United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 2006 No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Reverend Don Borling, Pastor, All Saints Lutheran Church, Orland Park, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

O God of goodness and grace, it's another day and maybe just an ordinary moment.

We are here in the very heart and soul of our Nation, a place committed always to the very goodness and power of the human spirit, a spirit binding us together in a world that is too often divided by things that really should bring us together: our diversity, our varied colors and religions, our cultures and backgrounds.

O Lord of all life, we call You by many names, we worship You in styles and ways that reflect the humanity with which You create us, we debate and we argue, we vote and we compromise, we come together in this sacred Chamber with so much at stake, with so many people counting on us and needing the very best of what we have to offer.

Please watch over us today. What we do here is sacred. Please give us the humility and grace to live up to our calling.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NUSSLE 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 DON BORLING

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me acknowledge and welcome so many of our former colleagues back to the House Chamber here today. We welcome you. We thank you for your many years of service, and we look forward to the opportunity to renew old friendships.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome our guest chaplain here today, Don Borling, who is the pastor of All Saints Lutheran Church in Orland Park, Illinois. He has been the pastor there for over 30 years. You might wonder why a guy from Iowa is introducing a minister from Illinois. Well, when I went to high school there, this was my home church. It is still my parents' home church. Don has been a good friend for many years. It is a pleasure to be able to welcome him and his wife, Jude; his son, Quinton; and his extended family who are here today.

For many years Don has taught me and so many members of our church on the south side of the Chicagoland area about the living God that is with us here today, that is in our hearts, in our minds, is in the great moments of a Chamber like this where we come together with the spotlight of history and the television cameras, but also the kind of God that is there in the small moments, when no one is watching and when it really matters. He has taught us not only about the God that we worship on Sundays but the God that needs to be there every day, Monday through Saturday, in our lives. He has been a minister to me; but he has also been a mentor, he has been a brother, he has been a friend.

We welcome Pastor Don Borling and his family, and we thank him for opening our House today in prayer.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, April 25, 2006, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair to receive the former Members of Congress.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The Speaker of the House presided.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the House, I consider it a high honor and distinct personal privilege to have the opportunity of welcoming so many of our former Members and colleagues as may be present here for the occasion. We all pause to welcome you.

I want to say personally, good morning. On behalf of the House of Representatives, I am pleased to welcome back all of you. It is always good to see so many familiar faces, and for me who has been here 20 years, even a few unfamiliar faces. I see my former leader, I see people who I have served with, so many people I have come into Congress with and have continued to serve this Nation well. I am especially glad to see my friend from the great State of Missouri and your president, Jake Buechner. Jack, I know of the loss of your dear wife, Nancy, this year after a courageous fight with cancer. I just want to let you know on behalf of all of us in the House of Representatives, our thoughts and prayers are with you and your family.

Matt McHugh is a worthy choice for the Distinguished Service Award, and I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to Matt. Matt served in the House while I was here, a great

Printed on recycled paper.

Member from New York. During his tenure, he was a valuable member of several committees, including the Appropriations Committee and what has been called the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus. Since leaving the House, Matt has continued his efforts to improve our Nation and our world. He has served as vice president at Cornell University and currently serves as counsel to the president of the World Bank. He is also chairman of Bread for the World, a group that fights to end hunger in this world.

Meetings like this are more than just a chance to catch up with old friends. It is a time when you, our more seasoned Members, can offer some words of advice and maybe even tell us a few things that maybe we're doing right. Trust me, you're in a room full of lawmakers and we love to hear what we're doing right.

Seriously, though, I am also glad to see this group and hear about all the great things that you continue to do for our Nation. This organization serves a valuable purpose. You spread the good news about the importance of our democratic government. And I understand that you have a new project that you are undertaking in cooperation with some of our international partners, the International Election Monitors Institute.

Again, I want to thank you once again for the work that you continue to do on behalf of the American people. I want to thank you for coming. Personally, I want to say that as all of us who get up in years and have served 20 years or so in this place, we don't always look forward to becoming former Members, but we know that we will be. I want to look forward to say I appreciate the welcome that you have given everybody that has left these Halls and look forward someday to joining your ranks myself.

Thank you, God bless you, and have a great day.

The Chair now recognizes the Honorable Jim Slattery, vice president of the association, to take the chair.

Mr. SLATTERY (presiding). Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's great to see you. On behalf of the association, we certainly wish you good health and continued wonderful service to our country, also. It's great to see you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you.

The Clerk will now read the roll of the former Members of Congress.

The Clerk called the roll of the former Members of Congress, and the following former Members answered to their names:

FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS PARTICIPATING IN 36TH ANNUAL SPRING MEETING THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 2006

William Alexander (Arkansas)
Glen Browder (Alabama)
James T. Broyhill (North Carolina)
Jack Buechner (Missouri)
Bill D. Burlison (Missouri)
Beverly B. Byron (Maryland)
James K. Coyne (Pennsylvania)
Ron DeLugo (Virgin Islands)
Joseph J. Dioguardi (New York)
Thomas W. Ewing (Illinois)
Harold Ford (Tennessee)
Louis Frey, Jr. (Florida)
Benjamin A. Gilman (New York)
William Grant (Florida)
William Goodling (Pennsylvania)
Margaret Heckler (Massachusetts)
Dennis M. Hertel (Michigan)
Peter Hoagland (Nebraska)
George J. Hochbrueckner (New York)
William J. Hughes (New Jersey)
Robert W. Kastenmeier (Wisconsin)
David S. King (Utah)
Ernest Konnyu (California)
Peter Kyros (Maine)
Romano L. Mazzoli (Kentucky)
Matthew F. McHugh (New York)
Richard Dale Nichols (Kansas)
Howard W. Pollock (Alaska)
Larry Pressler (South Dakota)
William R. Ratchford (Connecticut)
John J. Rhodes, III (Arizona)
Patricia Schroeder (Colorado)
Richard Schulz (Pennsylvania)
David E. Skaggs (Colorado)
Jim Slattery (Kansas)
Dennis A. Smith (Oregon)
Lawrence J. Smith (Florida)
Stephen J. Solarz (New York)
R. Lindsay Thomas (Georgia)

Mr. SLATTERY. The Chair is pleased to announce that there are 39 former Members of Congress that have responded to their names here today.

The Chair at this time would recognize the distinguished gentleman from the State of Missouri, the Honorable Jack Buechner, the president of our association.

Mr. BUECHNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker pro tem, and all of you for being with us this morning. We are especially grateful to Speaker HASTERT for taking the time from his busy schedule to greet us and give us his warm welcome.

It is always an honor and a privilege to return to this magnificent institution. We revere it and we have shared so many memorable experiences here that I think it is indelibly inked into our psyches. Service in Congress is both a joy and a heavy responsibility. Whatever your party affiliation, we have great admiration for those who continue to serve here, serve their country, serve their constituency in this rather unique institution. We thank all of you who have served and all those who continue to serve, and we thank those who are here for giving us the opportunity to report on the activities of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. This is our 36th annual report to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. SLATTERY. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BUECHNER. Our association is nonpartisan. It has been chartered by Congress, but receives absolutely no funding from Congress. We have a wide variety of domestic and international programs which several other Members and I will discuss briefly. Our membership numbers 550; and our purpose is to continue, in some small measure, the service to country which began during our terms in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Our finances are sound. We support all our activities via three income sources: membership dues, program-specific grants and sponsorships, and our annual fund-raising dinner. In addition, we have had the good fortune to receive a bequest from Frieda James, the widow of the late Benjamin Franklin James, a five-term Republican from Pennsylvania.

During the presidency of my esteemed predecessor, Larry LaRocco of Idaho, the association established its first endowment fund. The goal of the fund is to ensure the financial viability of the Former Members Association, for not just this coming year but for many years to come. We envision a time when investment earnings of the endowment fund can be used to supplement the association's budget during lean years, a safety net to guarantee that tough economic times will not shut down this association. Many of our members have made contributions to this fund, and we thank them for their kind generosity.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Association of Former Members again has had a very successful, active, and rewarding year. We have continued our work serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures overseas. We have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building. We have had many of our members involved in election monitoring missions worldwide. We again sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress to university campuses here in the United States and abroad as part of our Congress to Campus Program. I am therefore pleased to now report on the program work of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress.

When I stood at this podium 1 year ago to present our association's activities to the Congress, I announced that we were in the process of creating an election-monitoring organization to train former legislators in this important aspect of democracy building. I am very pleased to report today that in the past year we have cofounded the International Election Monitors Institute, an organization jointly administered by the U.S. Association of Former Members, the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians, and the Association of Former Members of the European Parliament. We have joined in the drafting of initial by-laws of the institute, and later this week we will select four members of our association to join four Canadians and four Europeans as the first board of directors of this exciting new venture.

I will now yield to our association's secretary, Dennis Hertel of Michigan, to give more details about this association program.

Mr. HERTEL. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for giving me the opportunity to report on the International Election Monitors Institute and the other advances our association

has made in this field. The goal of the institute is to train former legislators from the three associations in proper standards of election monitoring. We have adopted the U.N. Code of Conduct For Election Observers and will train our members to be objective and impartial monitors of elections.

It is clear what a crucial role election monitors can play in furthering true democracy across this globe. In addition, former legislators offer such a unique and unparalleled experience in this field that really no other group of people can match. To then couple this with a truly international undertaking that involves former parliamentarians from the United States, Canada, and Europe is a very exciting and groundbreaking idea. I am pleased that our association has created this new entity and through it will send well-trained election observers around the world. We will not only monitor on election day, but even preceding the election will have teams in place to observe how the actual campaign is being conducted.

