tell you why I know it was a success. The press did not talk about it. Seventy-six percent voted of 100 percent. In other words, of all adults, not the two-thirds that bothered to register, not 76 percent of two-thirds; 76 percent of all adults.

And now we have seen a very dicey moment. The Sunni insurgents are playing their trump card. Not their last straw, not their final gasp. They are playing their trump card, and they may succeed if the Shiias give in to sectarian violence. And we are trying to make them understand that they are the majority and they can run this country. Do not allow the Sunni insurgents to get them to do what would be the stupidist thing, to give in to the violence, to give in to a civil war, and then fail.

We are going to leave Iraq when the Iraqis ask us to leave or if they give up. If they give up to the sectarian violence, we will move our troops away from harm's way and we will take them out. But they are so close and they have done so much. I have met such brave Iraqi men and women.

Quickly, one Iraqi man, Al-Alusi, after the election he lost his two sons. His security had been taken away because he had gone to Israel, and he came to visit me later in 2005, and I said, You cannot go back. You are a marked man. You are a dead man walking.

He looked at me with some surprise and said, I have to go back. My country needs me.

Which is to introduce one point I would love to make: When I ask Iraqis what their biggest fear is, it is not the bombing. Their biggest fear is that you will leave us, that you will give us a taste of democracy and then you will leave us.

Let me just conclude by saying this: That very man who went back to Iraq is now an elected member of the assembly. He is a very brave man, and he is typical of the Iraqis who are grasping very hard to have a democracy and to have a better future.

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

(Mr. KILDEE 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 gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR 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 Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS 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 Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LEVIN 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 gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. OWENS 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 Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

## THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is budget week here in the U.S. House of Representatives, and sometimes we hear people say, Oh, no, I just dread it when we get around to talking about this budget. And then we will hear others say, I love to just really tackle this budget issue. I love looking at where we spend our money. And I kind of appreciate that attitude because we are the stewards of the taxpayers' money and it is our responsibility to be a good steward and to be diligent in the work we are going to do as we work on this budget and decide what should the priorities of our government be? What should be our concerns? Where should we be looking for ways to achieve a savings?

And over the past several months, actually over the past 3 years, we have come to the floor regularly to talk about waste, fraud, and abuse and find ways and point out ways and to continue to seek ways that we can achieve a savings for the American people.

And from time to time over the past few years, we have talked about lots of different reports. Many different reports from different government agencies, from the General Accounting Office, from some of our friends who are in the media that have pointed out programs that maybe have outlived their usefulness, programs that are wasting money, programs that cannot achieve a clean audit. And some of our colleagues, we have worked on ways that we can go in and investigate and highlight and look at what this drain is on our tax dollars. And we have House committees, certainly the Government Reform Committee, that continue to hold hearings. Oversight and investigations from our Energy and Commerce Committee are certainly looking at ways to achieve a savings and find ways to review how our agencies are spending their money.

We have clear data showing places where the Federal Government is bleeding funds. And the President's budget this year has included more than 100 programs that could and should be targeted, Mr. Speaker. So the target for spending reductions is clearly enormous. We have got 100 programs, 100, that we can look at through so many different agencies and so many different spots in the Federal Government. Now, certainly, out of 100 programs, we are going to be able to find a way to achieve a savings.

One of the interesting things is no matter what part of this country that you are in and no matter whose district that you are in, whether it is a Democrat or a Republican, there is consensus among the American people that we have a problem. Government does not have a revenue problem; government has a spending problem. Government does not have a revenue problem; government has a priority problem. It is time that we begin to fine tune our focus and decide what the priority of government ought to be.

The taxpayers pay far too much of their paycheck in taxes. They are tired of every time somebody comes up with a good idea, they say well let us just go raise the taxes. And, Mr. Speaker, I tell you what, if it were not for the leadership in this House, we would see those taxes going up. If our friends across the aisle had their way, they would be raising taxes, not cutting programs. That is not where we want to go. We know it is tough to eliminate waste.

I often quote Ronald Reagan, who is pretty close to my favorite President ever, I will have to say that, but one of my favorite remarks he ever made was that when you look at Federal programs, there is nothing so close to eternal life on Earth as a Federal Government program. When you get the thing, it is just the dickens to get rid of it. It is so tough to get rid of it, Mr. Speaker.

Sometimes in my townhall meetings in Tennessee, I will have constituents say, Why is it so tough to get rid of these programs? We see the waste. We know the waste is out there. Everybody knows these programs are wasting money. Why is it so difficult to call them into accountability? Why is it so difficult to get rid of these programs?

And to that, Mr. Speaker, I will have to say if you listen to our colleagues from across the aisle this morning when they gave their 1 minute speeches, then you can see why it is so very difficult for us to downsize this government. Those colleagues across the aisle, Democratic Members, Member after Member, came to the floor this morning, as they do on many days, and they decried our efforts to make reductions in Federal spending.

Mr. Speaker, we spend trillions of dollars to support all sorts of social spending programs; yet any reduction or even holding the line on spending, not increasing anything, just holding the line, all of a sudden it is called a ''draconian cut.'' It is amazing how it works.

Most Americans do not get a massive salary increase every year. But we have colleagues that think if they are not giving every agency an increase every year, then they are getting a cut. It is the most incredible, most incredible, program that you have ever seen. If you do not get an increase, then you are getting a cut.

□ 2015

It does not work that way in real life, only in the bureaucracy. We have to look at this and see that it happens year after year after year.

You know, I don't think that asking the Federal Government to reduce its spending, I don't think asking bureaucrats to be accountable, I don't think asking agencies to be accountable and get clean audits and know where they are spending their money is evil. I don't think it is uncaring. But many of our colleagues across the aisle will come down here and demonize those of us who simply want the spending increases to stop.

I have talked a lot about the Great Society government that was created over 40 years of Democratic control of Congress, and I will have to tell you, yes, indeed, they built an enormous monument, a monument of spending to their party's vision of what government ought to be; a vision in which government solved society's ills and

took care of every problem by spending more money.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know that that vision is a failure. We know it is an absolute failure. You don't solve problems, you don't solve problems, by throwing more money at them. Many times all you do is mask the problem. In the long run, you make it worse, because you are not addressing the causes of the problem.

The moveon.orgs of the world, the Democratic leadership, they don't want to admit this. They want to protect and expand their monumental government, this huge bureaucracy in this town, huge bureaucracy. So many of my constituents get frustrated with it. They want us to break it apart; to send the money, send the power back to our States and back to our local governments. They want to keep their paychecks in their pocket. They don't want the Federal Government to have first right of refusal on it.

They are a little bit confused many times, and understandably so, I think all of us are, of why the Democratic leadership wants to keep, why the liberal leadership wants to keep, a big, big, big bureaucracy in this town. But it is their party's creation. It is their legacy.

I am joined by some colleagues tonight who are going to share some of their thoughts on the great ideas that we can bring to the table to look at how we are spending the Federal Government's money. This party and this leadership is the one that is keeping the attention on spending less and reducing the size of the Federal Government.

Mr. HENSARLING is joining us tonight. He is a member of the Budget Committee, and he has had the Family Budget Protection Act. Mr. HENSARLING is going to open our conversation this evening and talk a little bit about the budget, the work that they have done in the Budget Committee, the process reforms that we are beginning to look at and move forward, and add to the discussion that we are going to have this week as we continue to work on our plan to yield savings for the American people and to reduce the size of the Federal Government.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I especially appreciate her leadership in this body on issues of spending, on issues of budget and trying to protect the family budget from the Federal budget. Certainly she is one of the most powerful and articulate Members that we have, helping lead this charge.

Mr. Speaker, it is that time of year again for the United States House of Representatives to consider its budget. To some people, this is about kind of green eyeshade accounting. It is about numbers. Frankly, it is a lot more than that. It is about numbers. But, more important, Mr. Speaker, it is about values.

There are going to be a number of budgets that are going to be introduced by different caucuses, different groups. I myself have written a budget. But at the end of the day, I think, as usual, if history is our guide, this is going to come down to two budgets: The one that was passed by the House Budget Committee, and the Democrat alternative, and this body, and really the American people, are going to be faced with two very different choices that represent fundamentally two very different sets of values.

One budget, our budget, the Budget Committee, the House Republican budget, is going to value the family budget over the Federal budget, because every time somebody grows a Federal program, Mr. Speaker, it takes away from some family program.

Ours will be a budget that values more freedom. Theirs will be a budget that values more government. And we know, as one of our Founding Fathers, Thomas Jefferson, once said, that as government grows, liberty yields.

We want a budget about opportunity that empowers people to go out and use their God-given talents in this wonderful land that we call America, to be able to put food on their table, to put a roof over their head.

Now, many people will say this is the debate about how much we are going to spend on health care and how much are we going to spend on nutrition programs and how much are we going to spend on education programs. To some extent, it is a debate about those subjects.

But the Democrats only value government spending, only government spending. We, Mr. Speaker, value family spending. We want families to do the spending, not government, and we know the difference. So, there will be two very different sets of values that are present presented in this budget debate.

You are going to hear a lot of things in this budget debate. You are going to hear about which budget is the more compassionate of the two. Well, Mr. Speaker, they are going to present essentially a status quo budget, only worse.

Right now, we are facing a fork in the road. If we don't change things, we know that the great entitlement programs of Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security are growing way beyond our ability to pay for them.

The Democrats will present their vision, and they will claim they want to balance the budget, but yet all they want to do is increase spending.

Mr. Speaker, if that is true, if they want to balance the budget, if they want to increase spending, if they refuse to reform any programs, and, Mr. Speaker, we know, we know, we can get better health care, we can get better retirement security at a lower cost. That is a different debate for a different night. If they want to increase government spending, if they refuse any reforms, if they want to balance the budget, well, Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office, the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, the liberal Brookings Institution, the conservative Heritage Foundation, anybody in America who has looked at this dynamic will tell you that we are on the road to double taxes on the American people if we follow their budget. Double taxes in one generation.

So that is something, Mr. Speaker, as the American people follow this debate, they have to look at quite carefully.

Now, you will also hear a lot about budget cuts. Well, recently I went to Webster's dictionary and looked up the word ''cut.'' It actually means to reduce. That is what it means everywhere in America except Washington, D.C. In Washington, D.C., when we listen to the Democrats, it seems to mean something else. In Washington, D.C., what it means is some program is not growing quite as fast as a big government bureaucrat liberal wants it to grow.

Mr. Speaker, I know you are going to hear a lot about how somehow government spending has been cut over the last few years. Well, don't believe me. Go to the historic tables of the Office of Management and Budget. What you will discover is over the last decade, international affairs has grown by 89.1 percent; science, space and technology spending at the Federal level has grown 49.5 percent; natural resources and environmental spending at the Federal level has grown 43.8 percent; Federal agricultural spending has grown 118.1 percent; Federal transportation spending has grown 83.5 percent. The list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, over this same time period, guess what? Median family income grew by 33 percent and inflation grew by 25 percent. In other words, government, just over the last decade, just over the last decade, government has been growing far faster than family income.

We are growing the Federal budget way beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for it, and if all we wanted to do was keep government that we had 10 years ago, we would have grown it by inflation. We are growing it at twice the rate of inflation.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we start hearing all these accusations about cuts, we have to remember how America defines that term and how liberal big government Democrats define that term, and those are two very, very different things.

Mr. Speaker, something else you are going to hear as this debate ensues is nowhere in a $2.8 trillion Federal budget can we find any savings whatsoever for the American people. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just absurd. Not only is it absurd, we have to find the savings. If we don't find the savings, again, we will either place massive debt on our children or they will be looking at a massive tax increase.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government could not account for $24.5 billion that it spent just a couple of years ago. It just kind of disappeared into thin air. Federal auditors who are currently examining all Federal programs have reported that 38 percent of them examined have failed to show any positive impact on the populations they serve. Thirty-eight percent are not meeting the stated goals of when Congress published them.

It wasn't that long ago that the Department of Defense wasted $100 million on unused flight tickets and never bothered to collect the refunds, even though the tickets were refundable. Mr. Speaker, if it is your money or it is my money, my best guess is we are going to go out and get that refund. But, you know, there is a truism, and that is we are never as careful with other people's money as we are with our own.

The Federal Government spends almost $25 billion annually on what is known as earmarks, pork projects, including the infamous bridge to nowhere, grants to the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame. Hey, I love rock & roll, but, you know what? The last I looked, it was a fairly profitable industry and probably didn't need subsidies from the Federal Government. We had the infamous $800,000 outhouse, the rain forest in Iowa, and the list goes on and on and on.

In the last year of the Clinton administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development couldn't account for $3.3 billion in overpayments. Ten percent of their entire budget just disappeared, 10 percent of their budget. There is no family in America, there is no small business in America, that could just watch 10 percent of their revenues disappear and expect to survive.

We have the Conservation Reserve Program paying farmers $2 billion annually not to farm their land. We spend over $60 billion on corporate welfare versus a smaller amount on homeland security.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on all evening, but I have given you this list just to illustrate a handful of items where we could go out and we could find savings.

Again, Mr. Speaker, what is at stake here? What is at stake here is really the kind of America we are going to leave the next generation. Are we going to go with a budget that would take this Nation from $8 trillion in debt to, who knows, $11 trillion, $12 trillion? Or, if we are not going to go the debt route? Are we going to increase taxes on our children, double taxes?

The average American family is paying $20,000 a year combined in their Federal taxes. That is what we are paying. Are we going to expect our children to pay $40,000? How are they going to buy a first home or send a kid to college or buy that second car to get that parent to work? Is this the kind of America we want to leave our children?

Mr. Speaker, this is what this debate is all about. You are going to hear a lot about compassion, but, Mr. Speaker, I don't see any compassion in doubling taxes on our children. I see no compassion there whatsoever.

You are going to hear a lot again from the Democrats about how we have to increase this Federal program and that Federal program. I want to remind you, these are the people who voted against any tax relief whatsoever for American families and small businesses.

When we back in 2003 enacted tax relief for small businesses and families, guess what, Mr. Speaker? Five million new jobs were created. Yet the Democrats in their budget, what they want to do is, they believe that somehow paychecks are not about compassion, and yet welfare checks are. The compassion of our society should be defined by how many paychecks we create, how many opportunities there are for men and women to use their God-given talents and to go out and find good productive careers. That is how our budget is going to define compassion.