Earlier this year we had the chance to apply this model to the parliamentary elections in Ukraine where we had international observer teams in-country for both the campaign and the actual election. I proposed this commission after the Ukraine election in November a year and a half ago. We had over 90 former Members, Republicans and Democrats as always, who participated in the lead-up and in that election in November which was overturned because of what the election observers had seen and reported. So we made a difference in that country for democracy.

We also had after that November election for the December election, former Members come over the Christmas holidays to be away from their families, but to fight for democracy as election observers for that final election in the Ukraine also. Funding for this venture came from the U.S. Agency for International Development via a grant to the U.S. Ukraine Foundation. I personally had the chance to spend election day in Kiev and be an officially accredited observer of Ukraine's election this year.

I recommend our Web site for a detailed report of our missions. What we have seen is that there are issues; and as much as our people are well-trained and politically aware, we want to prepare them and those members from the EU and the Canadian Parliament for whatever surprises might come during the election period.

In addition to creating the International Election Monitors Institute, our association during this past year created partnerships with some of the key institutions in this field. For example, we teamed with IFES and successfully applied to the U.S. Agency for International Development to become one of their approved organizations to receive democracy-building grants. We also partnered with OSCE and have received an invitation from this international body to send former Members of Congress as U.S. delegates on their election monitoring missions.

One partnership of which we are especially proud is with the House of Representatives. DAVID DREIER and DAVID PRICE head up the House Democracy Assistance Commission, and former Members of Congress will serve with current Members of Congress on democracy-strengthening missions all over the world, not just for elections but after, to do democracy-building. In addition, we will lend some of our expertise and experience to panels for legislators from newly emerging democracies as they learn the nuts and bolts of a representative democracy.

These are all very exciting developments for this association, and I am extremely pleased to be a part of this undertaking, and I am so very proud of the former Members who give of their time with no compensation whatsoever to be away from their families, to travel to all ends of the globe for these activities, to be gone from home for 10 days, 2 weeks, to report back and to continue to monitor those activities.

During the past year, we also placed some of our association members on election monitoring missions organized by the International Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute.

I now yield to my colleague Jay Rhodes of Arizona to report on his experience monitoring the election in Afghanistan.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you, Dennis. It is a pleasure to be with you this morning and to just share with you very briefly an experience that I had monitoring the parliamentary elections in Afghanistan in September of last year. I was invited to join a monitoring team by the International Republican Institute. Frankly, I was invited to join on fairly short notice and I hesitated, because we're all busy people, but my wife said to me, How can you possibly think about passing up an opportunity like this? And I said, Well, you know, that makes a lot of sense, so I said, Yes, I will go to Afghanistan.

One of the things I have to tell you is being in Afghanistan is a very interesting experience, but getting to Afghanistan is likewise a very interesting experience. It's a long way from anyplace. Also, speaking of places like Afghanistan, security is an interesting proposition, but I can tell you it is more difficult to get out of Dulles Airport than it is to get into Afghanistan.

The country is absolutely beautiful, but it is really a tough place. Kabul is one of the most poverty-stricken places I have ever seen in my experience. But to sum it all up, the Afghans, with very, very little history of democracy and very, very little history of conducting elections, conducted in what was the unanimous opinion of virtually all the international observers a very, very good, well-run, capable election. I personally went to 16 polling places. Our team went to 110-some polling places. This was the IRI team. There were others. I think probably over a thousand polling places were visited on election day. Everybody came away with the almost unanimous impression that the election itself was handled capably, professionally, and well.

That is the good news. The bad news is that as soon as the polls closed, the ballot boxes all disappeared and didn't reappear for another 4 weeks. We were pretty well assured about ballot box security, and I heard very little to indicate that in that 4-week period of time anything happened to the ballot boxes. But Afghanistan is such a far-flung place and it is so primitive that it took virtually 3 weeks to gather all the ballots in a central place where they could be counted.

The most impressive thing that I came away with aside from the fact that this country with no electoral history at all handled an election very capably was a meeting that our team had with 10 female candidates for the parliament. The new Afghan Constitution requires that 25 percent of the parliament be filled with ladies, females. We sat and listened to these candidates for 2 hours. Of the 10, five were professionals: four doctors and one registered nurse. The other five were people who had run a shop someplace or did rugs or stayed home. Their stories about living under the Taliban were chilling, scary. Their stories about their intense desire to take part in the new Afghanistan was thrilling. We watched the women vote on election day. They voted in great numbers. That was the most important, I think, experience that I came away with from having been there, was the dedication on the part of the new leadership in Afghanistan to include women, and to include them in a meaningful way.

I have a great deal of hope that democracy in Afghanistan is going to take hold. It is not going to be easy. The Taliban is not dead. But I think that the dedication of those people that we were able to interact with in the week that I was there indicate to me that this is a place where it can happen.

Dennis, thank you very much.

Mr. BUECHNER. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank Dennis and Jay for those reports.

Mr. Speaker, since its founding, the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress has played an important role in fostering dialogue between the leaders of other nations and the United States. We have arranged more than 450 special events at the United States Capitol for delegations from over 80 countries and the European Parliament. We have hosted meetings for individual members of parliaments and parliamentary staff. We have organized approximately 50 foreign policy seminars in about a dozen countries involving more than 1,500 former and current parliamentarians, and we have conducted over 20 study tours abroad for Members of Congress.

The association serves as the secretariat for four legislative liaison programs which bring current Members of Congress together with their colleagues in the parliaments of Germany, Mexico, Japan and the most recent addition, Turkey. The Congressional Study Group on Germany, which is our largest and most active exchange program involving the U.S. Congress and the parliament of another country, is our flagship international program of the association. It is a bipartisan organization with approximately one-third of the Members of Congress, both House and Senate, participating. The Congressional Study Group on Germany serves as a model for all other study groups under the umbrella of the association.

For over 20 years, the Congressional Study Group on Germany has been a forum for lawmakers from Germany and the United States to communicate on issues of mutual concern. The study group was founded in 1983 as an informal group and was established as a formal organization in 1987. The primary goal of the study group is to establish a forum for communication between Members of Congress and their counterparts in the German Bundestag. Ongoing study group activities include conducting a Distinguished Visitors Program at the United States Capitol for guests from Germany, sponsoring annual seminars involving Members of Congress and the Bundestag, providing information about participants in the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program to appropriate Members of Congress, and organizing a senior congressional staff study tour to Germany each year.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany is funded primarily by the German Marshall Fund of the United States. Additional funding to assist with administrative expenses is received from a group of corporations whose representatives serve on a business advisory council to the study group. The business advisory council is chaired by former Member Tom Coleman of Missouri, who served as the chairman of the Congressional Study Group on Germany in the House in 1989. The study group has established itself as the most productive means of communication between the U.S. Congress and the German Bundestag. To date, 163 Members of Congress belong to the Congressional Study Group on Germany: 34 Senators and 129 House Members.

Let me just interject a little anecdote, and that is, when the Iraq war commenced and there were the attitudes in Europe, and particularly Germany and France chose not to participate as Germany had, for instance, in Afghanistan, Members of our Congress were contacted by or contacted their Bundestag counterparts. The French Ambassador, who had just come to the United States, inquired of the German Ambassador why was it that France was beaten about on the floor of the House and the French toast was taken off the menu and French fries, and Germany seemed to, although it had the same position, not receive the same amount of sort of verbal pummeling. The German Ambassador said, quite candidly, that the study group had developed a rapprochement between Members of the House and the Senate and their counterparts in the Bundestag so that there were phone communications and e-mail communications, and there was a lot of political understanding that went on, where a member who stands for election in Germany was talking to Members who stand for election over here, even though their politics were not necessarily the same. You could have a Social Democrat in Germany meeting with a Republican here, or vice versa. You could have a member of the Free Democrats in Germany talking to a very liberal Democrat over here.

And the idea was that there was communication and there was an understanding. I think that that is the greatest thing that we can do with these other parliaments is create an atmosphere of understanding. That understanding goes a long way toward creating better relationships; and, for that matter, it makes our Members better Members. The Federal Republic of Germany is one of our most important allies, and the study group has been instrumental in helping to cement trans-Atlantic ties over the years.

The most visible activity of the group is its Distinguished Visitors Program. That brings high-ranking German elected officials to Capitol Hill to meet with Members of Congress. In 2005, the Study Group on Germany organized briefings for Members of Congress with the then German Ambassador to the United States, Wolfgang Ischinger; member of the Bundestag, Minister President Gunther Oettinger; Minister President Roland Koch; and a group of newer Bundestag members.

The highlight of each programming year is the Congressional Study Group on Germany's annual seminar. Every year, the study group brings approximately eight Members of Congress together with German legislators for several days of focused discussion on a predetermined agenda. The parliamentarians usually are joined by several Members of the Congress and Bundestag officials of the two federal governments, think tank and foundation representatives, and members of the German American corporate community.

The 2005 annual Congress-Bundestag seminar took place in Berlin; Brussels, which was an acknowledgment of the part that the EU played especially in trade issues; and Frankfurt from March 18 to March 24, 2005. This program included high-level meetings with representatives of the German Government, the European Union and NATO. For the first time the Congressional Study Group on Germany spent part of the annual seminar in Brussels, as I said, because many policy areas are now being governed out of Brussels. One of those policy areas under the EU domain is agriculture, which was examined in detail with experts during a panel discussion in Brussels. In addition, seminar participants attended meetings with NATO officials in Brussels. A visit with American soldiers at the Landstuhl military hospital, which is usually the first destination for the wounded from Iraq, occurred at the end of the annual seminar.