Their budget is going to define compassion by how much dependency they can create, what kind of labyrinth, what kind of tangled labyrinth of welfare can they make people more dependent upon. We want to empower people. We want to get people off of welfare and on to work so that they can have careers, so they can have opportunities, so they can have freedoms that previously they haven't been able to dream of.

□ 2030

And those are the two different values that are going to be represented in this debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is so right when he talks about the compassion and what is the compassionate thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, in 1994, the Republicans swept in here and took control of this body and have been working ever since to turn this ship around and turn that corner so that we look at how we handled the Federal purse, how we handle the priorities of the Federal Government, how we shift that focus and move it away from saying, let us give government the money, and then task government to go solve all the ills to say, we believe this is government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and we believe the people can solve these problems. They can do it.

We know that most people feel when they see their taxes increase, when they see more of their money going to feed that bureaucracy, they know that their freedom has been cut.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening by Dr. GINGREY, who is a member of the Rules Committee and is going to have a few comments on the budget. Certainly, he is a gentleman who knows of compassion and how we should be working with and for our Federal man.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee. It is really an honor to be part of this hour discussion tonight with some of the most fiscally responsible Members of this body. My Republican colleagues on the Republican Study Committee, that you just heard from the gentleman from Texas, you will be hearing from others, the gentleman from New Jersey, the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentlewoman from Ohio. These are Members, Mr. Speaker, that get it. As Mr. HENSARLING just said, this is really not green eye shade stuff; this is about people and values, as he so well pointed out. It is about real needs as distinct from just wanting more, more, more.

Mr. Speaker, my dad told me one time when I was just a teenager, he said, ''Somebody asked a very rich person one time, what would it take to make him happy?'' And the answer was, ''Just a little bit more.'' That is a problem that we have in trying to satisfy all of the wants and not necessarily just the real needs.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues here tonight and on this side of the aisle are committed to restoring some fiscal sanity to this place, and I commend Mr. HENSARLING in particular. I have told him in private that he is our modern day William Proxmire of the 109th, and indeed, the 108th Congress as we came in together in regarding to ferreting out waste, fraud, and abuse in this Federal Government. In fact, that was our class project that the gentlewoman from Tennessee and myself and others in the 108th class were determined to do, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about the other side and what they want to do and their plans. The tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 is an example of what they did not do. They voted no for those tax cuts. They said we cannot do that. That is going to, according to the Congressional Budget Office, when you do this static scoring, we are going to cut taxes, we are going to cut rates for everybody that pay taxes. We are going to lower capital gains, we are going to lower the tax on dividends, which indeed is a double taxation.

We are going to get rid of the marriage tax penalty. We are going to increase child tax credit from $600 to $1,000 per child. We are going to finally stomp dead the death tax. As Steve Forbes once said, there should be no taxation without respiration.

We did these things, and the opposition said, well, that is going to cost $1.3 trillion over 10 years. Mr. Speaker, you know, I know, my colleagues know, I hope the American people know that it did not cost us any money. We gained revenue, something like $250 billion over 10 years. That is what happened in 1960 under Democratic President Kennedy; it happened in 1980 under my colleague's favorite,

maybe all-time favorite President Reagan. We cut taxes, we raised revenue, and it works. The opposition, they not only oppose that, but they also opposed health care reform, Medicare modernization, Prescription Drug Act. They said that is going to cost $750 billion over 10 years. But of course, actually, their plan, if we had done what they wanted us to do, would have probably cost $3 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, it was only going to cost that money if it did not work. And what we are finding today, as we are getting closer and closer to that deadline of May 15, the 6-month opportunity for seniors to take that option and sign up for prescription drug benefit, we are reaching our goal. We are beyond our goal. Seniors are saying, members of my own family, my mom, my brother, constituents in my district saying, ''Thank you, Congressman. We are saving money.'' I have had people spending $900 a month who found out they qualified for the low income supplement and now are spending $27 a month, they are saving $900 a month.

We wanted to do Social Security reform to give individuals an opportunity to have an individual personal account. What does the other side do? They fight that. They are the party of no, of negative.

But these are the things that this majority and particularly the Members here tonight, Mr. Speaker, are determined to do for the American people: To reform government, to save money, to let people put that money back into the family budget, as Mr. HENSARLING has pushed so hard for.

This budget that we are going to vote on, this 2007 budget is a very fiscally sound, responsible budget. It virtually freezes nondefense discretionary spending at the 2006 level. Again, the other side will say, well, you are taking money away from the school children, you are taking money away from Head Start, you are taking money away from social welfare programs. Not at all, Mr. Speaker. All we are doing is putting a cap on discretionary spending, and then we are saying to the appropriators: You decide where that money needs to be spent. You decide whether cuts really need to be made and whether plus-ups need to be made. And that is the responsible way to do it.

In conclusion I want to say, too, to the chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the great job that he has done and his willingness to include in this 2007 budget a rainy day fund. This is something that all of the Members here tonight who are speaking during this hour have been calling for and for a number of years saying, look, we know every year that we are going to have a hurricane, we are going to have a natural disaster.

It may not be every year, but all of a sudden you go a couple of years and then you have a Katrina. So we need to fund this based on a 10-year average of how much we spend on a natural disaster and emergency. So this is in the budget, $4 billion for each of the next 5 years. I think that is absolutely responsible.

In addition to that, we are going to come forward with a line item veto. The President needs it, the Congress wants it, and we are going to get that done. We are also going to have the earmark reforms that Congressman FLAKE has called for shine the light of day on those earmarks, some of which are very good and should be included in the budget; and last but not least, of course, a sunset commission.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, it is an honor. I know we want to hear from our other colleagues on this issue. But I commend the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her continued work on fiscal responsibility and putting together this hour tonight and giving us a chance to weigh in on it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I appreciate so much that he calls our attention to some of the issues that are at hand.

Mr. Speaker, for any of our colleagues who are looking for more information on the House budget, they can go to the Web site gop.gov, and pull down the House Budget Resolution fact sheet.

Here is some interesting information on it, and it goes back to what Mr. HENSARLING was talking about on the budget. It is a $2.7 trillion budget authority. One of the things that is so important in this is when you look at the discretionary, it is a 3.6 percent increase over what we had in fiscal year 2006. We did some interesting things here, and Chairman NUSSLE is to be commended for this. We have a $50 billion placeholder in here for our war effort cost.

We have money for Katrina or for emergencies such as Katrina. Then we go in and we look at our discretionary spending, a near freeze in nonsecurity discretionary spending. A near freeze. Quite amazing, is not it, when you think about the growth that year after year after year took place. And I would encourage the individuals that are listening to this over TV tonight to call their legislators. Call us. Let us know what we think. We love to hear from you.

We have another Budget Committee member, and leader who is with us tonight, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), who is going to have a few things to say, and then we are going to invite some of our other colleagues in.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for this opportunity. I applaud her for being here not only tonight, but on so many nights when you bring these important issues to the American public. I will be brief, and I just want to go back to one of your very first comments that you made as you began this night's program.

You started out by saying, ''I do not know whether people who are listening here tonight are going to be interested on this debate on the budget or whether they are not. Some people are going to be interested, other people are not.''

I think the debate that we have here in Congress when it comes down to the Federal budget in reality is absolutely no different than the debate that goes around the kitchen table in the families across America, once, twice, three times a month with regard to the family budget. That is really all we are doing here, is we are just one large family, the American family and the American family budget.

You know, back at home right now, as I say, once or twice a month, people probably sit down as I do with the household checkbook, and you sit there with a stack of bills on the one side and you write out the checks to pay for them, whether it is the electric bill or the gas bill or other utility bills, the rent or the mortgage or other expenses that you have, maybe some more luxurious items, going out to eat or buying videos or other luxuries, a new car or what have you. And, at the end of it, at the end of that evening as you write out that check, you hope that you are able to write out that last check and that there was money in your checking account to pay for all those necessary and extra bills. But if there was not, if at the end of it you look at it and you say, ''Gee, there just is not enough money going around this month,'' what does the American family have to do with their budget? What they have to do is set priorities, set boundaries, set parameters, set a limit as to what they are able to do next month in their budget.

This is nothing different than what the Founding Fathers of this country said. Madison said in Federalist Number 45 that: The powers of the Federal Government are few and limited, but the powers of the States and the people are numerous and indefinite.

For that reason, we come to the Budget Committee and the budget process here in the Federal level realizing that those are limits on us and what we have to do so that we can protect the American family budget.

So I applaud you for doing what needs to be done here, and we can discuss later today and at other times, what are those priorities, and what are those waste, fraud, and abuse, as Mr. HENSARLING has addressed in the past, that we must do to cut out so we put more priorities back into the family budget.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his thoughts. He is such a thoughtful member of our Republican Conference, and a thoughtful and studious member of the Budget Committee, and the ideas that he brings forth are very important to us, because that is what we bring, ideas. How are we going to work through this process of reducing what the Federal Government spends?

How are we going to work through the process of being certain that Federal agencies are called into accountability for how they spend your money?

□ 2045

This is not the government's money. It is the taxpayers' money, and we need to remember that every single day.

A gentleman who does a great job of reminding us that it is the taxpayers' money is the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), and at this time I yield to Mr. MCHENRY.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, thank you. I certainly appreciate your leadership and support on these budget issue. They are so important to every working family in America and so vital to the debate we are going to have tomorrow and on Friday on the Federal budget here in Washington, D.C.

I also want to commend my colleagues Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GARRETT and Mr. HENSARLING, who I have worked extensively with on budget issues, and I am so happy that Congresswoman SCHMIDT joined us as well.

I think it is important that we let the American people know how we are spending their money and what this debate here in Washington, D.C., on our Federal budget means to average Americans.

The Democrats in the left wing represented here often times in loud ways, but represented here in this body, will scream that Republicans are cutting too much, they are hurting people. They scream, they yell and it is just all about emotion with them, and when you get down to what we are doing as Republicans, as conservatives, as the majority in this House, you see that we are just trying to reform government so it more efficiently provides services for people.

I know the American people would understand, Mr. Speaker, and see that there are programs out there that are no longer fulfilling their purpose or their mission. There are government bureaucrats who are not working as we need them to work. We have useless bureaucracies here in Washington, D.C., that in the name of big government continue to grow and prosper, all the while siphoning off money from every American, every American family.

What we are saying is conservatives have to look at those programs, and if they are not providing a service, if we have empty buildings, that perhaps we need to sell those empty buildings and gain revenue for the Treasury so we do not have to raid the American taxpayers' treasuries and the working families' treasuries.

As conservatives, we understand that this is the American people's money, that it is not, as some in the left would say, the government's money. No, it is the American taxpayers' money, and we need to be diligent on how we spend our tax money, your tax money, my tax money here in Washington, D.C.

I am so happy that we are going to begin this debate because I think the American people will see the more fiscal party is the Republican Party, and I think they will understand the leadership we are trying to provide to change the direction of the ship of state, and in order to change the direction of a ship, you cannot turn on a dime. We are talking about a $2.7 trillion budget, so enormous, but if we can just change the direction ever so slightly, it will have an impact over time, and that is what we are trying to begin now, Mr. Speaker.

I want to commend my colleague Congresswoman BLACKBURN from Tennessee for leading this debate, this colloquy here on the floor, and I think she, of everyone here in the House, has been so outspoken in talking about what this means to the taxpayers.

When she goes back to Tennessee, they do not know MARSHA BLACKBURN as the Congresswoman. They know MARSHA BLACKBURN as the leader of fighting taxes in Tennessee, of stopping that income tax that they wanted to put in place in Tennessee just a few years ago, and she is bringing that same leadership here to say, wait a second, let us look at our fiscal house because if we spend recklessly, they are going to tax recklessly, and that means that every American, instead of paying for their children's books, paying for their children's college, providing for their families, their perhaps retired parents or their children coming up, buying a new car or actually owning a home, that they will have to only pay their tax bill instead of doing those things.

So we need to look at how we spend money because that is directly tied to how we take money from the taxpayers. I appreciate your leadership.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and as he said, it is so important that we keep the attention on both sides of this ledger, that we hone that focus and just target it, what we are taking in and what we are spending.

When we go back and we look at the 2003 tax cuts, we know that 91 million Americans saw a tax reduction of about $1,100. That is real money. We also know that when government takes more of that paycheck, that the individuals are not making choices, that the government is making choices, and that is where we see a decrease in our freedom.

The gentleman is so correct. It is the debate of ideas and putting new ideas on the table that is so very important, and we are joined, as you mentioned, by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT), who has a few thoughts to offer on the line item veto and some of the ideas that are being offered for our budget process, and I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee. I appreciate the opportunity to talk tonight, Mr. Speaker, about an important tool that would I believe help eliminate wasteful spending.

When I was first elected to Congress last August, I pledged to be a fiscal conservative for the residents of the 2nd District of Ohio. Taking a fiscally disciplined approach to government has always been one of my top priorities as an elected official. I am committed, as my colleagues on this side of the aisle are, to seeking out and supporting common-sense measures that promote fiscal responsibility and curb government spending.

That is why I cosponsored and strongly support the Line Item Veto Act of 2006, which the President recently sent to Congress. The line item veto would be a useful tool designed to reduce the budget deficit, improve accountability and ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely.

Many people are surprised to learn that the President currently has no power to remove wasteful or unnecessary spending in appropriations bills or other pieces of legislation that are presented to him. Oftentimes, provisions are slipped into a larger spending bill that never gets discussed or debated. The result is more spending in the Federal budget.

The Legislative Line Item Veto Act would allow the President the authority to line out unjustified spending items, eliminate new entitlement spending from larger legislation, and return the bill to Congress for consideration. The Congress, us, would then have 10 days to vote on each and every proposed cut.

I am proud to say this is a bipartisan issue. Leaders and Members of the Republican and Democratic side of this aisle, in both the House and the Senate, have supported this approach in the past. They have. In fact, in 1996, the Congress gave the President a line-item veto but the Supreme Court struck down that version of the law in 1998 because the Court felt that the act gave the President too much power to change the text of enacted statutes.

But this Line Item Veto Act does not raise those constitutional issues because the President's rescission proposals must be approved by a majority in Congress and signed into law. So we do have congressional oversight.

Forty-three governments, including my own in Ohio, have the line-item veto to reduce spending, and I believe now is the time to give the President of the United States a similar tool to help control spending in the Federal budget.

The line Item Veto Act is not about giving the President more power or taking power away from Members of Congress. This legislation is about ensuring that hard-earned taxpayer dollars are spent more wisely, and that is our mission, is it not, to spend the taxpayer dollars more wisely, more efficiently, more prudently.