A report about the activities of the Congressional Study Group on Germany would be incomplete without thanking its financial supporters. First and foremost one needs to thank Craig Kennedy and the German Marshall Fund of the United States because without him and his foundation, the study group could not function at its present level of activity. Also, one must not forget former Member Tom Coleman of Missouri who chairs, as I said, the business advisory council to the study group. His tremendous dedication in raising much-needed funds to support the administrative side of the study group has been essential. He has put together a group of companies that deserve our gratitude for giving their aid and support to the administrative aspects of this program. Current BAC members are Allianz, BASF, DaimlerChrysler, Deutsche Telekom, DHL Americas, EDS, Eli Lilly, Lufthansa, RGIT, SAP, Siemens, and Volkswagen.

Modeled after the Congressional Study Group on Germany, the association established a Congressional Study Group on Turkey at the beginning of 2005. Turkey, one of our strategic allies, is situated at the crossroads of many important challenges for the 21st century: peace in the greater Middle East, the expansion of the European Union, and the transformation of NATO. The Study Group on Turkey brings current Members of Congress together with their legislative counterparts in Turkey, government officials and business representatives in Turkey and serves as a platform for all participants to learn about U.S.-Turkish relations firsthand.

Thanks to funding from the Economic Policy Research Institute, a think tank established by the Turkish business association TOBB, the German Marshall Fund of the United States, and a group of corporate sponsors, the Study Group on Turkey has started a Distinguished Visitors Program in Washington. This program involves events for Members of Congress such as roundtable discussions or breakfast/luncheon panels featuring visiting dignitaries from Turkey. Recent guests include then-Turkish Ambassador to the United States Logoglu; the EU Ambassador to the United States, John Bruton; Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan; Speaker of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey Arinc; and current Turkish Ambassador to the United States Sensoy.

The Congressional Study Group on Turkey also conducts an annual U.S.-

Turkey seminar. The seminar is a week-long conference for U.S. Members of Congress to discuss areas of mutual concern with their legislative counterparts from Turkey. The 2005 U.S.-Turkey seminar took place from May 28 to June 3 and included stops in Istanbul and Ankara. The members of the delegation met with high-level representatives, including Speaker of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey Arinc; Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan; the Minister of State for the Economy, Ali Babacan; Turkish Foreign Minister Abdullah Gul; and the Chief of the Turkish General Staff, General Ozkok; and Minister of Defense Gonul. Topics that the participants discussed included the U.S.-Turkish military alliance; Turkey's relationship with its neighbors, including Armenia and Syria; economic issues; trade and human rights.

Because of the Congressional Study Group on Turkey, Members of Congress were able to interact with their Turkish counterparts and learn more about the vital relationship between the two countries. The U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress is pleased to add the study group to its portfolio of international programs. It is certain to attract great interest in Washington and in Ankara. The next U.S.-Turkey seminar is scheduled to take place in November of this year.

The association also serves as the secretariat for the Congressional Study Group on Japan and the Congressional Study Group on Mexico. Founded in 1993 in cooperation with the East-West Center in Hawaii, the Congressional Study Group on Japan is a bipartisan group of 71 Members of the House and Senate with an additional 36 Members having asked to be kept informed on study group activities. The Congressional Study Group on Japan arranges opportunities for Members of Congress to meet with their counterparts in the Japanese Diet in addition to organizing discussions for Members to hear from American and Japanese experts about various aspects of the U.S.-Japan relationship. In the past year, featured guests have included Japanese Ambassador to the United States Ryozo Kato; Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs R. Nicholas Burns; and former Senior Director for Asian Activities at the National Security Council, Michael Green.

The Congressional Study Group on Japan is funded by the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission. I am also glad to say that our member, the former Speaker of this House, Thomas Foley, has made himself available at least on two occasions to discuss the issues of concern and his Japanese counterpart has joined him at some of these meetings for a rare insight of diplomat to diplomat.

Last but not least, the association administers a Congressional Study Group on Mexico. U.S.-Mexican relations are a priority and not merely set against the backdrop of immigration, though this is obviously a very important and timely issue of mutual concern. The Congressional Study Group on Mexico is a unique organization in that it serves as a bipartisan forum for U.S. legislators from both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate to engage in issue-specific dialogue with Mexican elected officials and government representatives so the two countries' political decision-makers receive a comprehensive picture of the issues revolving around U.S.-Mexico relations.

The study group also replicates this forum for senior congressional staff. Topics such as border security, trade and narcotics trafficking are just a sample of the subjects pertinent to the bilateral relationship with Mexico. The Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Turkey, Japan and Mexico are examples of how the Former Members Association can provide an educational service to current Members, their staffs and aid in the foreign relations of this country. Let me also add that the association has enjoyed a highly productive working relationship with the French embassy, in particular our relationship with the French Ambassador, his Excellency Jean-David Levitte. This has led to the creation of the Former Members Committee on France, which brings former Members of Congress together with current members of the French National Assembly and their friendship societies. We have had very interesting discussions on foreign policy and trade, and we thank Ambassador Levitte for the numerous times he has hosted our association for roundtable discussions and panel presentations.

Mr. Speaker, of course not all of our activities are international in nature. One of the most gratifying programs involving this association and its members is the Congress to Campus Program. This is a bipartisan effort to share with college students throughout the country our unique insight on the work of the Congress and the political process more generally. Our colleague from Colorado, David Skaggs, has been managing this program for the association for the last 4 years as a project of his Center for Democracy and Citizenship at the Council for Excellence in Government, in partnership with the Stennis Center for Public Service.

I now yield to David to report on the program.

Mr. SKAGGS. Thank you, Mr. President, I appreciate your yielding the time, and I am proud to be able to report to our colleagues about the Congress to Campus Program activities for this past academic year, 2005–2006. As the gentleman from Missouri indicated, this is a partnership between my organization and the Stennis Center for Public Service in Mississippi. I would ask unanimous consent that a full report on the activities of the program be submitted for the RECORD.

Mr. SLATTERY. Without objection, so ordered.

CONGRESS TO CAMPUS PROGRAM

REPORT TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE U.S. ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—APRIL 27, 2006

Introduction

The Congress to Campus Program addresses a significant shortfall in civic learning and engagement among the country's young people of college age. It combines traditional educational content about American government and politics (especially Congress) with a strong message about public service, all delivered by men and women who have ''walked the walk.'' The Program sends bipartisan pairs of former Members of Congress—one Democrat and one Republican—to visit college, university and community college campuses around the country. During each visit, the Members conduct classes, hold community forums, meet informally with students and faculty, visit high schools and civic organizations, and do interviews and talk show appearances with local press and media.

In the summer of 2002, the Board of Directors of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress (Association) engaged the Center for Democracy & Citizenship (CDC) at the Council for Excellence in Government to help manage the Congress to Campus Program (Program) in partnership with the Stennis Center for Public Service (Stennis). CDC and Stennis, with the blessing of the Association, have worked together since to increase the number of campuses hosting Program visits each year, to expand the pool of former Members of Congress available for campus visits, to develop new sources of funding, to raise the profile of the Program and its message in the public and academic community, and to devise methods of measuring the impact of the program at host institutions.

Quantity and Quality of Program Visits

This is the fourth year under the current program management. In the 2005–2006 academic year, the Program sponsored twenty-six events involving twenty-nine colleges and universities around the country and the world. [See Attachment 1—Roster of '05–'06 Academic Year Visits & Participants.] These visits took former Members to universities, service academies, colleges and community colleges in seventeen states and three countries. Over the past four years, former Members have visited over 120 colleges and universities during campus visits in the U.S. and around the world speaking to nearly 40,000 students in the process.

We have found college and university participation in the Program to be cyclical in nature. While the numbers were down slightly this academic year, applications and expressed interest from host institutions indicate that the 2006–2007 academic year will likely be Congress to Campus' most productive year ever. The average number of visits for fall semesters has been 13 over the last three years; a number already surpassed by applications and requests for visits from schools for this coming fall.

We continue to fine-tune the content and substance of Program visits based on feedback from Members and host professors. The Program asks visiting Members and host professors to complete an evaluation of each visit. As the result of those evaluations, we encourage host schools to include nearby colleges and universities in Congress to Campus visits and to schedule a broad scope of classes and activities for the former Members. We will continue to make changes in response to the suggestions of participating former Members and host faculty.

The Program asks host schools to insure contact with at least 250 students over the

course of a visit, and that number is often exceeded. During the past academic year, approximately 9,000 students heard Members' unique story about representative democracy and their special call to public service.

A draft schedule of events is prepared in advance of each campus visit and reviewed by staff to assure variety as well as substance. There is a conference call before each trip with Members and the responsible campus contact person to review the revised schedule and iron out any remaining problems. Members also receive CRS briefing materials on current issues and background information on government service opportunities prior to each visit.

Recruiting Member Volunteers for Campus Visits

The success of the Program obviously depends on Members' participation. With travel back and forth, Members end up devoting about three days to each campus visit. This is a priceless contribution of an extremely valuable resource.

Each year Members of the Association are surveyed again to solicit information regarding their availability for and interest in a Program campus visit. Using responses to these surveys and direct contact with a number of former Members, CDC developed a pool of just over one hundred available former Members, and some forty participated in visits this year. A ''bench'' of one hundred was deep enough to fill the openings during the current academic year, but more will be needed to meet the demands of future academic years. Association Members are encouraged to complete and return the survey they will receive this summer and then to be ready to accept assignments to one of the fine institutions of higher education the program will serve next year.