While I do believe that this legislation will go a long way toward identifying and eliminating waste in government, I caution this body to realize this is not the only solution. This is one of many, and I am committed to

working with my colleagues in Congress on both sides of the aisle to seek out other ways to promote fiscal responsibility and curb spending.

Thank you, and I commend my good colleague from Tennessee for taking on this issue and all the Members that are here.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and it is so true. We are to spend wisely, and this week, as we look at this year's budget, there are some things that you will hear us talking, some themes that will bear themselves out as we talk about this budget this week. As I said, you can go to the Budget Committee Web site, through house.gov or go to gop.gov, our colleagues can, and get more information on the budget.

We are going to talk about strength and how we look at strength and security in this budget. We look at defense, homeland security, national security. We are going to talk about spending control, the issue that we have talked about tonight, how we work on waste, fraud and abuse, how we seek that savings and continue to seek that savings for the American people and how we continue to push for reform, so that government avails itself of every possible efficiency, every possible efficiency that is out there to be certain that the taxpayer is receiving the best buy for their dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

When we talk about the Federal budget, sometimes the numbers are just so large that it goes out of our sphere of understanding, as I was referencing before our conversation with regard to the family budget and the dollars that they spend there, but at the end of the day the issue has really come down to the exact same thing, and that is, are you taking in as much money, income, your paycheck, what have you, through Federal tax revenues as you are paying out at the end of the day? Do you have a balanced budget? Do you have a paycheck?

That is a problem for the American family. This is a problem for the States, as well as the gentlewoman knows I come from the great State of New Jersey, and people from New Jersey know right now our State is having a difficult time with the State budget. Other people are looking in and they realize we are having a difficult time with the State budget. We have a new Governor who is trying to deal with this issue. As a matter of fact, in the State of New Jersey, we are looking at a $6 billion shortfall in revenue coming in. What that means is that we have less money coming in than is going out at the end of the day for the State treasurer when he writes out his checkbook at the end of each day.

But what the State of New Jersey has to do now, of course, is the same thing as the family budget. That is, they have to set priorities, boundaries or limits, but so, too, does the Federal Government.

The Federal Government is basically on some of the items that you have already raised. We have to decide what are the priorities of the Federal Government.

I think one major word that you described for almost all of them is security: homeland security, economic security.

In the area of homeland security, if you look at the budget that came out of the Budget Committee that I serve on, we are planning to spend a 3.8 percent increase in homeland security to make sure that Americans at home feel more secure, that our borders are secure, that the Department of Homeland Security and the people that work for them have adequate money in order to get the job done.

Another area, of course, for us in the area of security is defense. We want to make sure that we are able to protect our Nation, protect the freedoms and the liberties that our Fore Fathers have fought and other generations have fought since that time. For that reason, in this budget, we will be seeing a 7 percent increase in defense.

Veterans, of course, is another area that this budget does not skimp on at all, and I think the gentleman from Texas gave some of the numbers before as far as the policy and the goals of this administration and of this Republican Congress to make sure that our veterans are adequately taken care of and protected.

So this budget does continue what this Republican Congress has done in the past. It sets out what the appropriate priorities have got to be for this Congress and for this Nation, and once we establish those priorities, we can establish our spending.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talked about priorities and where the priorities are in this budget. I think that is one of things that our colleagues will want to watch over the next couple of the days because over the past decade, we saw discretionary spending increase by an average of 7 percent each year. What we have done in last year's budget and this budget is to come to a near freeze in nonsecurity discretionary spending.

□ 2100

And that is so important, because that points to the priorities that you have mentioned and the gentleman from Texas has mentioned and the gentleman from North Carolina has mentioned.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. And if the gentlewoman will yield. After anyone, a State or a family or the Federal Government sets its priorities, the second half of the equation then must be what are the items that don't rise to that level of a significant priority? Where are those areas, again as Mr. HENSARLING referred to that we can begin to say maybe we should not be spending all the money that we have been in the past. And I would humbly suggest a couple that I would at least suggest that may not be the top priorities.

Some of the areas where we could see some savings, for example, the Great Ape Conservation program, the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation program, the African Elephant Conservation program. Certain areas and important issues, I am sure, but when you compare them against making sure our veterans have the TRICARE services they need, I would say they pale in comparison.

How about the exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners program, or the Native Hawaiian Vocational Educational program, or the Native Hawaii Health Care program, for that matter.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman will yield, earlier we talked about our colleagues across the aisle and this morning how they were bemoaning the fact that we were going to freeze spending or reduce spending, or if they weren't going to get everything they wanted, then it is considered a cut. Now that is government speak, as the gentleman from Texas said. That is government speak. It is not really a cut.

But we have to realize that every single time, every single time we start to make reductions in what the Federal Government spends, there are some who try to keep us from doing that. And their answer is always, we need more money. Government can't afford that cut. Government can't afford that tax reduction.

And as you said, it is so important that we differentiate between this.

Mr. MCHENRY. If the gentlewoman will yield, and I thank Congresswoman BLACKBURN.

This is one of the things they always say on the other side, if you cut taxes, you are going to cut revenue to the government. Now, that is absolutely misunderstood. Because as we know, the Bush tax cuts have fueled the economy and government returns, tax returns, the money sent to government because people are working, those things have gone through the roof. And I will yield to the gentleman if he has something to add to that.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. If the gentleman has yielded.

Mr. MCHENRY. Absolutely.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Normally, the press and the media would say that if you had unemployment under 6 percent that you are doing good. We have seen because of the actions of this Republican Congress in cutting the taxes and returning the money to the family budget, as opposed to keeping it here in Washington for the Federal budget, we now see unemployment in this Nation around 4.7 percent.

Normally, the press and the national media would say if you have growth in the economy of around 2 percent that

you would be doing good. Well, we, of course, know that because of those tax cuts that you referenced just a moment ago, we have seen the growth in the economy of over 3 percent for the last 11 straight quarters. So it is because of this pro-growth economic policy you just set forth that we are seeing the economy grow.

And by having a strong national economy, obviously it is helping the revenue stream on this side and obviously it also affects the family budget.

Mr. MCHENRY. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield back.

Mr. MCHENRY. This is one of the great discussions of the day. If you cut taxes does government get less in income or taxation? What we have seen through the tax cuts is it is a pro-growth policy. We allow people to keep more of what they earn, therefore they can actually provide for their child. They can go out this time of year and buy shorts and T-shirts and tennis shoes for the kids.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman can yield for just a second.

Mr. MCHENRY. Absolutely.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I want to yield to the gentleman from Texas, because I think it is important for us to bring the deficit back into this. We are allowing the taxpayer to keep more of their paycheck, and the tax reductions in 2001 and 2003 certainly have done that. The gentleman from Texas can talk for a moment about the deficit and how we are speeding along and reducing that deficit faster than we had originally thought that we were because of the growth in taxes and because of the changes we have made in budgeting.

Mr. HENSARLING. Again, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. It is a very important point that we are going to have in this debate. Number one, there is no doubt that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will be talking about tax cuts are bad; we can't have any more tax cuts.

Well, first, Mr. Speaker, nobody is talking today about any more tax cuts. Unfortunately, in this very odd budget process we have in Washington, tax relief is temporary and spending is forever. The only thing we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is make sure that the American people don't have a huge automatic tax increase brought about by the Democrats.

They will tell you, my Lord, if we allow the American people, if we allow small businesses to keep more of what they earn, that is going to cost government. Well, number one, Mr. Speaker, it is not the government's money, it is the people's money.

Second of all, we have given tax relief to American families and small businesses. And, guess what? The deficit starts to come down. Revenues are up. Again, don't take my word for it, go to the United States Treasury and here is what they will tell you. We cut marginal rates in 2003. We helped small businesses. We helped families. We cut tax rates. And guess what? We ended up with more tax revenue. More tax revenue.

Individual tax receipts were up 14.6 percent. Corporate tax receipts were up 47 percent. A huge boon of revenue. That brings the deficit down because people are going out and they are saving and they are working and they are rolling up their sleeves and they are building new businesses. In just this year, in the first few months of this fiscal year, corporate tax receipts are up 29.6 percent. Again, don't take my word for it, go to the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I would be glad to yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Just for a quick point. I don't normally do this, but I would reference you to The New York Times and today's edition, because they verify that too. You can't go by what their headlines say, because their headline is a little misleading. But they did an article in the business section in The New York Times today saying who benefitted from the tax cuts that this Republican-led GOP Congress and this administration passed. And if you get beyond the headlines and you dig down into the weeds, even The New York Times admits that the benefits to them are to the middle class and the lower class, as opposed to the higher incomes, as the other side would argue.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentlemen will yield. As we wrap up our hour, I want to bring it right back to where we started, talking about the compassionate thing to do is to let the American taxpayer keep their paycheck, be certain that they have first right of refusal on that paycheck and not the Federal Government.

I also want to encourage our constituents to talk to us and our colleagues, to talk to our constituents so that we are certain that everyone understands our goal as the majority party here in this House is to be certain that we preserve individual freedom, that we preserve hope and opportunity, and that we allow the American taxpayer to keep control of their paycheck. And that as stewards of the taxpayers' money, that we are good and accountable stewards.

## 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House once again. As you know, those of us that are in the 30-something Working Group come to the floor if not nightly, every other day to share not only with the Members but the American people about what is happening here, what is really happening here under the Capitol dome.

Unfortunately, many times we have to share bad news, but at other times we share very good news, the good news of saying there could possibly be a brighter future. Either one of two ways, Mr. Speaker, either the Republican majority says, hey, we want to work with the Democrats in a bipartisan way on issues such as national security, education, tax reform, issues that we can all rally around, health care for American workers, making sure that American companies wouldn't have to do what they did in Congressman TIM RYAN's district when the third shift showed up for work and they said there will no longer be a third shift. That is a problem, and that is something that we have to work on in a bipartisan way.

Or, Mr. Speaker, the American people can make the decision that they are willing to go with a Democratic House of Representatives and a Democratic Senate to move us in the direction of working together on behalf of all Americans.

First, we have to deal with the issue of incompetence, we have to deal with the issue of corruption, we have to deal with the issue of cronyism in many areas, and we have to deal with the issue of governance. And I think it is very, very important as we outline a number of these issues here tonight and also pepper it with Democratic proposals that we will hopefully be able to turn the tide in many of these areas.

Mr. DELAHUNT, my good friend from Massachusetts, and my good friend from New Jersey, and we are going to have another good friend from Ohio, and a gentlelady from Florida, and we may have some folks from Texas come in tonight, because we said last night, Mr. Speaker, that this is almost not fair. Some would believe that we just make up this information, that happens to be fact. And it is sad that it is fact.

If I was looking at this as some sort of political reason why we come to the floor to share what we believe the situation may be, it would be one thing, but we come to the floor and pull the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We come to the floor to talk about a vote that just took place yesterday. We come to the floor with fresh statements from Members of the Republican, former members of the Republican Caucus, and also a past Speaker that gave birth to the Republican majority, making statements to the press of saying, listen, as an American, I have to say something. Not as a Republican. I have to say something. When you are the Speaker, you are the leader.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. MEEK, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I would certainly yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think you are talking about Newt Gingrich, who was the father, if you will, of the Gingrich

revolution back in 1994. And, in fact, my friend and classmate, because we came in together into the House of Representatives back in January of 1997, STEVE ROTHMAN, we were here when Newt Gingrich presided over this House.

Both STEVE and I can attest that this was a man who was partisan, very conservative, and when you hear him saying, and this is as recent as this past Friday, ''they,'' and by ''they,'' he is referring to the Republican majority in this House, ''they are seen by the country as being in charge of a government that can't function.''

Mr. ROTHMAN. Can I first say a couple of things? I want to first thank Congressman MEEK and yourself, my dear friend Congressman DELAHUNT. We started out in Congress 9½ years ago. We are delighted to welcome this very bright young man who is now a veteran Congressman.

I represent, I suppose, the 50-somethings. I know, BILL, you are probably still 30-something. But I have been watching you young people, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and others, and I have always been jumping up at my television saying, gee, I wish I had the time to add my voice. Well, something happened yesterday, gentlemen, and Mr. Speaker, that so outraged me that I had to come to the floor to speak about it.

Actually, it was this past week. We had the commissioner of the IRS, Mr. Everson, before us. He announced that he was going to, according to the President's policy, in order to collect some taxes that were acknowledged to be due by the taxpayers, the IRS is now going to hire private collection firms to collect the taxes of United States citizens.

It gets worse. Private tax collecting firms collecting taxes due by United States citizens to the IRS are going to charge up to 25 percent commission. A 25 percent commission. So for every dollar they collect from the taxpayer, they are going to keep 25 cents.

Now, what is interesting is, I asked certain questions and I discovered that a Federal employee in the Internal Revenue Service who collects taxes, their overhead is about 5 cents on the dollar. Five cents on the dollar. The private collection agencies are going to get 25 cents on the dollar.

So I asked the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, I said, Mr. Commissioner, why are you giving away taxpayer money? Federal employees to collect taxes costs 5 cents on the dollar, you are giving 25 cents on the dollar to a private firm to collect these taxes. Why are you giving away 20 cents of our money?

□ 2115

He said, Well, you know, the President doesn't like big government and so we are going to privatize it, in essence he was saying. We are going to give it to the private sector so we do not have it on our books that we are paying people to collect taxes.

I said, Wait a minute, the bottom line is you are wasting money, am I correct, sir?

And he said, Yes, we are.

I said, Wouldn't it make sense, Mr. Commissioner of the IRS, and by the way, we have been carrying hundreds of billions of dollars of receivables from taxpayers who didn't pay their taxes on our books for decades. So if we hired some Federal employees to add to the IRS to collect taxes, they would have plenty of work for their whole career. Isn't this a waste of money, Mr. Commissioner?

And he said, Yes.

I said, Isn't there one other element that you find frightening, to have a private company handling the private details of a taxpayers' basic and most important financial documents? Doesn't that concern you, sir?

He said, Yes, actually it does, and he pointed to some effort in New Jersey where they tried to do it and it was rife with some corruption and he was concerned about it and they were going to take steps.

I said you are worried about corruption and you are worried about the violation of the citizens' privacy by hiring these private tax collection firms, and you are going to lose 20 cents on the dollar because it costs 25 cents for these firms versus 5 cents for the IRS employee and you are wasting tens of millions of taxpayer money, and he had no answer.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me thank you for asking those questions. And as you explained it, I was thinking that you found something rare, and that is somebody in this administration who gave you a straight answer.

Mr. ROTHMAN. I got another one today.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And an honest answer, by the way.

Mr. ROTHMAN. It was an honest answer, and I thanked him for that. He said that it was wasteful, and he said that is the budget that the President gave me.

My subcommittee had a hearing today and we had the Secretary of the Treasury in front of us, Mr. Snow. I said Mr. Secretary, a lot of people say that tax cuts that go to the richest people in the country, people making over a million dollars a year, but if you added up all of the tax cuts, people say that we get money back from the tax cuts and it fills up the government coffers far beyond what we cut in terms of taxes to the rich.

Another honest answer, he said, Congressman ROTHMAN, for every dollar we cut in taxes, we only get back to the Federal treasury about 30 or 40 cents. For every dollar we cut in taxes, we only get back 30 or 40 cents.

I said, Wait a minute, what about the supply side notion and all this talk about the economic growth generating revenues?

He said, Well, that is the consensus of opinion, that for every dollar of taxes cut, we only get back 30 or 40 cents.

I said, Wait a minute, we are losing money every time we do a tax cut and then you tell veterans in this budget, the Bush budget, veterans have to pay more for their health care and poor people have to pay more for their prescription drugs. A family who wants to send their child to college has to pay another $2,000 or $3,000 a year. There is money for nothing but tax cuts.

He said, Oh, by the way, that deficit that we have, the largest deficit in the history of the United States, the one we have today under this Republican majority and this President, one-third of the deficit said Treasury Secretary Snow today, one-third of the deficit is directly related to the tax cuts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Another honest, straight answer.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We have to talk to this guy. I just want to make a point because I am for tax cuts if they go to the right people, if they go to the middle class.

I couldn't believe we had other people citing this, but today in the New York Times an analysis finally came out that talked about the 2003 tax cut. What this says is that among taxpayers with incomes greater than $10 million annually, their investment tax bill, just for the investments that they made, was reduced by $500,000 so they got $500,000 back, less in taxes, and total savings for someone who made $10 million a year was $1 million from the Bush tax cuts and the Republican bobble-head Congress who said yes, Mr. President, deficits do not matter. We can borrow from foreign countries to foot the bill for this.

We don't have money to give a guy or woman who makes $10 million a year, we do not have the money to give them a million dollars back. We had to go out and borrow that million dollars.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Here is another interesting statistic. By the way, working people need tax cuts. They need incentives to save and incentives to work even harder than they already do, if that is possible.

But people who make over $400,000 a year, people who make over $400,000 a year, God bless them, this is a fact that we in America have to deal with in order to decide is the Republican majority and is the President or are each of them making the right policy judgments. People make tax cuts for people making over $400,000 a year.

This year if you add up just those tax cuts, it will be a greater sum than all that we spend on homeland security. And yet the majority and this administration says we can only afford to inspect 5 percent of the containers coming into America, even though in Hong Kong they inspect 100 percent of the containers. This is the priority of this administration.

By the way, I asked Secretary Snow, I said, because he was very proud that perhaps tax cuts helped get us out of the recession that was very shallow. I said, Mr. Secretary, the recession is long over. It has been over for 3 years

or more. So why do we continue to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in the country, accounting for a third of our deficit and when we tell working people and veterans and school kids we do not have money for you, in fact we are going to cut your budgets and keep those tax cuts.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to point this out. This is publicly held debt. Tax cuts are given to a fellow, a woman who makes $10 million a year giving a million dollars back in taxes. We do not have it so what do we do, we go out and borrow it. This is the publicly held debt by China. It had quadrupled under President Bush. In 2000 it was $62 billion. In 2005 it was $257 billion. We are borrowing money from the Chinese to give a person in America who makes $10 million a year $1 million in a tax cut.

Now somebody come down here and explain how that is a good thing for our country because the money that they get, that $1 million, they are not investing it in Delphi stock. They are not investing it in General Motors stock, they are not investing it into the United States of America. They are investing it in China.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Mr. RYAN please tell us the phone call that you got, what happened in your district today to the workers?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. About 6:30, 7:00 this morning my e-mail goes off. I pick it up. The third shift at a General Motors plant that I have in Lordstown, Ohio, the third shift is being eliminated, and 1,200 United Auto workers, nothing is official, but the third shift is being eliminated and 1,200 people will be out of work. Those are average people in the United States of America that are making $60,000 or $70,000 a year, paying taxes and trying to send their kids to school and we are giving a person who makes $10 million a year a $1 million tax cut. That makes no sense to anybody except the Republican majority.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RYAN.

This is something to be very concerned about. We started at the top of the hour, and I am glad the Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has also joined us.

The bottom line is that Mr. ROTHMAN is 110 percent right. What they say on the Republican side, especially here in this Chamber and in this city and what the White House says, I am going to tell you, I am not talking about anybody, but I am just talking about what I am talking about. You hear one thing and there is another.

You got an answer out of the IRS official that came before your committee. You got an answer out of Secretary Snow, and you got to nail them to the wall to get the answer because the administration said this is the direction we are going to go, we are going to write it in the budget; and Mr. Secretary, you will do as you are told.

Secretary Snow, the Secretary of the United States Treasury Department, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, he is a great American and I appreciate his service. But he has to do his job. He did not only send one letter that said we had to raise the debt ceiling or we are going to run out of money on the eve of Near Year's eve, December 29th, 2005, he came back into the office while the rest of us were baking cookies and celebrating religious holidays back home with the family, to say we are going to run out of money because the Republican Congress has passed policies, Mr. Speaker, that cannot hold water and it is going to run us into a fiscal nightmare.

Not only did he write that letter, he turned around again when the Congress did not act, February 16, same letter. Hey, things are really getting bad, you all, we have to do something. Please help us. We have to do something about this debt ceiling.

March 6, and these are the Republican rubber stamps here, but on March 6 he writes again in almost desperation. Please, raise the debt ceiling. He begged the Congress to do it. Here is the gentleman who is in charge of what we do.

Now what Mr. RYAN was sharing with us a little earlier was the fact that when you have Members come to the floor and say Mr. Speaker, or what have you, or Members, we are fiscally responsible, our tax cuts are working for the American people. What Mr. RYAN was saying, and I am going to take it home a little further, tax cuts for whom? What, we are going to borrow money from another country, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. Speaker, we are going to borrow money from another country to give millionaires a tax break here in this country? I am sorry, and it has been done by this Republican majority. Guess what, it is history in all the wrong way. In 4 years, and here is the President, here is the Republican Congress.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, not only is the gentleman absolutely correct that this is what this President and the Republican majority have done for 5½ years, they want to make this policy permanent. They want to make it permanent. Permanent tax cuts for individuals making over a million dollars a year. Permanent tax cuts for people making over $400,000 a year, the sum of which is greater than all we spend on homeland security, and they want to make it permanent. If we vote against it, you know what they say, there they go again, the Democrats want to raise taxes. We do not want to raise taxes, we want sensible fiscal policy that does not give us the biggest deficit in the history of the United States and does not give the people making millions of dollars a year a million dollar tax cut.

□ 2130

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROTHMAN. Yes, of course.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Do you know what else we want as Democrats? We just want the Congress to do what American families all across this country do. They only pay for what they have money to pay for. They pay as they go. Now, there are a lot of families, unfortunately in this country that get themselves into trouble. They run up debt on their credit cards. They end up spending a lifetime hand wringing over how much debt they have because they have paid for luxuries on credit that they didn't have revenue in their household coming in to cover. That is what we are doing here. And there is no end in sight.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Will the gentlewoman yield for a second?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes, be happy to yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am just going to close out on this and then I am going to back up, because I know that Congressman DELAHUNT, sir, you were very reserved last night. We were limited to 50 minutes. I just want you to be able to share, because I know you are ready to come out of the locker room on some of this stuff, and I think it is important that we hear from you this evening.

But I want to make sure, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, that we break this down, because we don't want any Members to go back home and say, you know, I didn't quite understand that at the time I voted for it. I want to make sure that their constituents know exactly what is going on.

And the bottom line is that we are borrowing from foreign nations more than we have ever borrowed in the history of the republic, Mr. Speaker, in the history of the United States Congress.

You heard it. They want to make it permanent. It is not what we are saying. That is what the majority is saying. 1.05 trillion in 4 years. That is what the Republican Congress and the President has done, more than 42 presidents, and was only able to borrow 1.01 trillion over 224 years. 224 years. And I don't even need to get into what happened in the 224 years.

Who are we borrowing from? Well, let's just look at it. I am not going to pull this off because it came apart last night. It is just so much here.

Look at Japan, Mr. Speaker. Japan. We owe Japan. While folks are running around here defending people that are making $10 million a year, that they may very well have to pay their fair share for homeland security and all of that as it relates to the tax cut that this majority wants to make permanent. Japan, $882.8 billion of American apple pie. It pains me to stand here and hold this poster like this. I am glad it's not my creation. I am glad I voted against all of this debt that we have given foreign nations.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If the gentleman would just yield for a minute.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I would just yield for a minute, but please allow me to get through this.

Mr. DELAHUNT. 30 seconds. I will let you get back to it. But you know what? I am just looking at that, Japan at $680 billion. Japan is actually subsidizing partially that tax cut, or that tax refund for the extremely wealthy in this country. I mean, that is where that money is going. I wonder if that extremely wealthy taxpayer might consider taking that tax refund in yen?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Just save the transactional cost.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Because the way we are going, we are going to bankrupt this United States of America.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Will the gentleman yield? I have a statistic you won't believe. I happen to serve on the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROTHMAN. And we were only inspecting 5 percent of the containers. That was the Republican majority's policy. They were in charge. They made the rule. The majority rules, and they won.

We said in the House Appropriations Committee, we said to our colleagues, our Republican friends, if we cut $5,000 from the 80 or $100,000 tax cut, 80 or $100,000 tax cut, depending how much money these folks make, if we just take 5,000 from the 80,000 we are sending them, we could triple the number of containers we inspect from 5 percent to 15 percent.

And do you know what every single one of my Republican colleague on the House Appropriations Committee did? They voted against it.

And I went to them and I said hey, man, what are you doing? I have nothing against people who are worth a fortune. This isn't class warfare. Do you want to give it to them, or do you want to spend it on inspecting our containers coming into the port? And they said, we are story, STEVE. This was the President's directive.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROTHMAN. Yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Because I want to illuminate what you just said because actually, we put our action where our words are, because it is not just that we said that we should drop those tax cuts by just a little bit and make sure we could fund port security. Here is the third party validation that we always talk about.

On June 18, 2004, there was an amendment by Representative DAVE OBEY, who is the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee that Mr. ROTHMAN sits on. He offered an amendment to increase port and container security by $400 million. Republicans refused to allow consideration of that amendment.

October 7, 2004 an amendment offered by Representatives OBEY and SABO and Senator BYRD that would have increased funding to enhance port security by $150 million. Republicans defeated this amendment along party lines.

September 29, 2005, just last fall, there was an amendment which Representatives OBEY, SABO and Senator BYRD, again, to increase funding for port and container security by $300 million; all of these proposing to drop the tax cut for the wealthiest Americans by just a small amount of money. The House Conferees, led by the Republicans, defeated this amendment along party lines.

And March 2, 2006, Republicans blocked an effort by Democrats to bring the King-Thompson Dubai port deal bill to the floor, which would have expedited procedures to ensure a congressional vote on the Dubai port deal bill sponsored by a Republican and a Democrat. And Republicans voted against that 197–216. So who is for port security?

Mr. ROTHMAN. By the way, the incomes of the people who were going to have their tax cut reduced by 5,000 were only individuals whose annual income was $1 million or more. And we said, can we take 5,000 from the 80 or 100 or 150,000 they are going to get in tax cuts, take 5,000 to increase our port inspection of our containers. And every Republican said no. Mr. Speaker, that is the priority of this Republican majority and this President.

Mr. DELAHUNT. You know, if I can interject for a moment, your point is well made. And I think the American people have to realize that these statistics that they are hearing tonight are accurate. That New York Times piece that we were referring to earlier, it goes on to say that because of these recent tax cuts, even the merely rich, even those that are very rich, making hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, and I am reading from that piece, are falling behind the very, very wealthiest. In other words, what we are doing, we are creating a super rich elite in this country.

There was another New York Times story that came across my desk. And for those that are listening to our conversation this evening, I would refer them to an article that appeared in the New York Times on January 29 of this year. Corporate wealth share rises for top income Americans. In 2003, and this is the most recent data, the top 1 percent of households owned 57½ percent of corporate wealth in this country. That was up from 53.4 percent the year before. This top group, this 1 percent, in 1991 had 38.7 percent. In other words, this 1 percent is doing so well that they are leaving everybody behind. The top 1 percent is gaining so much money and corporate wealth in this Nation that the other 99 percent have experienced a decline in their share of the wealth of America.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Sure.

Mr. ROTHMAN. You know, some people will say, oh, there the Democrats go again, class warfare. There they go again, class warfare. Nonsense. We love rich people. We love poor people. We love middle class people. We love Americans. This is about the choices that America is going to make with their tax dollars.

What should we do with the tax dollars that people send to Washington? Should we give them, by the way, the recession is over. We are in the start of the fourth year of the war in Iraq. We are still paying for Katrina and Hurricane Rita.

With all of these problems and the recession over 3 years ago, is this the time not only to continue these tax cuts that benefit the wealthiest people making over $400,000 a year, millions of dollars a year? Or should we, in fact, pay off some of the debt, spend down the deficit, pay for college for kids.

Mr. DELAHUNT. How about restraining spending?

Mr. ROTHMAN. And remember this, not only has this been the policy that has put us in the largest deficit in the history of the country, the Republican majority and the President want to make this policy permanent. They want to make their tax cuts for the rich permanent.

They will claim we are against wealthy people. Class warfare. Nonsense. We want the money that we send to Washington spent wisely and not given away.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is important to note that this is a matter of priorities. What is sad, and I am the least senior among the five of us, and what I have found the most sad since joining the Congress and joining you all last year, is how far astray we have come from when President Clinton was in office.

When President Clinton was in office and I was in my state legislature in Florida, what I watched Congress debate was what we were going to spend the surplus on. Were we going to use the surplus that we had at that time to shore up Social Security? Were we going to shore up Medicare? We didn't have a deficit. We had a surplus.