Funding Sources

In addition to the generous contribution of money and staff time made each year by the Stennis Center for Public Service, the Association continues its support of the Program. Other organizations have also provided funding to help with the expansion of the Congress to Campus Program for this academic year including the Cultural Affairs Office of the U.S. Embassy in Canada (visit specific) and the Eccles Centre for American Studies at The British Library and the Cultural Affairs Office of the U.S. Embassy in the United Kingdom (visit specific). While Stennis' commitment to the Program is ongoing, funding from the other organizations is being provided on a year by year basis. The effort to find new sources of funding for Congress to Campus is a continuing challenge.

Host schools are expected to cover the cost of Members' on-site accommodations and local travel and to make a contribution to cover a portion of the cost of administering the Program. A suggested amount of contribution is determined according to a sliding-scale based on an institution's expenditures per pupil [see Attachment 2—Application Form]; a waiver is available to schools that are not able to pay the scale amount. Several schools received a full or partial waiver in 2005–2006. Still, school contributions produced several thousand dollars in support of the program. Additional funding sources will be necessary if the Program is to continue at current levels.

International Initiative

Congress to Campus made its first international visit in October 2003 to the United Kingdom. An earlier Association study tour had laid the groundwork for the visit and had established a relationship with Philip John Davies, Director, Eccles Centre for American Studies at The British Library and the U.S. Embassy's Cultural Affairs Office. The success of that initial visit in 2003 has led to visits to the United Kingdom in 2004 and 2005 with another planned for fall of 2006.

This academic year the Program developed a relationship with the U.S. Embassy in Canada which resulted in support for a campus visit to Carleton University in Ottawa in February, 2006. We expect this relationship to continue and lead to support for future Congress to Campus visits to colleges and universities in Canada.

In past years, the program has sponsored campus visits to Germany and China, as well.

Program Outreach and Publicity

The continuing interest on the part of colleges and universities in hosting Congress to Campus visit is the result of a multi-faceted outreach effort. Association leadership and numerous former Members, as well as staff at CDC and Stennis, have made many personal contacts on behalf of the Program. In addition, CDC Executive Director and former Member David Skaggs has made a number of public presentations in behalf of Congress to Campus and informational material has been emailed directly to all members of the APSA's Legislative Studies and Political Organizations & Parties Sections, as well as to many other college and university organizational contacts.

Campus press and media at host institutions are offered access to visiting Members. Each host institution is also encouraged to make commercial print and broadcast media interviews a part of each Congress to Campus visit's schedule.

Conclusion

Interest in Congress to Campus remains strong in the academic community. Association Members participating in campus visits are enthusiastic about the value of the Program and the rewards it brings to all who are involved in those visits. The Program could be expanded further on domestic and international levels if funding uncertainties can be addressed.

ATTACHMENT 1

Congress to Campus Program

The U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress

Congress to Campus Program

ROSTER OF '05 –'06 ACADEMIC YEAR VISITS AND PARTICIPANTS

FALL

High Point University - September 18-20, 2005

Republican: Arlen Erdahl (R-MN)
Democrat: Ken Hechler (D-WV)

Denison University - October 2-4, 2005

Republican: Denny Smith (R-OR)
Democrat: Andy Jacobs (D-IN)

Frostburg State University (MD) - October 16-18, 2005

Republican: Bill Goodling (R-PA)
Democrat Dennis Hertel (D-PA)

Wilkes University – October 18-20, 2005

Republican: Nick Smith (R-MI)
Democrat: Jim Bilbray (D-NV)

University of Missouri – Kansas City – October 24 & 25, 2005
(in association with fall USAFMC meeting)

Democrat: Jerry Patterson (D-CA)
Cathy Long (D-LA)
Republican: Jan Meyers (R-KS)

Ursinus College – October 31- November 2, 2005

ATTACHMENT 1

Republican: Lou Frey (R-FL)
Democrat: Jim Lloyd (D-CA)

United Kingdom – November 5-13 , 2005
De Montfort University

Republican: Ron Sarasin
Democrat: Beverly Byron

Siena College – November 6-8, 2005

Democrat: Bill Roy (D-KS)
Republican Peter Torkildsen (R-MA)

University of Michigan – Ann Arbor – November 6-8, 2005

Democrat: David Skaggs (D-CO)
Republican: Orval Hansen (R-ID)

Rhode Island College - November 13-15, 2005

Republican: Jan Meyers (R-KS)
Democrat: George Hochbrueckner (D-NY)

Suffolk University, November 13-15, 2005

Republican: Mikey Edwards (R-OK)
Democrat: Barbara Kennelly (D-CT)

Indiana University – South Bend – November 13-15, 2005

Democrat: Harold Volkmer (D-MO)
Republican: Dan Miller (R-FL)

University of Kansas (Dole Institute) - November 15-17, 2005

Republican: Orval Hansen (R-ID)
Democrat: Cardiss Collins (D-IL)

ATTACHMENT 1

SPRING

Washington Center for Internships "Inside Washington" – Jan 3-6, 2006

David Skaggs (D-CO) Beverly Byron (D-MD)
Mickey Edwards (R-OK) Jack Buechner (R-MO)
Ron Sarasin (R-CT)

Dartmouth College – February 6-8, 2006

Republican: Robert Walker (R-PA)
Democrat: Vic Fazio (D-CA)

Carleton University (Ottawa, Canada) February 6-8, 2006

Democrat: Bob Carr (D-MI)
Republican: James Greenwood (R-PA)

University of California, Irvine – February 12-14, 2006

Democrat: Dennis Hertel (D-PA)
Republican: Peter Torkildsen (R-MA)

U.S. Naval Academy - February 26-28, 2006

Democrat: Charlie Stenholm (D-TX)
Republican: Bill Goodling (R-PA)

Mississippi State University - March 5-7, 2006

Republican: Ron Sarasin (R-CT)
Democrat: Earl Hutto (D-FL)

University of Utah - March 5-7, 2006

Republican: Orval Hansen (R-ID)
Democrat Jim Lloyd (D-CA)

Fitchburg State College April 2-4, 2006

Republican: Steve Kuykendall (R-CA)

ATTACHMENT 1

Democrat: David Minge (D-MN)

Amherst College – April 2-4, 2006

Democrat: Matt McHugh (D-NY)
Republican: Bill Goodling (R-PA)

West Virginia University - April 2-4, 2006

Republican: Dan Miller (R-FL)
Democrat: Ron Klink (D-PA)

University of Texas – Austin – April 10-12, 2006

Democrat: Mike Forbes (D-NY)
Republican: Robin Beard (R-TN)

People to People Ambassador Program – April 11 & 18, 2006
David Skaggs (D-CO)

Washington Center for Internships "Inside Washington" – May 19, 2006

ATTACHMENT 2

Congress to Campus Program

The United States Association of Former Members of Congress

in partnership with

center for DEMOCRACY and CITIZENSHIP

and

STENNIS Center for Public Service

APPLICATION FOR CONGRESS TO CAMPUS VISIT

Please complete this form (you may include attachments as needed) and email, fax or mail copies to:

Congressman David Skaggs
Center for Democracy & Citizenship
1301 K Street NW, Suite 450 West
Washington DC 20005
Fax: 202-728-0422
Email: congresstocampus@excelgov.org

Name of Institution _____

Address _____

Sponsoring Department _____

Responsible Contact Person _____
[This individual must have authority to act for the host school regarding all arrangements and aspects of the visit.]

Address _____

Email _____ Phone _____ Fax _____

Submitted by _____ Date: _____

Revised 1.5.04

ATTACHMENT 2

Background on Institution [founding; governance; accreditations; degrees offered; student body size and characteristics; faculty size and characteristics; geographic area served; religious affiliation; endowment; if this information is readily available on your website, just provide the address for the website.] (Attach additional sheet, if needed.)

_____

_____

Please check those activities from the following list you expect tentatively to be able to include in the Members' schedules if your application for a visit is approved. Experience suggests that allocating most of the visit to a variety of classes works best.

- ❑ Introductory classes in political science or U. S. government [Please try to avoid multiple appearances in different sections of the same course.]
- ❑ Advanced classes in political science or U. S. government, including courses in the Congress, political theory or foreign affairs
- ❑ Classes in political philosophy or history*
- ❑ Classes in other disciplines [e.g., health, science, engineering, environment] for students who may be interested in public service careers or who simply need a better grounding in American government*
- ❑ ROTC classes
- ❑ One-on-one or "office hours" style meetings with individual students interested in public service or political careers [To work well, this option needs to be well publicized, preferably with advance sign-up.]
- ❑ Campus political clubs, e.g., Campus Democrats and Young Republicans
- ❑ Campus extracurricular activities or clubs with some public policy dimension, e.g., an environmental or international relations club
- ❑ Campus speaker series or open campus forum [Please be prepared to do some work to publicize such a session, or give class credit, or risk low attendance.]
- ❑ Meeting with student government organization or leadership
- ❑ Meetings with school president, chancellor, dean or other senior administrator [This option is offered if it meets a real need for your school; there is no need for a meeting just for protocol reasons; if included, should be *brief*.]
- ❑ Meeting with career counseling staff regarding public service
- ❑ Faculty departmental colloquium
- ❑ Interview with campus newspaper(s) and radio station
- ❑ Interview with local newspaper(s) and editorial board(s)
- ❑ Interview or talk show appearance with local radio station(s)
- ❑ Interview or talk show appearance with local TV station(s)
- ❑ Meeting with community service organization(s), e.g., Rotary, Lions, League of Women Voters
- ❑ Community talk or forum, e.g., "town hall" type meeting at a public library
- ❑ Class visits or assembly at local high school

* At least one class should be in a discipline other than political science or government studies.

ATTACHMENT 2

- ❑ "In-service" teacher training on Congress, federal government for middle and high school social studies teachers arranged through local school district(s)
- ❑ Major federal government installation or major private sector employer near campus able to host a session with a significant number of employees
- ❑ Meeting with local government officials, e.g., appearance at City Council or County Board session or meet with state legislators
- ❑ Other (specify) _____

While it is not possible to include all the activities suggested above, the schedule for each visit should include a good variety of activities and not be limited only to classes. Please include at least one class from outside the political science (or government studies) department. Visits typically cover 2 full days following Members' arrival, with no more than two nights on site. If Members arrive the evening before the schedule begins, they will expect to depart in time to get home the evening of the second day of scheduled events; if they arrive on a morning, they will expect to leave after noon on the third day. Activities may be scheduled from 8 or 9 AM until (as late as) 9 PM, including (some) meal times; for each 4 or 5 hours of scheduled time, an hour of "down" time should be set aside (this may be lunch hour), with facilities for Members to check emails and use a phone. Please attach a proposed schedule for your school visit, comprised of two full days, incorporating the elements tentatively checked above. Please indicate the number of students expected at each proposed activity. (The Program hopes for both quality and quantity, with substantive contact with at least 250 students during a visit as a goal.)

If your application is approved, you will need to submit a complete schedule for the visit at least one month prior to the visit; this is a critical deadline. For class presentations, the instructor for the course should provide brief written guidance to the Members in advance of the visit about what they should discuss during the class period and how it fits into the course (a copy of the course syllabus is helpful. Program staff may request revisions to the schedule if necessary to meet Program standards. Formal campus tours and other area touring are secondary to the Program's educational objectives and generally should be avoided.

Preferred dates for a visit that fit your academic calendar. _____

Transportation: nearest airport; distance from campus; means of transportation to

campus. _____

_____

Other considerations that make your school a good site for the Program. _____

_____

_____

ATTACHMENT 2

The host school is expected to cover the on-site expenses for Member accommodations, meals and local transportation. Please understand that the average Congress to Campus visit also entails about $5000 in administrative, overhead and transportation expenses. In order to make the Program as widely available as possible, we would also like to recover a portion of those costs, based on the host school's ability to pay. Please indicate the financial category applicable to your institution from the following schedule. _____

Host School Suggested Contribution

Category	Current expenditures per "full-time" student*	Suggested contribution
A	$30,000 or more	$3500
B	$20,000 to $29,999	$2500
C	$10,000 to $19,999	$1500
D	$9999 or less	$1000

We do not want this cost-sharing goal to prevent any school that wishes to host a visit from doing so. With that in mind, do you need a waiver of all or part of the applicable contribution, and, if so, do you also need assistance with on-site costs? ____ (If 'yes,' please attach an explanation and statement of need signed by an appropriate financial officer of the school.)

Where or how did you learn about the Congress to Campus Program? _____

_____

Note: The host school contact person will be responsible for identifying faculty members who will assist in administering a brief survey instrument to be completed after the Congress to Campus visit by a sample of students in classes visited by Members and by an otherwise comparable sample of students in classes *not* visited. The purpose of this survey is to determine any difference (change) in attitude about politics, government and public service in one group compared to the other, and so to indicate the impact of the visit on student attitudes. In addition, the host school contact person will be expected to complete an evaluation of the visit and to report on print and electronic media coverage of the visit, the expenses paid by the school in connection with the program visit, and the student attendance at each event on the schedule.

* The expenditures figures used to calculate the contribution level should be for the most recent academic year and should be readily available from your school's business or finance office. They are standard data used by the Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). For public institutions that follow the GASB 34/35 reporting model, use your school's total expenses – the sum of Operating Expenses and Non-Operating Expenses. Public institutions using the College and University Audit Guide should use the total of current funds expenditures and mandatory transfers. Independent institutions following the Not-for-Profit Audit Guide should use the expenses category. The enrollment figures should come from the IPEDS data for the current academic year, converted to a full-time equivalent enrollment based on one full-time student per three part-time students.

Mr. SKAGGS. Over the last 4 years, the Congress to Campus Program has visited over 120 campuses around the country and really around the world. As most of the people here in the Chamber know, this is a program that exists because of the volunteer time that our former Member colleagues are willing to donate to the program. A Republican and a Democrat spend a couple of days on campuses around the country and just as the association is dedicated to the promotion of democracy abroad, this program helps build democracy here at home. Its purposes are to educate this generation of college students and actually some of their faculty as well about how our government works and in particular how this Congress works, and, secondly, to encourage them to consider spending some of their careers in public service.

We hope that by having a Republican and a Democrat demonstrate that on most things there is more agreement than disagreement for members of the two major parties that we can also communicate some message about how we really solve problems in our political process. This program is only possible because of the generous donation of very precious time on the part of our colleagues, over 50 of whom participated in the program this year. I would like to call on two of them to give us a little bit of a snapshot of the experiences they have had both this year and in the recent past.

I first would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all I want to thank the Stennis Center, Former Members Association, and David's leadership in giving me the opportunity to lift my spirits when I'm depressed after reading headlines in the local newspapers and The Washington Post and the New York Times, you name it, because it is a lifting experience to go out there and exchange with thousands of students all across this country. I have had the opportunity to go to northern Idaho, to northern Florida, to Amherst, U.S. Naval Academy and Frostburg State University. I am sure in most instances I have gained more than they have gained from my presence, but we give them the opportunity to dig in deeply as to just how this Congress works. We don't tell them everything, of course, but we are very frank. It is a great experience. If you become depressed, as I said, as I do occasionally and wonder whether there is a future for this country, go out and meet with these young people.

The greatest experience, I guess, was to sit in the dining room with 5,000 of the brightest and best young men and women at the Naval Academy and then exchange with them in their classrooms. It sent bumps up and down my spine just being there. So I would encourage you, if you haven't participated and you want an uplifting experience, go out to the Congress to Campus Program and meet with these young people. As an educator for 22 years before I came here, of course, it just gives me a great opportunity to get up in front and wax eloquently about everything that I don't know anything about and then respond eloquently.

As I tell them every time they ask a question, I'll do the same as I always did in town meetings. No matter what the question is that you ask, whatever it was that I wanted to say this night, I'm going to say whether it has any relevance whatsoever to the question you asked. So if you want an uplifting experience, go and serve on the Congress to Campus Program.

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for his participation.

I would like to yield to another stalwart in the program, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Hochbrueckner.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, and I lend my words of support to what the gentleman has just mentioned. The Congress to Campus Program is a great program because it gets you out there with real kids, real people; and it is a tremendous outreach program that certainly should be encouraged. I was very fortunate to visit Rhode Island College with Jan Meyers and also Fitsburg, Massachusetts, their college with Greg Laughlin. As was pointed out, there are really two goals of the program. The first is to promote careers in government service and secondly to provide an insider view of how does government really work. You would be surprised at some of the questions that you do get from the kids in terms of various things we do, how it works, and what the inside view is.

Of course as you know as former Members, we will tell most because we're open. We don't have an ax to grind. We're willing to share. I think it's a very educational program for the students. By the way, at Rhode Island, I was pleased that they actually expanded the program, so not only did we speak to the usual political science and other classes but also they had a forum for high school students, and then they took us off to the local media.

So it is a real good opportunity to get the message out that people in government are real people who happen to have fallen into this very important position through various mechanisms. We are just ordinary people serving our fellow people and we get there in a variety of ways. That is the kind of thing I think that gets expressed to the students.

As was pointed out over the last 4 years, the program has visited 120 campuses, and we have addressed over 40,000 students, 9,000 alone just in this past year. So it is a great program. If you have participated already, thank you very much. I know you appreciate it, as Bill does. If you haven't, please consider it. It is well worth your time and the time of the people of our Nation. I am also very pleased that my former colleague from New York, Matt McHugh, is being honored today. Congratulations to you, Matt. Thank you for the time.

Mr. SKAGGS. Thank you.

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

Mr. BUECHNER. Thank you, David. And thank you, George and Bill, for your very astute observations.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other activities of the U.S. Association of Former Members which deserve to be highlighted today. One certainly is our annual Statesmanship Award Dinner. It has been chaired so exceptionally over the last few years by Lou Frey of Florida. I would like to now yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Frey, to comment on the dinner that was held this past March.

If I may reclaim my time for just a second, we have a visitor here. We have the chairman of the, we always say, the powerful Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, DAVID DREIER.

Would the gentleman like to address the organization?

Mr. DREIER. What do you think?

Mr. BUECHNER. I think you should.

Mr. DREIER. Thank you very much, Jack. Let me begin by extending congratulations to our friend Matt, and you all are obviously absolutely brilliant in choosing to honor him. As I look around this Chamber, I can't tell you how much I wish many of you were back. I can't tell you which ones exactly, but there are more than a few of you that I wish were back for many, many, many different reasons.