And Mr. MEEK, I think it would be a good idea for you to get back to really describing the scope of the foreign debt that we have here, because we got you mid map. But we really need to make sure that people understand the stark contrast between what we were able to debate during the Clinton administration and what we are forced to debate now. So I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And if we could, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I am going to go through this, because it was really to drive home a point that Mr. RYAN was making. And then Mr. RYAN was going to share that chart there, because I think these visual aids are needed at this particular time, because we have some Members that don't necessarily, I mean, I just don't want the American people to be hoodwinked. Some may say bamboozled. We say here in Washington, D.C., you

know, to get the Potomac 2-step on folks saying they didn't quite understanding what they were doing while they were making history here in the United States of America of allowing these countries to own, Mr. Speaker, own a part of the American apple pie.

I am just, once again, going to mention Japan. We stopped there. But I think we could move across the country, okay? I think we can. $692.8 billion. Japan has bought our debt.

Again, this Republican Congress is saying we want to make tax cuts permanent to billionaires and we want to give subsidies to companies that come in number one in profits this year, and that is one industry, which is the oil industry.

China, $249.8 billion. They bought up our debt. That means that they have given us money to spend in a way as though we are spending our own money. We owe them this money.

America will be forever changed. But if you want to do away with allowing these countries to cover our States because of the debt that we owe them, then you can elect a Democratic Congress. I am going to slide this over a little bit.

The U.K, United Kingdom, $223.2 billion that they own of our debt.

Now, you have got to remember. This is a 4-year deal. This is the Bush policies and the Congress, the Republican majority that have voted time after time to back the President up on this. They have even lost the former speaker, Mr. Speaker, of the House, Newt Gingrich. And we need to read his quote to the Knight Ridder newspapers that cover this Nation.

Caribbean nations. Many of you will be spending time there, vacation time there. It is important. It is important that people understand that they own $115.3 billion of our debt.

Taiwan. You go in your room, unfortunately many of the toys there that your kids and grandkids may have may have Taiwan on it. We owe them $71.33 billion that they have bought of our debt.

Canada, just north of us. We owe them $53.8 billion of our debt.

□ 2145

We will take them off there. Korea, $66.5 billion we owe Korea because this Congress has said that we have to give subsidies to industry because they wanted it and that is something that we need to get back to. I do not blame industry. I blame the Republican Congress.

Germany, $65.7 billion we owe Germany. OPEC nations, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Iran, we owe them $67.8 billion of the American apple pie.

Now, before I yield to you, Mr. RYAN, I just want to say it is almost like I bust through the door at home and say, Hey, let us go on a European vacation. We are living to from paycheck to paycheck, but let us go because I am going to put it all on the credit card. As a matter of fact, in this case our credit cards are maxed out, but I am going to sign one of those little letters that come into the house that say just sign here, automatic country. That is what we are going to use to vacation on. Everyone is happy, jumping up and down, but guess what. The bill is coming in in 30 days.

And soon folks, Mr. Speaker, are going to start calling the House, and they are not going to call and say, ''May I speak to Mr. MEEK.'' They are going to say, ''I want to speak to KENDRICK,'' because they disrespect you when owe them. Too many men and women laid down their lives and that are bleeding now, getting sand in their teeth for us to have the right to salute one flag, and I will be doggone if we stand here like it is just regular business here in Congress and allow this Republican majority to go without anyone checking them on this. But it is not just us. We have even got Republicans coming out, folks over there are talking about spending, that we are responsible, that we are good spenders. Yes, you are great spenders and borrowers at the same time. And so when you come to the floor, majority, and start talking about fiscal responsibility, just because you say it does not necessarily mean it is happening. I want you to come to this floor, grab these charts here that are sitting right over here in the corner, and explain what is good about them because these are your policies.

So, Mr. RYAN, what you were mentioning earlier, I just want to drive this point home because when folks start talking about ''we want to make sure the American people keep their money,'' well, we want to make sure the American people keep their money. But who are the people? Is it the $10 million annual salary individual? Is it the individual sitting over there at some company that is getting a bonus at the same time they are telling their third shift that there will no longer be a third shift?

So the real issue here is whose side are we on? Whose side is the Republican majority on? And from what I am seeing of the polls, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, when I am hearing prominent Republicans saying ''because we are Americans first,'' put that party stuff aside just for a moment and look at Democrats, Republicans, Independents, Green Party, nonvoters, they are all concerned about what is happening in this country. And I am going to tell you right now the Republican majority, and it is not what I am saying but what they are saying, cannot govern. We are ready to govern.

Mr. RYAN, I yield to you, sir.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate that, and I wish the Republican majority would start putting the country before their own political interests. It seems that time and time again they have chosen the loyalty to their own party.

We have got a nice third party validator here. The former Republican Director of the Congressional Budget Office, who was talking about the borrow and spend Republican Congress, he said, Budgeting is about making choices, and this period the Bush presidency and Republican Congress is one that shows a complete absence of that.

They do not have to make any choices. Why? You get the credit card out. But let us take your analogy one step further. You have got the credit card. You are going to Europe, but you are living paycheck to paycheck. Who ultimately suffers in that little family scenario there? The kids. Because there will not be money for education. There will not be money for the health care bill, and they will become a burden on the rest of society. All the way down the line the ripple effect goes.

And as Mr. MEEK and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ were saying earlier, this is what they are doing. They have increased the debt limit in the United States by $3 trillion, trillion with a big fat ''t.'' In June of 2002, May of 2003, November of 2004, March of 2006, total over $3 trillion, this Congress raised the debt ceiling that would allow the Secretary of Treasury to go out and borrow money from all the countries that Mr. MEEK showed. Time and time and time again.

I just want to reiterate the point that Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ made, and that point is this: The Democrats, whether it is port security or pay-as-you-go, time and time again we tried to restrain, pull in this Republican Congress, get yourselves under control.

And I know, Mr. ROTHMAN, you were probably in the committee when these amendments were being offered time and time again by Mr. OBEY, not once but twice, by Mr. SPRATT and the Budget Committee, by Charlie Stenholm when he was here. The Democratic Party was trying to say if you are going to raise the debt limit, you had better put some restraints on the runaway spending that these Republicans have gotten into a very bad habit of doing over the past 4 or 5 years. This is ridiculous. We are sacrificing the future of the United States of America, selling it off piece by piece, diminishing opportunity for our kids and our grandkids, and at the same time just spending money like it does not matter. Let us be responsible in the United States Congress, Mr. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, let us be responsible here. We have a solemn oath that we swear to when we come into this Congress. One of the great honors is to be in this Chamber. Only 10,000 people have actually served in this body. Let us take the responsibility seriously.

And one final point, like Mr. MEEK said, we have a responsibility. And people may grumble when we walk by them in the hall, and they may look at us a little cross eyed because we come down here every night, but we have an obligation to the American people. And if we have got to crack a few eggs to make an omelet, then so be it. And I have a lot of respect for the people on the other side of the aisle, and many of

them are our friends, but we have legitimate differences here.

And I would say this to my friends, Mr. Speaker: You have borrowed $3 trillion from foreign interests, raised the debt ceiling, cut funding for education, and you gave tax cuts to people who make $10 million a year. You have given them $1 million back. Do you expect us to sit up in our office and go to the little refrigerator and get out a Diet Dr. Pepper and a bag of Cheetos and just sit there and watch VH–1 in our office? No, we are not going to do it. We are going to keep coming down here until the American people get the message.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And that is because we did not come here to just sit idly by and not express the outrage that our constituents communicate to us when we go home.

The chart that you had up there a minute ago, Mr. RYAN, the one with the blue background that says ''Borrow and spend Republican Congress,'' that really says it all because what Mr. ROTHMAN said earlier is that our critics, Democratic critics, like to throw around that Democrats are supportive of class warfare, and I am not going to repeat their message. I am going to make sure that we get across like we do every single night here in the 30-Something Working Group that what is going on here in Washington is a borrow and spend Republican Congress. And it is not true just because we are here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives saying it is true. We have third-party validators that say it is true.

USA Today on Monday, April 3, 2006, headline: ''Growth in Federal Spending Unchecked.'' The borrow and spend Republican Congress. A USA Today editorial on February 21 of this year, the title of it was ''Who's Spending Big Now? The party of 'small government.' ''

''Tax cuts, they say, force hard decisions and restrain reckless spending. The last time we looked, though, Republicans controlled both Congress and the White House. They are the spenders. In fact, since they took control in 2001, they have increased spending by an average of nearly 7.5 percent a year, more than double the rate in the last 5 years of Clinton-era budgets.''

Now, what we talk about on this floor every night is the difference between words and actions. They can say that they are the party of small government and more personal responsibility and the claptrap that they like to throw around that are just words.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROTHMAN. It is important for people to understand that this majority came in saying that we needed to balance the budget and that is why the American people should elect a Republican majority. When I was the mayor of my hometown 25 years ago, a little city in New Jersey, we had to balance the budget every year. And we did. We left them with a surplus, but at least balance the budget. And they said, well, let us make a constitutional amendment. And we said, Why are you amending the Constitution? You are in the majority. Balance the budget. You have the majority. Balance the budget.

So in terms of third-party validation, Mr. Speaker, the American people know that the Republican Party has been in power, in the majority, in the House and the Senate for about 5½ years, with President Bush as our President for 5½ years. And we have the greatest deficits in history. We are projected to have deficits for the next 15, 20 years with no end in sight, with budget cuts to education, health care, veterans, college loans, the environment, clean air, clean water. Cut, cut, cut, cut everything, except tax cuts for the wealthiest. And, again, I do not want to harp on that because tax cuts for the working people are important. But is this the time to continue that policy ad infinitum and make them permanent? I do not think so.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What you are pointing out is there are consequences to the fiscal recklessness. That is what I have observed for the last 15 months. It is just fiscal recklessness.

The most glaring consequence is right here in front of us with what Mr. RYAN talked about that happened in a town in his district. Twelve hundred jobs gone. Seven point two million Americans today remain unemployed with an additional 4.2 million who want a job but who are not counted among the unemployed. Since this President took office, the economy has posted only 15 months of job gains that have 150,000 or more. That is just the number of jobs that we need to keep up with population growth.

But the most telling, which is the one that is evidenced by what happened in the town in your district, Mr. RYAN, is that there are now 1.3 million more unemployed private sector workers than in January, 2001. The long-term unemployment rate, people who are unemployed for more than 26 weeks, has nearly doubled since that time. And the manufacturing jobs that we have lost literally have reached 2.9 million since 2001.

There are day-to-day policy implications that affect people's lives that result from the fiscal recklessness. There are consequences. The Republican economic disaster is hurting real people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Can I intervene here for one second because I am thrilled with everything that is happening here. But I came down here to listen to Mr. DELAHUNT a little bit.

Mr. ROTHMAN. That is a good idea.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I just want to congratulate you all for a very thoughtful conversation. You have hammered home the truth.

And I think what we are saying to the American people is that if you govern, you have to govern responsibly and that your rhetoric has to match your deeds. Otherwise, you fail the American people. And the truth is that today in America, this administration, this Bush White House, and this Bush Congress are failing the American people.

DEBBIE was making a point about the job growth. I think what is more telling is that the jobs that are being produced today and the jobs that currently exist are paying less. A family of four in America today is making less than that same family income 10 years ago. This is not about criticism. This is about telling the truth and being responsible.

□ 2200

We use terms like PAYGO. Well, I think we owe the American people an explanation of what PAYGO means. It means what they do most every day of their lives. They make decisions and choices based upon what they have in their pocket, and if they don't have the money in their pocket, they don't buy it. It is really that simple.

That is what we are talking about this evening and on other occasions. Let's go back to those real conservative values, those genuine American, conservative values. I can't believe I am saying this. But the longer I serve in this body and listen to the neoconservatives, I find myself describing my own philosophy as fiscally conservative.

Ironically, it is the Democratic Party today that stands for sanity and stands for responsibility and doing it the old-fashioned way. That is what we are. Maybe we are an old, traditional party. But, do you know what? We made America great. When America was in trouble because of the Depression, it was those great Democrats Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry Truman that brought the country back, because we know there is a social compact out there that doesn't say only the very, very wealthy get most of everything. In a society which is really a community, where there are mutual rights and responsibilities, everybody has a shot.

Today what we are seeing is America becoming much like a banana republic, where it is the haves, the elites, and then there are the rest of us, and that is sad.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman makes a great point. America is not the only country with really, really rich people. There are wealthy people in every country. The difference in America is that we had a strong, vibrant, energetic middle-class of people who worked as of last night on the third shift at the GM plant in Lordstown, Ohio. That is what makes America America, and that resolve to go back and say we want everybody on board here, at least to have the opportunity; not to give the top 10 million people who make $10 million a year a tax cut, $1 million back, but to

create that middle-class again and the economic environment that would do it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just want to give one quick statistic. Here is another third-party validator, the Tax Policy Center. And here is the startling contrast between the tax cuts that Mr. ROTHMAN was talking about that go to the wealthiest few and what the tax cuts have provided for the average working family in middle income America. In 2006, according to the Tax Policy Center, millionaires received an average tax cut of $111,550, while the middle-class American received a tax cut of $750.

When I asked in my town hall meetings, and I represent a pretty middle-income, even middle to upper-middle income district, I have a lot of wealthy communities and a lot of upper-middle class communities and some middle to lower-middle income communities, no matter what kind of room, other than the wealthiest few, that I ask people to raise their hands to tell me whether they got money in their pocket from the Bush tax cuts, maybe in rooms full of several hundred people I will get two or three people that raise their hand.

If this tax relief was benefiting a wide swath of Americans, the broad spectrum of Americans of varied income, in a district like mine you would get more than three hands.

Mr. ROTHMAN. May I just remind the Speaker that today Secretary of the Treasury John Snow said in his testimony before our subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee that the tax cuts of this majority and President Bush account for one-third of the deficit, and that every dollar that is cut for the wealthiest folks in tax cuts, we don't get back more than a dollar in revenue. We lose. For every tax dollar we cut, we only get back 30 to 40 cents. We lose 60 to 70 cents for every tax dollar we cut.

Whether that is a good thing or bad thing, the American people can decide. But in a time of war, the biggest deficits in our history, is that what we want to be doing with our money, and should we be making those tax cuts permanent?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman would yield, as I was in my office and I saw this very focused message, let me just briefly say that today we added insult to injury by the debate on the floor regarding the 527s.

I know we are talking about the massive tax cuts, but I think the American people should know, rather than focusing on the seriousness of addressing these monumental tax cuts, frankly, as was distributed on the floor today, we are just passing legislation that allows random excessive spending as relates to campaigns.

So what I say to my friends on this side, the other side of the aisle, is why waste time with, as they say, this massive spending of dollars in campaigning, and not really providing transparency for the American people to note, making a mirage on the Floor of the House that we are trying to do something good about scandal and corruption, and, at the same time, not spending our time focusing on correcting this deficit, correcting this increasing debt limit and spending the people's money by enormous tax cuts.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If I can, as it relates to time, Mr. RYAN, if you could give our website. We have to close out.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I want to do one-third party final validator. The former speaker the House, Mr. Gingrich, the leader of the Republican Revolution in '94. He said the Republicans, they are seen by the country as being in charge of a government that can't function.

As my friend from Florida so eloquently put it earlier today on the House floor, it is scary when the head of the Republican Revolution is referring to his friends on the other side of the aisle as ''they.'' I think that is a tremendous point.

Www.housedemocrats.gov/30something, Madam Speaker. Www.housedemocrats.gov/30something for e-mails that folks may want to send to us. All these charts that were available here tonight, Madam Speaker, are available on this website. I thank everyone for the vigorous discussion.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, we would like to thank the leadership for the opportunity to speak tonight.

## IRAN: THE NEXT NEOCON TARGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. Foxx). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for half the time remaining until midnight.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, it has been 3 years since the U.S. launched its war against Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction. Of course, now almost everybody knows there were no weapons of mass destruction and Saddam Hussein posed no threat to the United States. Though some of our soldiers serving in Iraq still believe they are there because Saddam Hussein was involved in 9/11, even the administration now acknowledges that there was no connection.

Indeed, no one can be absolutely certain why we invaded Iraq. The current excuse, also given for staying in Iraq, is to make it a democratic state friendly to the United States. There are now fewer denials that securing oil supplies played a significant role in our decision to go into Iraq and stay there. That certainly would explain why the U.S. taxpayers are paying such a price to build and maintain numerous, huge, permanent military bases in Iraq. There are also funding a new $1 billion embassy, the largest in the world.

The significant question we must ask ourselves is, what have we learned from these 3 years in Iraq? With plans now being laid for regime change in Iran, it appears we have learned absolutely nothing. There still are plenty of administration officials who daily paint a rosy picture of the Iraq we have created. But I wonder, if the past 3 years were nothing more than a bad dream and our Nation suddenly awakened, how many would for national security reasons urge the same invasion? Or would we instead give a gigantic sigh of relief that it was only a bad dream, that we need not relive the 3-year nightmare of death, destruction, chaos and stupendous consumption of tax dollars? Conceivably, we would still see oil prices under $30 a barrel, and, most importantly, 20,000 severe U.S. casualties would not have occurred. My guess is 99 percent of all Americans would be thankful it was only a bad dream and would never support the invasion knowing what we know today.

Even with the horrible results of the past 3 years, Congress is abuzz with plans to change the Iranian government. There is little resistance to the rise and clamor for democratization in Iran, even though their current President, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, is an elected leader.

Though Iran is hardly a perfect democracy, its system is far superior to most of our Arab allies, about which we never complain. Already the coordinated propaganda has galvanized the American people against Iran for the supposed threat it poses to us with weapons of mass destruction that are no more present than those Saddam Hussein was alleged to have had.

It is amazing how soon after being thoroughly discredited over the charges levied against Saddam Hussein the neoconservatives are willing to use the same arguments against Iran. It is frightening to see how easily Congress, the media and the people accept many of the same arguments against Iran that were used to justify an invasion of Iraq.

Since 2001, we have spent over $300 billion and occupied two Muslim nations, Afghanistan and Iraq. We are poorer, but certainly not safer, for it. We invaded Afghanistan to get Osama bin Laden, the ringleader behind 9/11. This effort has been virtually abandoned. Even though the Taliban was removed from power in Afghanistan, most of the country is now occupied and controlled by warlords who manage a drug trade bigger than ever before. Removing the Taliban from power in Afghanistan actually served the interests of Iran, the Taliban's archenemy, more than our own.

The long time neocon goal to remake Iraq prompted us to abandoned the search for Osama bin Laden. The invasion of Iraq in 2003 was hyped as a noble mission, justified by misrepresentation of intelligence concerning Saddam Hussein and his ability to attack us and his neighbors. This failed policy has created the current chaos in Iraq, chaos that many describe as a civil war.

Saddam Hussein is out of power, and most people are pleased. Yet some

Iraqis who dream of stability long for his authoritarian rule. But, once again, Saddam Hussein's removal benefited the Iranians, who considered Saddam Hussein an arch-enemy.

Our obsession with democracy, which is clearly conditional when one looks at our response to the recent Pakistani elections, will allow the majority Shia to claim leadership title if Iraq's election actually leads to an organized government. This delights the Iranians, who are close allies of the Iraqi Shia.

Talk about unintended consequences. This war has produced chaos, civil war, death and destruction and huge financial costs. It has eliminated two of Iran's worst enemies and placed power in Iran's best friends.

Even this apparent failure of policy does nothing to restrain the current march towards a similar confrontation with Iran. What will it take for us to learn from our failures? Common sense tells us the war in Iraq soon will spread to Iran. Fear of imaginary nuclear weapons or an incident involving Iran, whether planned or accidental, will rally the support needed for us to move on Muslim country number three.

□ 2215

All the past failures and unintended consequences will be forgotten. Even with deteriorating support for the Iraq war, new information, well-planned propaganda, or a major incident will override the skepticism and heartache of our frustrating fight. Vocal opponents of an attack on Iran again will be labeled unpatriotic, unsupportive of the troops, and sympathetic to Iran's radicals.

Instead of capitulating to these charges, we should point out that those who maneuver us into war do so with little concern for our young people serving in the military and theoretically think little of their own children if they have any. It is hard to conceive that political supporters of the war would consciously claim that a preemptive war for regime change where young people are sacrificed is only worth it if the deaths and the injuries are limited to other people's children. This I am sure would be denied, which means their own children are technically available for the sacrifice that is so often praised and glorified for the benefit of families who have lost so much. If so, they should think more of their own children. If this is not so and their children are not available for such sacrifice, the hypocrisy is apparent. Remember, most neocon planners fall into the category of chicken hawks.

For the past 3 years, it has been inferred that, if one is not in support of the current policy, one is against the troops and supports the enemy. Lack of support for the war in Iraq was said to be supportive of Saddam Hussein and his evil policies. This is an insulting and preposterous argument. Those who argued for the containment of the Soviets were never deemed sympathetic to Stalin or Kruschev. Lack of support for the Iraq war should never be used as an argument that one was sympathetic to Saddam Hussein. Containment and diplomacy are far superior to confront an enemy, and are less costly and far less dangerous, especially when there is no evidence that our national security is being threatened.

Although a large percentage of the public now rejects the various arguments for the Iraq war 3 years ago, they were easily persuaded by the politicians and media to fully support the invasion. Now, after 3 years of terrible pain for so many, even the troops are awakening from their slumber and sensing the fruitlessness of our failing effort. Seventy-two percent of our troops now serving in Iraq say it is time to come home. Yet, the majority still cling to the propaganda that they are there because of the 9/11 attacks, something even the administration has ceased to claim. Propaganda is pushed on our troops to exploit their need to believe in a cause that is worth the risk to life and limb.

I smell an expanded war in the Middle East and pray that I am wrong. I sense that circumstances will arise that demand support regardless of the danger and the cost. Any lack of support once again will be painted as being soft on terrorism and al Qaeda. We will be told we must support Israel, support patriotism, support the troops, defend freedom. The public too often only smells the stench of war after the killing starts. Public objection comes later on, but eventually it helps to stop the war.

I worry that before we can finish the war we are in and extricate ourselves, the patriotic fervor for expanding into Iran will drown out the cries of, ''Enough already.'' The agitation and congressional resolutions painting Iran as an enemy about to attack us have already begun. It is too bad we cannot learn from our mistakes. This time, there will be a greater pretense of an international effort sanctioned by the U.N. before the bombs are dropped. But even without support from the international community, we should expect the plan for regime change to continue. We have been forewarned that all options remain on the table, and there is little reason to expect much resistance from Congress. So far there is little resistance expressed in Congress for taking on Iran than there was prior to going into Iraq.

It is astonishing that after 3 years of bad results and tremendous expense there is little indication, we will reconsider our traditional non-interventionist foreign policy. Unfortunately, regime change, nation-building, policing the world, protecting our oil still constitutes an acceptable policy by the leaders of both major parties. It is already assumed by many in Washington I talk to that Iran is dead serious about obtaining a nuclear weapon and is a much more formidable opponent than Iraq. Besides, Mahmud Ahmadinejad threatened to destroy Israel, and that cannot stand. Washington sees Iran as a greater threat than Iraq ever was, a threat that cannot be ignored.

Iran's history is being ignored just as we ignored Iraq's history. This ignorance or deliberate misrepresentation of our recent relationship to Iraq and Iran is required to generate the fervor needed to attack once again a country that poses no threat to us. Our policies toward Iran have been more provocative than those toward Iraq. Yes, President Bush labeled Iran part of the axis of evil and unnecessarily provoked their anger at us. But our mistakes with Iran started a long time before this President took office. In 1953, our CIA, with the help of the British, participated in overthrowing the democratic-elected leader, Mohammed Mossadegh. We placed in power the Shah. He ruled ruthlessly but protected our oil interests, and for that, we protected him. That is, until 1979. We even provided him with Iran's first nuclear reactor.

Evidently, we did not buy the argument that his oil supplies precluded a need for civilian nuclear energy. From 1953 to 1979, his authoritarian rule served to incite a radical opposition led by the Ayatollah Khomeini who overthrew the Shah and took our hostages in 1979. This blow-back event was slow in coming, but Muslims have long memories. The hostage crisis and overthrow of the Shah by the Ayatollah was a major victory for the radical Islamists. Most Americans either never knew about or easily forgot about our unwise meddling in the internal affairs in Iran in 1953.

During the 1980s, we further antagonized Iran by supporting the Iraqis in their invasion of Iran. This made our relationship with Iran worse, while sending a message to Saddam Hussein that invading a neighboring country is not all that bad. When Hussein got the message from our State Department that his plan to invade Kuwait was not of much concern to the United States, he immediately preceded to do so. We, in a way, encouraged him to do it almost like we encouraged him to go into Iran. Of course, this time our reaction was quite different, and all of a sudden, our friendly ally, Saddam Hussein, became our arch enemy.

The American people may forget this flip-flop, but those who suffered from it never forgot. And the Iranians remember well our meddling in their affairs. Labeling the Iranians part of the axis of evil further alienated them and contributed to the animosity directed toward us.

For whatever reasons the neoconservatives might give, they are bound and determined to confront the Iranian government and demand changes in its leadership. This policy will further spread our military presence and undermine our security. The sad truth is that the supposed dangers posed by Iran are no more real than

those claimed about Iraq. The charges made against Iran are unsubstantiated and amazingly sound very similar to the false charges made against Iraq. One would think promoters of the war against Iraq would be a little bit more reluctant to use the same arguments to stir up hatred toward Iran. The American people and Congress should be more cautious in accepting these charges at face value, yet it seems the propaganda is working since few in Washington object as Congress passes resolutions condemning Iran and asking for U.N. sanctions against her.

There is no evidence of a threat to us by Iran and no reason to plan and initiate a confrontation with her. There are many reasons not to do so: Iran does not have a nuclear weapon and there is no evidence that she is working on one, only conjecture. Even if Iran had a nuclear weapon, why would this be different from Pakistan, India, and North Korea having one? Why does Iran have less right to a defensive weapon than these other countries? If Iran had a nuclear weapon, the odds of her initiating an attack against anybody, which would guarantee her own annihilation are zero, and the same goes for the possibility she would place weapons in the hands of a nonstate terrorist group.

Pakistan has spread nuclear technology throughout the world, and in particular, to the North Koreans. They flaunt international restrictions on nuclear weapons, but we reward them just as we reward India. We needlessly and foolishly threaten Iran, even though they have no nuclear weapons, but listen to what a leading Israeli historian, Martin van Creveld had to say about this: ''Obviously we do not want Iran to have a nuclear weapon, and I do not know if they are developing them. But if they are not developing them, they are crazy.''

There has been a lot of misinformation regarding Iran's nuclear program. This distortion of the truth has been used to pump up emotions in Congress to pass resolutions condemning her and promoting U.N. sanctions. IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei has never reported any evidence of undeclared sources or special nuclear material in Iran or any diversion of nuclear material. We demand that Iran prove it is not in violation of nuclear agreements, which is asking them impossibly to prove a negative. ElBaradei states Iran is in compliance with the nuclear nonproliferation treaty required IAEA safeguards agreement.

We forget that the weapons we feared Saddam Hussein had were supplied to him by the United States, and we refused to believe U.N. inspectors and the CIA that he no longer had them. Likewise, Iran received her first nuclear reactor from us; now we are hysterically wondering if some day she might decide to build a bomb in self-interest. Anti-Iran voices beating the drums of confrontation distort the agreement made in Paris and the desire of Iran to restart the enrichment process. Their suspension of the enrichment process was voluntary and not a legal obligation. Iran has an absolute right under the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty to develop and use nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and this is now said to be an egregious violation of the NPT. It is the U.S. and her allies that are distorting and violating the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty.

Likewise, our proliferation of nuclear material to India is a clear violation of the nuclear proliferation treaty as well.

The demand for U.N. sanctions is now being strongly encouraged by Congress. The Iran Freedom Support Act, H.R. 282 passed in the International Relations Committee and recently the House passed H. Con. Res. 341, which inaccurately condemned Iran for violating its international nuclear nonproliferation obligations. At present, the likelihood of reason prevailing in Congress is minimal. Let there be no doubt, the neoconservative warriors are still in charge and are conditioning Congress, the media, and the American people for a preemptive attack on Iran, never mind that Afghanistan has unraveled and Iraq is in a Civil War.

Serious plans are being laid for the next distraction which will further spread this war in the Middle East. The unintended consequences of this effort surely will be worse than any of the complications experienced in the 3-year occupation of Iraq.