I want to thank Jack and Jim and David. As I listened to George Hochbrueckner and Bill Goodling talk about the Congress to Campus Program, I couldn't help but think about the fact that you all have been so intimately involved and supportive of a program that is taking place today right here in the Capitol, and that is the development of our House Democracy Assistance Commission. A year ago this month, we unveiled this bipartisan commission that Speaker HASTERT and Minority Leader PELOSI came together to form, I think it may have been the last time they met, but the fact is they came together to form this commission which is designed to build on the fact that there are so many emerging democracies all over the world.

We right now are hosting delegations from Macedonia, the Republic of Georgia, Indonesia and the newest country on the face of the Earth that was established in 1999, East Timor. The idea behind this, of course, as so many of you know, was to create over and above the National Endowment for Democracy and the Democratic Institute and the Republican institute, it was to build direct parliament-to-parliament relationships with these new democracies.

Now, I often quip that after they see us in operation, they may want to go back to totalitarianism in their countries, but frankly many have been able to benefit greatly from having spent last week in the States, in congressional districts, in congressional offices, meeting with chambers of commerce, the media, a wide range of other groups and this week here in Washington. At noon today, we are having our farewell gathering for these parliamentarians and we are also going to be expanding this into a number of other countries. I am going to be going to Kenya and Liberia and Lebanon. Obviously, we are going to focus on Afghanistan and Iraq.

I simply wanted to come by to express my appreciation to the many of you who have gotten involved in this very important issue. Obviously, you have the opportunity to take a little more time in working on this. But it is critical for us to do it.

Congratulations. It is great to see you all. Thanks very much for including me. Thanks, Jim.

Mr. SLATTERY. Chairman DREIER, let me just say that we deeply appreciate your leadership in this commission work, and we commend the work of Speaker HASTERT and Minority Leader PELOSI, and we know that you have given invaluable leadership to this commission.

Mr. DREIER. DAVID PRICE is the ranking member. He has worked very hard.

Mr. SLATTERY. And Congressman PRICE of North Carolina, we are aware of his participation, also. We look forward to working with you. Use us. Thank you.

Lou?

Mr. FREY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been asked to talk about two or three things briefly. The first is our Statesmanship Award Dinner. As you are aware, when I was chairman, I had an idea about 9 years ago to do it. I'm trying to figure out how to get out of running the dinner. But this is the ninth one, and it is very successful now. We have institutionalized it thanks to the hard work of so many people. I think we had over 400 people there this year. As you know, we auction off some memorabilia. It's a fun dinner. It has become a Washington institution, really.

For your memory, our first award recipient was Dan Glickman. We had Lee Hamilton, Lynn Martin, Norm Mineta, Vice President CHENEY, Secretary Rumsfeld. Probably the greatest one, they are all great, but the World War II generation one was just incredible. Talk about chills going up and down you. Bob Dole, Sam Gibbons, John Glenn, George McGovern, and Bob Michel all talked. It was just an incredible experience. Then we had John Breaux and, of course, just recently Chris Cox was our honoree.

We have a lot of people helping. For instance, Dan Glickman still helps with an auction item from his association, which is good. And we have on our trip to France got to be friends with a French count whose family goes back to William the Conqueror. He has a chalet over there. He has donated it to the association. Maybe something we should have known in the Congress, or learned, we sold it twice for the same amount of money. Denis de Kergorlay is the gentleman's name. He has become one of our biggest supporters of the association. We get a nice amount of money for it, and everybody is happy. It has been a good dinner, and it has been really our biggest fund-raiser because our dues don't amount to all that much, and we need that money to help run these various programs we have talked about.

We talked about the Congress to Campus Program. One of the complaints that we got early on is, gee, this is great, we learn all these things, but why don't you write it down. Why don't you put something down about all this. It is not in a textbook. So I said, okay, we'll write it down. And we did. With the help of 38 of our members in the House and Senate we wrote a book called Inside the House. University Press published it. It is being used now in a number of schools. I was just told now it is being used in the Ukraine as one of the texts over there. Obviously, it has had an impact and thanks to so many of you who participated.

That's the good news. The bad news is that we're getting complaints that they want something more written. So we are attempting to write a second book on the political rules of the road and how they apply to life. I have sent, I don't know, a lot of letters and some of you so many times you're sick and tired of it, but we have had over 200 and some responses from people. My rules are pretty simple of life and politics. Number one, don't get in a fight with a guy who buys ink by the carload and the second is, and I have been married close to 50 years and this rules applies in politics and at home, if you've got to explain, you're in trouble. Those are my two rules of life.

We have got some very interesting ones, and we are trying to put that book together which hopefully will add to what we're doing. It will probably be another year before we get done. It is not an easy thing to do, the toughest being getting help from you all. I am asking you again, those of you who haven't, please send in your paragraph or page about what your particular rules are.

The third thing I was asked to talk about is a trip to Chile that 14 of us took within, I guess, the last month, month and a half. I had been down there during the Pinochet days when people were disappearing and it was really a dicey time and a dicey place. I hadn't been there in 25 years. I was shocked. It is the jewel of South America. It is free. It has a free press. It has democratic institutions that are in there. They have elected a new President who is described by some people as vegetarian leftist. I had never heard that before, but I think what they were trying to say is that she wasn't too far on either side. She appointed 10 women of the 20 to her Cabinet and she appointed 10 of the opposite party to it. I think she has got an incredible chance to continue to move Chile forward.

The only ominous part that we saw was China. China has signed an agreement to take 70 percent of their copper for the next 5 years. Of course that is their biggest export. The other interesting part is of the profits from copper, 10 percent by their statute goes directly to the military. As you move around Chile, you will see cultural centers that are there now. English is a second language, but now Chinese is a third language; and I would suggest to you that Chile, this is just the tip of the iceberg with what is going on throughout South America with Chile. We have written a report about it. If you want to get a hold of Pete on that, we can give you a more detailed report on Chile.

Just a couple of other things. Matt, congratulations to you. It is certainly well deserved. We are so pleased that your family is here to see you honored as you should be. The other thing I have to say is that, Jack, you have been through some terrible tough times. You have our respect and our admiration and our affection for what you have gone through and also for the fact that you have continued to give great leadership to this association even in the darkest days. Thank you very much, Mr. President, for what you have done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUECHNER. Thank you, Lou, and I thank you for your kind personal remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the association has some other wonderful things that we have done. I want to thank Lou for the work, obviously, that he has done, the invaluable leadership. But we would like to highlight a few of the other activities. Just so the people up in the gallery understand who we are, we are former Members of Congress. One day a year, the Speaker is good enough to allow this Chamber to be used for us for our annual report back to the Congress of the things that we have been allowed to do in our facility as former Members.

In October of last year, the association hosted a fall meeting in Kansas City, Missouri. We brought together a number of former Members and their spouses and spent a long weekend in my beloved home State. Our main focus was to go to the Truman memorial library in Independence. We had the great opportunity to listen to former Member of Congress Ken Hechler of West Virginia who started his career as an adviser to President Truman. It was a great but an informal way of connecting with old friends and have the association represented in a place other than Washington. We have had a golf tournament, picnics, a

Christmas party for the first time in 2005. I guess you have to call it a holiday party. The association benefits tremendously from the efforts and leadership of many people.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. President, might I interrupt you for just a moment?

Mr. BUECHNER. I yield back to the Speaker.

Mr. SLATTERY. I would like to just acknowledge the presence of the distinguished minority leader, the gentlewoman from California. If Congresswoman PELOSI would like to give greetings, we certainly will welcome that.

Congresswoman PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much. So what's this, a Democrat in the Speaker's chair? This is a very friendly group.

Good morning to all of you. Jack, thank you for your leadership and the good work of the Former Members Association. Jim, it is wonderful to see you there. It is wonderful to see all of you here.

Thank you for coming. Thank you for your ongoing interest. You know that we consider you on both sides of the aisle intellectual resources to us in the Congress. We also quote you. We build upon your good work. It is just really a source of great encouragement to us that you continue to have the interest to come back to this place.

All of us who have ever served here who have had the privilege of stepping onto this floor and represent the American people, what a great privilege. It is a banner of honor for life. I come here on behalf of the House Democrats to bring you greetings, to welcome you here, to thank you for being an ongoing source of inspiration to us, and also to say that, as I have said before, all of us who serve here consider ourselves colleagues of people that we never even served with before because we have all shared this great honor.

On their behalf, I am privileged to say what a privilege it is for us to call you colleague. I am glad that we are also joined by our distinguished minority whip, Democratic whip, I always use the name Democratic, Democratic whip STENY HOYER of Maryland. I see so many friends here again on both sides of the aisle. I look forward to chatting with you individually but also look forward to what comes from your meeting here. It will be very important to us.

Thank you again for being here.

Mr. SLATTERY. Thank you, Leader PELOSI. It is great to see you.

Mr. BUECHNER. I thank the gentlewoman for her kind remarks.

I want to thank my fellow officers of the association for their energy, dedication and invaluable counsel during my 2 years as president: Jim Slattery, who is in the chair as the Speaker pro tem; Jay Rhodes, who spoke earlier; Dennis Hertel and Larry LaRocco, who is the president emeritus. Let me also thank the members of our board of directors and our counselors for providing excellent guidance and support throughout the year. In addition, we benefit greatly from the wonderful work of our auxiliary, led so ably by Debi Alexander.

Mr. Speaker, to administer all these programs takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals. We expanded our team from three to four full-time employees during 2005, another sign of how active and successful a year it has been for the association: Maya Yamazaki, our program officer; Rebecca Zylberman, who is the member relations manager; Sudha David-Wilp, the program director; and Peter Weichlein, executive director. Would you all stand and have the members give you a round of applause.