Our offer of political and financial assistance to foreign and domestic individuals who support the overthrow of the current Iranian government is fraught with danger and saturated with arrogance. Imagine how Americans citizens would respond if China supported similar efforts here in the United States to bring about regime change. How many of us would remain complacent if someone like Timothy McVeigh had been financed by a foreign power? Is it any wonder the Iranian people resent us and the attitude of our leaders?

Even though ElBaradei and his IAEA investigations have found no violations of the NPT required IAEA safeguard agreement, the Iran Freedom Support Act still demands that Iran prove they have no nuclear weapons, refusing to acknowledge that proving a negative is impossible. Let there be no doubt, though, the words ''regime change'' are not found in the bill. That is precisely what they are talking about. Neoconservative Michael Ladine, one of the architects of the Iraq fiasco, testifying before the International Relations Committee in favor of the Iraq Freedom Support Act stated it plainly. ''I know some members would prefer to dance around the explicit declaration of regime change as the policy of this country, but anyone looking closely at the language and the context of the Iraq Freedom Support Act and its close relative in the Senate can clearly see that this is, in fact, the essence of the matter.

□ 2230

You can't have freedom in Iran without bringing down the mulahs.''

Sanctions, along with financial and political support to persons and groups dedicated to the overthrow of the Iranian government, are acts of war. Once again, we are unilaterally declaring a preemptive war against a country and a people that have not harmed us and do not have the capacity to do so. And do not expect Congress to seriously debate a declaration of war. For the past 56 years, Congress has transferred to the executive branch the power to go to war as it pleases, regardless of the tragic results and costs.

Secretary of State Rice recently signaled a sharp shift toward confrontation in Iran's policy as she insisted on $75 million to finance propaganda, through TV and radio broadcasts into Iran. She expressed this need because of the so-called ''aggressive'' policies of the Iranian government. We are 7,000 miles from home, telling the Iraqis and the Iranians what kind of government they will have, backed up by the use of our military force, and we call them the aggressors? We fail to realize the Iranian people, for whatever faults they may have, have not in modern times invaded any neighboring country. This provocation is so unnecessary, costly and dangerous.

Just as the invasion of Iraq inadvertently served the interests of the Iranians, military confrontation with Iran will have unintended consequences. The successful alliance engendered between the Iranians and the Iraqi majority Shiia will prove a formidable opponent for us in Iraq as that civil war spreads. Shipping in the Persian Gulf through the Straits of Hormuz may well be disrupted by the Iranians in retaliation for any military confrontation. Since Iran would be incapable of defending herself by conventional means, it seems logical that they might well resort to terrorist attacks on us here at home. They will not passively lie down, nor can they be easily destroyed.

One of the reasons given for going into Iraq was to secure our oil supplies. This backfired badly. Production in Iraq is down 50 percent, and world oil prices have more than doubled to $60 per barrel. Meddling with Iran could easily have a similar result. We could see oil at $120 a barrel and gasoline at $6 a gallon. The obsession the neo-cons have with remaking the Middle East is hard to understand. One thing that is easy to understand is none of those who plan these wars expect to fight in them, nor do they expect their children to die in some IED explosion.

Exactly when an attack will occur is not known, but we have been forewarned more than once that all options are on the table. The sequence of events now occurring with regards to Iran are eerily reminiscent of the hype to our preemptive strike against Iraq. We should remember the saying: ''Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice,

shame on me.'' It looks to me like the Congress and the country is open to being fooled once again.

Interestingly, many early supporters of the Iraq War are now highly critical of the President, having been misled as to reasons for the invasion and occupation. But these same people are only too eager to accept the same flawed arguments for our need to undermine the Iranian government.

The President's 2006 National Security Strategy, just released, is every bit as frightening as the one released in 2002 endorsing preemptive war. In it he claims, ''We face no greater challenge from a single country than from Iran.'' He claims the Iranians have for 20 years hidden key nuclear activities, though the IAEA makes no such assumption, nor has the Security Council in at least 20 years ever sanctioned Iran. The clincher in the National Security Strategy document is if diplomatic efforts fail, confrontation will follow. The problem is the diplomatic effort, if one wants to use that term, is designed to fail by demanding the Iranians prove an unprovable negative. The West, led by the U.S., is in greater violation by demanding Iran not pursue any nuclear technology, even peaceful, that the NPT guarantees is their right.

The President states: Iran's ''desire to have a nuclear weapon is unacceptable.'' A desire is purely subjective and cannot be substantiated nor disproved. Therefore, all that is necessary to justify an attack is if Iran fails to prove it does not have a desire to be like the United States, China, Russia, Britain, France, Pakistan, North Korea, India and Israel whose nuclear missiles surround Iran. Logic like this to justify a new war, without the least consideration for a congressional declaration of war, is indeed frightening.

Commonsense telling us Congress, especially given the civil war in Iraq and the mess in Afghanistan, should move with great caution in condoning a military confrontation with Iran.

Madam Speaker, there are reasons for my concern and let me list those. Most Americans are uninterested in foreign affairs until we get mired down in a war that costs too much, lasts too long, and kills too many U.S. troops. Getting out of a lengthy war is difficult, as I remember all too well with Vietnam while serving in the U.S. Air Force in 1963 to 1968. Getting into war is much easier.

Unfortunately, the legislative branch of our government too often defers to the executive branch and offers little resistance to war plans, even with no significant threat to our security. The need to go to war is always couched in patriotic terms and falsehoods regarding an imaginary, imminent danger. Not supporting the effort is painted as unpatriotic and wimpish against some evil that is about to engulf us. The real reason for our militarism is rarely revealed and hidden from the public. Even Congress is deceived into supporting adventurism they would not accept if fully informed.

If we accepted the traditional American and constitutional foreign policy of nonintervention across the board, there would be no temptation to go along with these unnecessary military operations. A foreign policy of intervention invites all kinds of excuses for spreading ourselves around the world. The debate shifts from nonintervention versus intervention, to where and for what particular reason should we involve ourselves. Most of the time, it is for less than honorable reasons. Even when cloaked in honorable slogans, like making the world safe for democracy, the unintended consequences and the ultimate costs cancel out the good intentions.

One of the greatest losses suffered these past 60 years from interventionism becoming an acceptable policy of both major parties is respect for the Constitution. Congress flatly has reneged on its huge responsibility to declare war. Going to war was never meant to be an executive decision, used indiscriminately with no resistance from Congress. The strongest attempt by Congress in the past 60 years to properly exert itself over foreign policy was the passage of the Foley amendment, demanding no assistance be given to the Nicaraguan contras. Even this explicit prohibition was flaunted by an earlier administration.

Arguing over the relative merits of each intervention is not a true debate, because it assumes that intervention per se is both moral and constitutional. Arguing for a Granada-type intervention because of its success and against the Iraq War because of its failure and cost is not enough. We must once again, understand the wisdom of rejecting entangling alliances and rejecting Nation building. We must stop trying to police the world and, instead, embrace noninterventionism as the proper moral and constitutional foreign policy of our country.

The best reason to oppose interventionism is that people die, needlessly, on both sides. We have suffered over 20,000 American casualties in Iraq already, and Iraqi civilian deaths probably number over 100,000 by all reasonable counts.

The next best reason is that the rule of law is undermined, especially when military interventions are carried out without a declaration of war. Whenever a war is ongoing, civil liberties are under attack at home. The current war in Iraq and the misnamed war on terror have created an environment here at home that affords little constitutional protection of our citizens' rights. Extreme nationalism is common during war. Signs of this are now apparent.

Prolonged wars, as this one has become, have profound consequences. No matter how much positive spin is put on it, war never makes a society wealthier. World War II was not a solution to the Depression, as many claim. If $1 billion is spent on weapons of war, the GDP records positive growth in that amount, but the expenditure is consumed by destruction of the weapons or bombs it bought, and the real economy is denied $1 billion to produce products that would have raised someone's standard of living.

Excessive spending to finance the war causes deficits to explode. There are never enough tax dollars available to pay the bills, and since there are not enough willing lenders and dollars available, the Federal Reserve must create new money out of thin air and new credit for buying Treasury bills to prevent interest rates from rising too rapidly. Rising rates would tip off everyone that there are not enough savings or taxes to finance the war.

This willingness to print whatever amount of money the government needs to pursue the war is literally inflation. Without a fiat monetary system, wars would be very difficult to finance since the people would never tolerate the taxes required to pay for it. Inflation of the money supply delays and hides the real cost of war. The result of the excessive creation of new money leads to the higher cost of living everyone decries and the Fed denies. Since taxes are not levied, the increase in prices that results from printing too much money is technically the tax required to pay for the war.

The tragedy is that the inflation tax is borne more by the poor and the middle class than the rich. Meanwhile, the well-connected rich, the politicians, the bureaucrats, the bankers, the military industrialists and the international corporations reap the benefits of war profits.

A sound economic process is disrupted with a war economy and monetary inflation. Strong voices emerge blaming the wrong policies for our problems, prompting an outcry for protectionist legislation. It is always easier to blame foreign producers and savers for our inflation, our lack of savings, excessive debt and loss of industrial jobs. Protectionist measures only make economic conditions worse. Inevitably these conditions, if not corrected, lead to a lower standard of living for most of our citizens.

Careless military intervention is also bad for the civil disturbance that results. The chaos in the streets of America in the 1960s while the Vietnam War raged, aggravated by the draft, was an example of domestic strife caused by an ill-advised unconstitutional war that could not be won. The early signs of civil discord are now present. Hopefully, we can extricate ourselves from Iraq and avoid a conflict in Iran before our streets explode, as they did in the 1960s.

In a way, it is amazing there is not a lot more outrage expressed by the American people. There is plenty of complaining but no outrage over policies that are not part of our American tradition. War based on false pretenses, 20,000 American casualties, torture policies, thousands jailed without due

process, illegal surveillance of citizens, warrantless searches, and yet no outrage. When the issues come before Congress, executive authority is maintained or even strengthened while real oversight is ignored.

Though many Americans are starting to feel the economic pain of paying for this war through inflation, the real pain has not yet arrived. We generally remain fat and happy with a system of money and borrowing that postpones the day of reckoning. Foreigners, in particular the Chinese and Japanese, gladly participate in the charade. We print the money and they take it, as do the OPEC Nations, and provide us with consumer goods and oil. Then they loan the money back to us at low interest rates, which we use to finance the war and our housing bubble and excessive consumption. This recycling and perpetual borrowing of inflated dollars allow us to avoid the pain of high taxes to pay for our war and welfare spending. It is fine until the music stops and the real costs are realized, with much higher interest rates and significant price inflation. That is when outrage will be heard and the people will realize we cannot afford the humanitarianism of the neo-conservatives.

The notion that our economic problems are principally due to the Chinese is nonsense. If the protectionists were to have it their way, the problem of financing the war would become readily apparent and have immediate ramifications, none good.

□ 2245

Today's economic problems, caused largely by our funny money system, won't be solved by altering exchange rates to favor us in the short run or by imposing high tariffs. Only sound money with real value will solve the problems of competing currency devaluations and protectionist measures.

Economic interests almost always are major reasons for wars being fought. Noble and patriotic causes are easier to sell to a public who must pay and provide cannon fodder to defend the financial interests of a privileged class. The fact that Saddam Hussein demanded Euros for oil in an attempt to undermine the U.S. dollar is believed by many to be one of the ulterior motives for our invasion and occupation of Iraq. Similarly, the Iranian oil burse now about to open may be seen as a threat to those who depend on maintaining the current monetary system with the dollar as the world's reserve currency.

The theory and significance of ''peak oil'' is believed to be an additional motivating factor for the United States and Great Britain wanting to maintain firm control over the oil supplies in the Middle East. The two nations have been protecting our oil interests in the Middle East for nearly 100 years. With diminishing supplies and expanding demands, the incentive to maintain a military presence in the Middle East is quite strong. Fear of China and Russia moving in to this region to consume more control alarms those who don't understand how a free market can develop substitutes to replace diminishing resources. Supporters of the military efforts to maintain control over large regions of the world to protect oil fail to count the real cost of energy once the DOD budget is factored in. Remember, invading Iraq was costly and oil prices doubled. Confrontation in Iran may evolve differently, but we can be sure it will be costly and oil prices will rise significantly.

There are long-term consequences or blowback from our militant policies of intervention around the world. They are unpredictable as to time and place. 9/11 was a consequence of our military presence on Muslim holy lands; the Ayatollah Khomeini's success in taking over the Iranian government in 1979 was a consequence of our CIA overthrowing Mossadech in 1953. These connections are rarely recognized by the American people and never acknowledged by our government. We never seem to learn how dangerous interventionism is to us and to our security.

There are some who may not agree strongly with any of my arguments, and instead believe the propaganda Iran and her President, Mahmoud Almadinejad, are thoroughly irresponsible and have threatened to destroy Israel. So all measures must be taken to prevent Iran from getting nukes, thus the campaign to intimidate and confront Iran.

First, Iran doesn't have a nuke and it is nowhere close to getting one, according to the CIA. If they did have one, using it would guarantee almost instantaneous annihilation by Israel and the United States. Hysterical fear of Iran is way out of proportion to reality. With a policy of containment, we stood down and won the Cold War against the Soviets and their 30,000 nuclear weapons and missiles. If you are looking for a real kook with a bomb to worry about, North Korea would be high on the list. Yet we negotiate with Kim Jong Il. Pakistan has nukes and was a close ally of the Taliban up until 9/11. Pakistan was never inspected by the IAEA as to their military capability. Yet we not only talk to her, we provide economic assistance, though someday Musharraf may well be overthrown and a pro-al Qaeda government put in place. We have been nearly obsessed with talking about regime change in Iran, while ignoring Pakistan and North Korea. It makes no sense and it is a very costly and dangerous policy.

The conclusion we should derive from this is simple. It is in our best interest to pursue a foreign policy of nonintervention. A strict interpretation of the Constitution mandates it. The moral imperative of not imposing our will on others, no matter how well intentioned, is a powerful argument for minding our own business. The principle of self-determination should be respected. Strict nonintervention removes the incentives for foreign powers and corporate interests to influence and control our policies overseas. We can't afford the cost that intervention requires, whether through higher taxes or inflation. If the moral arguments against intervention don't suffice for some, the practical arguments should.

Intervention just doesn't work. It backfires and ultimately hurts the American citizens both at home and abroad. Spreading ourselves too thin around the world actually diminishes our national security through a weakened military. As the only superpower of the world, a constant interventionist policy is perceived as arrogant, and greatly undermines our ability to use diplomacy in a positive manner.

Conservatives, libertarians, constitutionalists, and many of today's liberals have all at one time or another endorsed a less interventionist foreign policy. There is no reason a coalition of these groups might not once again present the case for a pro-American nonmilitant noninterventionist foreign policy dealing with all nations. A policy of trade and peace, and a willingness to use diplomacy is far superior to the foreign policy that has evolved over the past 60 years. It is time for a change.

## CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006, AT PAGE H570

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
*Washington, DC, February 28, 2006.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker of the House,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find two resolutions approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on February 16, 2006, in accordance with 40 U.S.C. §3307.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
*Chairman.*

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MIAMI/MIRAMAR, FL

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives*, That pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 723,780 rentable square feet of space and 1,155 outside parking spaces for the Department of Justice, currently located in multiple leased locations throughout South Florida, at a proposed total annual cost of $25,332,300 for a lease term of 15 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

*Provided*, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

AMENDED PROSPECTUS—ALTERNATIONS—EMANUEL CELLER COURTHOUSE—BROOKLYN, NY

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives*, That pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307,

additional appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the Emanuel Celler Courthouse located at 225 Cadman Plaza East, in Brooklyn, NY at an additional design and review cost of $3,511,000 (design and review cost of $3,791,000 was previously authorized), an additional estimated construction cost of $27,193,000 (estimated construction cost of $61,046,000 was previously authorized), and additional management and inspection cost of $4,220,000 (management and inspection cost of $4,465,000 was previously authorized) for a combined estimated total project cost of $104,226,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution. This resolution amends Committee resolutions dated July 18, 2001, authorizing $3,791,000 for design and July 23, 2003, authorizing $65,511,000 for management and inspection and construction.

## 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. BAIRD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DINGELL, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. KILDEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MUSGRAVE, for 5 minutes, today.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 6, 2006, at 10 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6886. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-312, ''District of Columbia Bus Shelter Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6887. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-309, ''Home of Walter Washington Way Designation Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6888. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-308, ''Walter E. Washington Way Designation Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6889. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-311, ''Carolyn Llorente Memorial Designation Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6890. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-310, ''Terry Hairston Run Designation Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6891. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-313, ''Office and Commission on African Affairs Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6892. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-314, ''Real Property Disposition Economic Analysis Amendemnt Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6893. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-315, ''Lamond-Riggs Air Quality Study Temporary Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6894. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-316, ''Victims of Domestic Violence Fund Establishment Temporary Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6895. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-318, ''School Without Walls Development Project Temporary Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6896. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-317, ''Ballpark Hard and Soft Costs Cap and Ballpark Lease Conditional Approval Temporary Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6897. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-335, ''Way to Work Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6898. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-336, ''Home Again Initiative Community Development Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6899. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-337, ''Contracting and Procurement Reform Task Force Membership Authorization and Qualifications Clarification Temporary Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6900. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-338, ''Unemployment Compensation Contributions Federal Conformity Temporary Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6901. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-339, ''Procurement Practices Timely Competition Assurance and Direct Voucher Prohibition Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6902. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-340, ''White Collar Insurance Fraud Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6903. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-341, ''School Modernization Financing Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6904. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-319, ''Vehicle Insurance Enforcement Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6905. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Rear Impact Guards and Rear Impact Protection [Docket No. NHTSA-2004-19523] (RIN: 2127-AJ80) received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6906. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection With Licensing and Related Services — 2006 Update [STB Ex Parte No. 542 (Sub-No. 13) received March 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6907. A letter from the Attorney, Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gas Gathering Line Definition; Alternative Definition for Onshore Lines and New Safety Standards [Docket No. PHMSA-1998-4868; Amdt. 192-102] (RIN: 2137-AB15) received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6908. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Delayed Implementation of the Airspace Modification Final Rule for the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rule Area and Flight Free Zones [Docket No. FAA-2001-8690] (RIN: 2120-AI71) received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6909. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135BJ, -135ER, -135KE, -135KL, -135LR, -145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23187; Directorate Identifier 2002-NM-203-AD; Amendment 39-14397; AD 2005-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6910. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arriel 2B and 2B1 Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-22928; Directorate Identifier 2005-

NE-43-AD; Amendment 39-14406; AD 2005-25-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6911. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Vertol Model 107-H Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2005-23085; Directorate Identifier 2005-SW-25-AD; Amendment 39-14385; AD 2005-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6912. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319-100 Series Airplanes; Model A320-111 Airplanes; Model A320-200 Series Airplanes, and Model A321-100 and -200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20687; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-171-AD; Amendment 39-14325; AD 2005-20-28] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6913. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Standards: Normal, Utility, Acrobatic, and Commuter Category Airplanes; Correction — received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6914. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Corporation Ltd. Model 750XL Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21935; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-37-AD; Amendment 39-14387; AD 2005-24-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6915. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-300, 747SP, and 747SR Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20879; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-55-AD; Amendment 39-14326; AD 2005-20-29] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6916. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA — Groupe AEROSPATIALE Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21464; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-32-AD; Amendment 39-14320; AD-2005-20-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6917. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320-111 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22626; Directorate Identifier 2002-NM-295-AD; Amendment 39-14332; AD 2005-20-35] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6918. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-100, A319-100, A320-200, A321-100, and A321-200 Series Airplanes, and Model A320-111 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23087; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-225-AD; Amendment 39-14386; AD 2005-24-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6919. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Corporation Ltd. Model 750XL Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21935; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-37-AD; Amendment 39-14387; AD 2005-24-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6920. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 Airplanes and Model EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20011; Directorate Identifier 2003-NM-22-AD; Amendment 39-14382; AD 2005-24-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6921. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30464; Amdt. No. 3140] received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6922. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Oxygen [Docket No. FAA-2005-22915; Amendment No. 121-332] (RIN: 2120-ai65) received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6923. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-100, A319-100, A320-200, A321-100, and A321-200 Series Airplanes; and Model A320-111 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23382; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-221-AD; Amendment 39-14428; AD 2005-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6924. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Oxygen [Docket No. FAA-2005-22915; Amendment No. 121-317] (RIN: 2120-ai65) received January 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PUTNAM: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 766. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 376) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2011 (Rept. 109–405). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PUTNAM: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 767. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 109–406). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2955. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify that the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has exclusive jurisdiction of appeals relating to patents, plant variety protection, or copyrights, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4742. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to allow the Director of the Patent and Trademark Office to waive statutory provisions governing patents and trademarks in certain emergencies (Rept. 109–408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 319. Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the successful and substantial contributions of the amendments to the patent and trademark laws that were enacted in 1980 (Public Law 96–517; commonly known as the ''Bayh-Dole Act''), on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of its enactment (Rept. 109–409). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. LEE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. MEEKS of New York):

H.R. 5091. A bill to authorize assistance to the people of the Republic of Haiti to fund scholarships for talented disadvantaged students in Haiti to continue their education in the United States and to return to Haiti to contribute to the development of their country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 5092. A bill to modernize and reform the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 5093. A bill to revise the limitation on Impact Aid special payments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 5094. A bill to require the conveyance of Mattamuskeet Lodge and surrounding property, including the Mattamuskeet National Wildlife Refuge headquarters, to the State of North Carolina to permit the State to use the property as a public facility dedicated to the conservation of the natural and cultural resources of North Carolina; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico):

H.R. 5095. A bill to prohibit deceptive altering or disguising of caller identification on outbound telephone calls; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 5096. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to modify certain procedures relating to patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr.

ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H.R. 5097. A bill to facilitate and expedite direct refunds to coal producers and exporters of the excise tax unconstitutionally imposed on coal exported from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 5098. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand the deduction for tuition and related expenses for higher education and to reduce the maximum interest rate allowable on student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BOYD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PICKERING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JINDAL, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 5099. A bill to provide disaster assistance to agricultural producers for crop and livestock losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Armed Services, the Budget, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BEAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan):

H.R. 5100. A bill to establish a collaborative program to protect the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, Science, and House Administration, 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. BEAUPREZ:

H.R. 5101. A bill to authorize a major medical facility project for the Department of Veterans Affairs at Denver, Colorado; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. REYES, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BACA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota):

H.R. 5102. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit removal of covered part D drugs from a prescription drug plan formulary during the plan year once an individual has enrolled in the plan; 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. BOUCHER:

H.R. 5103. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the former Konnarock Lutheran Girls School in Smyth County, Virginia, which is currently owned by the United States and administered by the Forest Service, to facilitate the restoration and reuse of the property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida:

H.R. 5104. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1750 16th Street South in St. Petersburg, Florida, as the ''Morris W. Milton Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 5105. A bill to clarify that Arizona is in compliance with the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 with respect to English language learners; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 5106. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 to authorize grants for Partnerships for Access to Laboratory Science (PALS); to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BOYD, Mr. MACK, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SHAW, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 5107. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1400 West Jordan Street in Pensacola, Florida, as the ''Earl D. Hutto Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. POE:

H.R. 5108. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1213 East Houston Street in Cleveland, Texas, as the ''Lance Corporal Robert A. Martinez Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 5109. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require Senate confirmation for each appointment to serve in the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Health Emergency Preparedness, Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 5110. A bill to facilitate the use for irrigation and other purposes of water produced in connection with development of energy resources; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 5111. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to authorize discounted sales of royalty oil and gas taken in-kind from a Federal oil or gas lease to provide additional resources to Federal low-income energy assistance programs; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. POE, and Ms. HARRIS):

H. Con. Res. 378. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the 2006 National Crime Victims' Rights Week and efforts to increase public awareness of the rights, needs, and concerns of crime victims and survivors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMANUEL (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H. Con. Res. 379. Concurrent resolution directing the Architect of the Capitol to establish a temporary exhibit in the rotunda of the Capitol to honor the memory of the members of the United States Armed Forces who have lost their lives in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H. Con. Res. 380. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that United States intellectual property rights must be protected globally; to the Committee on International Relations, 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 Ms. PELOSI:

H. Res. 762. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House:

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H. Res. 763. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Children and Families Day, in order to encourage adults in the United States to support and listen to children and to help children throughout the Nation achieve their hopes and dreams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 764. A resolution recognizing and honoring firefighters for their many contributions throughout the history of the Nation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DENT, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H. Res. 765. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Campus Safety Awareness Month; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Res. 768. A resolution congratulating Geno Auriemma, the University of Connecticut women's basketball head coach, upon his selection to the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame in Springfield, Massachusetts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 138: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 198: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 475: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 517: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 521: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 586: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. HULSHOF.

H.R. 663: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 697: Ms. BEAN.

H.R. 699: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 717: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 824: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 867: Ms. HERSETH.

H.R. 999: Mr. BONNER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1079: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1100: Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 1105: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1120: Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1125: Mr. FILNER and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1172: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1175: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1182: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1243: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1256: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1298: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1370: Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 1405: Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1447: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1545: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1575: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1578: Mr. BEAUPREZ and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1652: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1704: Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1709: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1714: Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1789: Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 1792: Mr. RANGEL,

Ms. CARSON, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1823: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1849: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1850: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1951: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2034: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 2048: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2088: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 2122: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2317: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2421: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2456: Mr. CLAY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2568: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2629: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2679: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. RAHALL, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 2730: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2943: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 3103: Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 3190: Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 3307: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3352: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 3373: Ms. HERSETH.

H.R. 3435: Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 3476: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3590: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3614: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3616: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 3644: Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 3809: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 3850: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3859: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 3883: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 3949: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 4005: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BAIRD, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 4098: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 4166: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4188: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4298: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 4341: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MICA, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 4409: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KUHL of New York, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 4465: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4479: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4480: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 4493: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4547: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 4613: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 4624: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 4673: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 4740: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 4749: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4755: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BERRY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 4761: Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 4873: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 4894: Mr. KIRK and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 4897: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 4899: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 4902: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MACK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 4904: Mr. LEACH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GORDON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4922: Ms. HART.

H.R. 4946: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 4949: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SODREL, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 4959: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 4975: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 4981: Mr. CASE and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 5005: Ms. FOXX, Mr. NEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. POE, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 5009: Mr. PENCE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 5013: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. KLINE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 5015: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 5035: Mr. WEINER and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 5037: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 5052: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 5063: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 5065: Ms. HART.

H. Con. Res. 195: Mr. SWEENEY.

H. Con. Res. 320: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 323: Mr. WALSH.

H. Con. Res. 343: Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Con. Res. 348: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 366: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Con. Res. 370: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 521: Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 566: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. MATSUI.

H. Res. 578: Mr. LANTOS.

H. Res. 675: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Res. 688: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 697: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BOYD.

H. Res. 699: Ms. HERSETH.

H. Res. 737: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. DOYLE.

H. Res. 756: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DELAY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. LATHAM.

H. Res. 758: Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H. Res. 761: Mr. WEXLER.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 513

OFFERED BY: MR. DREIER

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 2, line 4, strike ''527 Reform Act of 2005'' and insert ''527 Reform Act of 2006''.

Page 8, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 9, line 3.

Page 16, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 17, line 5.

Insert after section 3 the following (and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly):

**SEC. 4. REPEAL OF LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF PARTY EXPENDITURES ON BEHALF OF CANDIDATES IN GENERAL ELECTIONS.**

(a) REPEAL OF LIMIT.—Section 315(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law with respect to limitations on expenditures or limitations on contributions, the national committee'' and inserting ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law with respect to limitations on amounts of expenditures or contributions, a national committee'',

(B) by striking ''the general'' and inserting ''any'', and

(C) by striking ''Federal office, subject to the limitations contained in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection'' and inserting ''Federal office in any amount''; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (4).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) INDEXING.—Section 315(c) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking ''(d),''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B)(i), by striking ''subsections (b) and (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''.

(2) INCREASE IN LIMITS FOR SENATE CANDIDATES FACING WEALTHY OPPONENTS.—Section 315(i) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(i)(1)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C)(iii)—

(i) by adding ''and'' at the end of subclause (I),

(ii) in subclause (II), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period, and

(iii) by striking subclause (III);

(B) in paragraph (2)(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking '', and a party committee shall not make any expenditure,'';

(C) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii), by striking ''and party expenditures previously made''; and

(D) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''and a party shall not make any expenditure''.

(3) INCREASE IN LIMITS FOR HOUSE CANDIDATES FACING WEALTHY OPPONENTS.—Section 315A(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a—1(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by adding ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A),

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period, and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(B) in paragraph (3)(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking '', and a party committee shall not make any expenditure,'';

(C) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking ''and party expenditures previously made''; and

(D) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ''and a party shall not make any expenditure''.

Add at the end the following:

**SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.