This has been a great 2 years. I have been honored to be in this position as the president. You have heard some comments about the loss of my wife who is going to be honored tomorrow and remembered at the auxiliary luncheon. I am sorry she is not here today to conclude my term.

In addition to all the programs and projects we reported on today, in addition to keeping all contact information about former Members of Congress as current and up to date as possible, in addition to identifying grant-giving institutions to fund programs such as the study groups, in addition to all that and more, our staff has organized and executed that office move I spoke to. We are now on K Street, but we are not lobbyists, so that works okay. We are in a bigger space.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HERTEL. I just want to thank on behalf of all the association members you, Jack, for all the work that you have done for making this organization so effective. There is so much that we can talk about that the members have volunteered their time internationally and around this Nation at college campuses. Every program has increased so much, the funding for these programs has increased, the volunteer support, the members' time, because of you, the dedication you have given this association, all the time that you have given it, even through these most, most difficult times. I just want to thank you on behalf of the association and give our heartfelt best to you and your son Charlie.

Mr. BUECHNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we are very pleased to have with us today several former legislators from our neighbor to the north, Canada. It gives me great pleasure to welcome Patrick Gagnon, Fred Mifflin, Barry Turner, and the Reverend Canon Derwyn Shea, all former members of the Canadian Parliament. Would you four please stand so we can give you a round of applause. We are honored that you have made the trip to join us today and by doing so reaffirm the great relationship that our organizations have.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my sad duty to inform the House of those people who served in Congress and who have passed away since our report last year. They are:

Robert Badham of California,
J. Glenn Beall, Jr. of Maryland,
Albert Henry Bosch of New York,
Clair Callan of Nebraska,
Ronald Cameron of California,
Caroll Campbell, Jr. of South Carolina,
Elford Cederberg of Michigan,
William Dorn of South Carolina,
John Erlenborn, past president of this association, of Illinois,
J. James Exon of Nebraska,
Joseph Karth of Minnesota,
Hastings Keith of Massachusetts,
Richard Kelly of Florida,
John Lesinski of Michigan,
Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota,
John McFall of California,
Donald McGinley of Nebraska,
Lloyd Meeds of Washington,
John Monagan of Connecticut,
Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin,
James Jerrell Pickle of Texas, also known as Jake,
Bertram Podell of New York,
Charles Porter of Oregon,
William Proxmire of Wisconsin,
Edward Roybal of California,
Dan Schaefer of Colorado,
James Scheuer of New York,
Stanley Tupper of Maine,
Richard Vander Veen of Michigan.

I ask all of you, including the visitors in the gallery, to rise for a moment of silence as we pay our respect to the memory of these citizens.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, as you know each year the association presents a Distinguished Service Award to an outstanding public servant who is a former Member of Congress. The award rotates between parties, as do our officers. Last year we presented the award to an outstanding Republican, former Senator Dan Coats. This year, we are very pleased to be honoring a remarkable Democrat, a remarkable public servant, former Representative Matt McHugh of the State of New York. Matt McHugh represented the 27th and 28th Congressional Districts of New York in the United States Congress from 1975 to 1992. He served on a wide range of congressional committees, including Appropriations, Intelligence, Standards of Official Conduct, Veterans' Affairs, Agriculture and Interior. He chaired the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus and the Democratic Study Group.

His colleagues dubbed him ''the conscience of the House.'' One of his last congressional duties was to preside over a bipartisan panel set up to investigate abuses of the House Bank that gripped the House in the early 1990s and brought discredit unfortunately upon this House. His post-congressional career includes serving as vice president at Cornell University and being counsel to the president of the World Bank. If you ask him his most challenging, yet gratifying, experience after leaving Congress, I am sure he

will tell you it is the 2 years he was president of the Association of Former Members of Congress.

Matt McHugh personifies what a Member of Congress ought to be because of his integrity, his willingness to work with Members from both sides of the aisle for the good of the country, and because of his dedication to the ideals of deliberative representation. I would like Matt to come forward here.

This plaque that we are going to present to Matt is inscribed as follows: The 2006 Distinguished Service Award is presented by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress to the Honorable Matthew F. McHugh for his long and illustrious career in the House of Representatives, and for his laudable efforts as counsel to the president of the World Bank. During his entire career in public service, Matt McHugh exemplified the highest standard of integrity, dignity, and intellect. He inspired those serving with him and left a legacy for those serving after him. His beloved State of New York sent to Congress one of the best and brightest ever to walk these hallowed Halls of the Capitol and his former colleagues applaud and salute him for his distinguished and dignified service.

Mr. MCHUGH. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Jack, for your very gracious remarks and for this recognition.

Thanks to all of you for being here this morning. We want to thank you, Jack, and the officers and staff for the great work that you do in leading the association and in making those programs that we heard about this morning work so well. On a personal note, I also want to say on behalf of my wife, Alanna, and myself how much we admire you and, as the Speaker said, our thoughts and prayers are with you and Charlie during these very tough times.

I also want to express appreciation to my wife and my family, some of whom are here in the gallery this morning. As we all know, politics is an exhilarating, serious profession with a lot of rewards and satisfactions along the way. But most of those rewards go to the candidate and the officeholder and precious few go to the spouse and the family. They make enormous contributions, but they are very seldom recognized. So today is a day to say thank you to Alanna and to my family for their patience and understanding and support at all times in my life, but especially during those very hectic political years that we are all so familiar with.

As I said, I am grateful for this recognition, but I am very much aware that the honor could as easily go to anybody sitting here. As I look around the Chamber, I see so many people who have contributed so much to our country and to the Congress. One of the great things about our association is that it gives us an opportunity to continue to serve an institution that we love. I see so many of you who have done that, during your years here and afterwards as well. The association brings us together for a variety of reasons. We get to see old friends. We reflect upon some of the experiences we shared together here. We learn something new about what is happening in the world today. But most importantly the programs of the association give us a chance to continue to serve in some small measure the institution that we do love and that is so important to the lifeblood of this country, the Congress.

We are able in some small measure to increase public awareness of how important Congress remains to the country. We have heard many of the programs described this morning, some of which serve that purpose very well but none more important, I think, than the Congress to Campus Program. I know many of you have participated in those campus visits that have been already described. Bill Goodling and I went together recently to Amherst College, and as always we were really touched by how impressive the young generation is, idealistic, bright.

But at the same time given the kind of coverage that government and politics gets today and the other distractions and pressures young people have in their lives, there is a real risk that many of them will not really take a real serious interest in public service. Of course, that would be a great tragedy for the country because clearly the future of the country rests with them. It rests with young people like my own granddaughter who is here today who is going off to college in the fall. And so the Congress to Campus Program gives us a chance to reach out to those young people to explain why public service is important and rewarding, to demonstrate among other things that Republicans and Democrats who serve together can actually talk and discuss issues thoughtfully and constructively, and to encourage them to really engage in public service and community service when their school days are over.

I think we can be grateful to our association for giving us that opportunity, not only in the Congress to Campus Program but in many other ways as well. I know that we are very limited on time. We are almost ready to abandon the Chamber, so I would like to close simply by thanking all of you for your work with the association, for your continuing service to the Congress and the country, for the recognition that you have given me today, and for being with us to share this very special moment.

Thank you so much.

Mr. BUECHNER. Matt, we also are presenting you with a scrapbook filled with letters of congratulations and little notes and memorabilia from your good friends from across the years that you have served with in this Congress, just another additional measure of our respect for you and the compassion that you have always held for the people of the great country and your district.

Mr. MCHUGH. Thanks so much, Jack.

Mr. BUECHNER. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield back to the Chair for some closing remarks.

Mr. SLATTERY. Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, let the Chair again congratulate Matt McHugh. It is great to see Alanna here today and the McHugh family. We welcome you. Matt, let me just say that I don't think anyone who I had the honor of serving with brought greater credit to this institution than you. I always viewed you as someone, and I am sure this view was shared by your colleagues on both sides of the political aisle, as someone who went to work every day here trying to not only make the decisions that you thought were best for the people of New York and the people of this country. That sense of duty and commitment to our country was deeply admired by all of us who had an opportunity to serve with you. To sum up, I would just say that you are a public servant in the finest sense of the word. We are honored to know you. We are honored to recognize you here today. Matt McHugh, good luck to you.

Before we wrap up today, I would also like to again associate myself with the remarks of others made here today about Jack Buechner and his dedicated service to this association. Jack, without your leadership over the last 2 years and your dedication to the objectives of this association, we would not have seen the progress that we have seen with the Congress to Campus Program. We would not have seen the progress that we have also seen with our efforts in the global democracy building work and the election-monitoring efforts around the world. We recognize you for your dedicated leadership through a most difficult and painful personal ordeal and time in your life. We have the deepest respect for you. We thank you from the bottom of our hearts for all you have done to advance the goals of the Association of Former Members of Congress. Jack, good luck to you, my friend. We look forward to your further participation in the work of the association. Jack Buechner, let's give him another round of applause.

The Chair again wishes to thank all of those former Members that are here today and give you all another opportunity to record your presence if you did not do that at the beginning of the events here today. The Chair also wishes to thank all the former Members of the House for their presence.

I am advised that the House will reconvene 15 minutes after the bells ring.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), the House continued in recess.

□ 1055

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches per side.

RAILROAD TO NOWHERE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the President this week threatened to veto the emergency supplemental spending bill currently under consideration in the Senate, and rightfully so.

Members of the other body have been busy adding billions of dollars in nonemergency pork to this emergency spending bill, and the price tag is simply unjustifiable.

One particularly egregious earmark seeks $700 million in Federal funds to move a railroad track that has just been repaired at the cost of $250 million. Supporters of the project say the rail line needs to be moved because it is vulnerable to hurricane damage. Yet the proposed new location is just a short distance inland and was greatly damaged by Katrina last year.

The real reason supporters want this newly repaired rail line moved is to make room for a casino gambling development along the gulf coast.

Mr. Speaker, relocating a newly updated rail line to an equally vulnerable area simply to make room for casino gambling is not an emergency. The taxpayer should not have to pick up the tab for this railroad to nowhere.

I urge the President to stand by his veto threat unless pork like this is removed from the bill.

REPUBLICAN NOTE TO LOBBYISTS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, investigators have recently uncovered a letter from the Republican leadership to special interest lobbyists.

Dear Lobbyists,

How do I love thee?

Let me count the ways.

I love thee to the depth of thy oil wells, for thou shall have $14.5 billion to drill them.

I love thee to the heights of thy drug profits,

For the Medicare bill gives you $139 billion in profits.

I love thee for thy golf courses, private jets and retirement jobs.

I love thee for thy donations, libations and vacations.

For now we must part, and I call it reform.

But remember, in December, once we get past November,

The travel ban expires, and I'll meet you at the tees.

Yours forever, cause I can't quit you,

The Republican Congress.

SIMPLE QUESTION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, along with the rising gas prices over the last few weeks, we have also seen the rise of Democratic demagoguery. For the moment, though, I would like the Democrats to put aside this demagoguery and answer a simple question: What have you done to help lower gas prices?

I know that House Republicans have been working hard to lower the cost of gasoline over the mid- and long term. We have passed the Gasoline for America's Security Act which increases U.S. fuel supply by encouraging new refineries, bans price gouging, promotes conservation.

House Republicans have also passed the Energy Policy Act which allows new domestic oil and gas exploration and development, increases conservation, and embraces new fuel choices.

That is what the Republicans have done. The Democrats, on the other hand, have opposed building new refineries, have opposed drilling in ANWR and, in fact, voted against both of these bills.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have worked hard to address America's energy needs. And the Democrats? Well, I think we have our answer. They have not done much.

ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there is no small amount of irony that Republicans are now rushing to investigate high gas prices and professing themselves to be on the side of the consumer.

What is important is not what they have said in the last couple of days, but what they have done for the entire time they have been in power here in Washington, D.C. It is outrageous that the same people who are now decrying high gas prices were lavishing billions of dollars in subsidies on the same oil industry a few months ago, despite already bloated profits.

In the 1990s the Republicans even passed legislation that forbade the Department of Transportation to even study higher fuel efficiency, something that would significantly reduce demand today.

And they have expressed no outrage that the American taxpayer is being cheated out of fair payment for the oil and gas that is being taken from public lands by these same large companies.

There are real solutions. Invest in conservation, the only way to reduce immediate dependence on expensive foreign oil now. Shift the billions of dollars in oil and gas companies to renewable and alternative energy sources, and insist that the American taxpayer be given full value for the billions of dollars of oil and gas taken from public lands.

□ 1100

LONE STAR VOICE: BILLY MINX

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, another Lone Star voice from my district. Billy Minx in Channelview, Texas, e-mailed me on Tuesday. This is what he had to say about those illegally in America:

''In the recent immigration protests; the first protests showed the true intent of the mass of these illegal immigrants. The overwhelming majority of the flags were Mexican flags. These people are loyal to Mexico. I have a neighbor down the street who is a naturalized U.S. citizen from Mexico, and he flat out told me if the U.S. and Mexico were at war with each other, he would fight for Mexico.

''We may be a Nation of immigrants, but the majority of Americans were born here and their parents were born here. My great, great, great, great, great Grandfather John C. Hale was killed at the Battle of San Jacinto in 1836 defeating Santa Anna and Mexico (and thus making Texas an independent country). He is one of nine Texans buried there on the battlefield.

''Now my elected officials want to simply hand Texas back to Mexico. It's a traitorous act what is about to happen in this Congress. I pray you will not be an accomplice.''

Mr. Speaker, Congress has an obligation to prevent the illegal colonization of this Nation.

And that's just the way it is.

BUSH RX DRUG TAX: EIGHTEEN DAYS UNTIL TAX TAKES EFFECT

(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. Mr. Speaker, if House Republicans really want to help America's seniors, they would join us in reversing a proposal in the Republican prescription drug plan that would penalize any senior who chooses a private drug plan after May 15.

As this calendar shows, we have 18 days left. If House Republicans do not support our efforts to extend the deadline until the end of the year, millions of seniors will face a prescription drug tax that they must pay every month for the rest of their lives.

Over 14 million seniors still have not chosen a plan. Some are frustrated, confused by dozens of plans they have to choose from. Others have heard the horror stories of seniors not having access to drugs they were promised or seniors being overcharged for some of their medication. Some of these seniors will eventually want to choose a

plan, but they should not be forced into making that tough decision by May 15.

It is time House Republicans stand up and support America's seniors. Reject the President's prescription drug tax. And as we mark off another day on the calendar, Republicans only have 18 days to make the right decision.

ASK THE LIBERALS WHY WE ARE PAYING HIGHER PRICES AT THE PUMP

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, our constituents are asking exactly the right question: Why are gas prices so high?

Well, I will tell you. There are liberal Members of this body for the past three decades that have voted to prevent domestic exploration for oil. They have also worked to make it virtually impossible to build new refineries, and they have succeeded. We have not built a new refinery in this country since 1976.

This week we have watched the Democrats stand around wringing their hands about high gas prices and blaming every Republican in sight. But this is not a partisan issue, it is an American issue, and people need to know the truth is in the voting.

Last year we passed the GAS Act with not a single Democratic vote in the House. Not one. That bill would have streamlined the overly burdensome permitting and regulatory work that goes into getting a refinery. It would have made price gouging a Federal crime. The bill got no liberal support here in the House. Now it is in the Senate.

Americans have only to ask the liberals why they are paying so much at the pump.

UNDERAGE DRINKING

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, April is Alcohol Awareness Month. Therefore, I want to highlight the crisis of underage drinking in this country.

Every month 11 million youth between the ages of 12 and 20 drink alcohol. Each day over 5,000 kids under the age of 16 take their first drink. Research has shown that these kids are significantly more likely than those who do not drink to become alcoholics, use marijuana, and try cocaine.

Alcohol is also known to impact adolescent brain development and increase risk-taking behavior that results in at least nine teenage deaths a day.

To address this crisis, I sponsored the STOP Act, which makes permanent the national antiunderage drinking media campaign, which is directed at those who have the greatest influence over children: their parents. The bill provides grants to combat underage drinking in our communities and establishes a report card to track States' efforts.

I encourage my colleagues to help stop underage drinking by sponsoring the STOP Act and passing it into law.

ENFORCE OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge our government to start enforcing our immigration laws dealing with alien smuggling.

It is a felony, punishable by a minimum of 3 years in prison, to bring an alien into the United States for financial gain. These alien smugglers, also called ''coyotes,'' get approximately $1,500 per illegal immigrant smuggled into the U.S.

On my recent trip to the Mexico border, Border Patrol agents in California told me they have arrested the same coyotes 20 times, but they are not prosecuted. The pathetic failure of the U.S. attorney in San Diego to prosecute alien smugglers who have been arrested 20 times is a demoralizing slap in the face to Border Patrol agents who risk their lives every day. This U.S. attorney has, however, recently prosecuted someone for selling a Mark McGwire baseball card with a forged signature.

Here is a tip: Stop worrying about baseball cards and start worrying about our national security and enforcing our immigration laws.

PRICE GOUGING

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, today around the country we see rising prices for American consumers at the pump and for heating costs at home. As the price of gas has doubled, profits for Big Oil and gas companies have tripled, and while at the same time American families' incomes have remained stagnant.

Instead of additional handouts to big oil companies, we need to take steps to keep gas prices down. Simply put, we need to crack down on price gouging.

The Democrats have a good idea on this one. Congressman STUPAK from Michigan has an anti-price-gouging bill that will not only address the issue of price gouging, but will also give Federal agencies the authority to prosecute oil companies engaged in such practices involving gasoline, home heating oil, and natural gas.

That is why I urge the Republican leadership to do the right thing. Bring this legislation to the floor. The American people cannot afford to wait any longer, and this Congress needs to act.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4975, LOBBYING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 783 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 783

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 4975) to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, 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 Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on the Judiciary, Rules, and Government Reform now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print dated April 21, 2006, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further 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. 2. In the engrossment of H.R. 4975, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 513, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 4975;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 4975 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 513 to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

SEC. 3. After passage of H.R. 4975, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table S. 2349 and to consider the Senate bill in the House. All points of order against consideration of the Senate bill are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4975 (as

engrossed pursuant to section 2 of this resolution). All points of order against that motion are waived. If the motion is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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 the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. Speaker, as we all know very well, a few recent disgraceful scandals involving members of both political parties have cast a pall over the American people's faith in their Congress. The actions of a few have undermined our effectiveness and shaken the trust of our constituents.

Bold, responsible, commonsense reform of our current lobbying and ethics laws is clearly needed. We owe it to our constituents. We owe it to ourselves. We owe it to this institution. This is not a partisan issue. Let me say once again, Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. It is an issue that goes to the integrity of the United States Congress, and every single Member has a stake in it.

When Speaker HASTERT and I kicked off the effort for lobbying and ethics reforms in January, we promised an exhaustive and bipartisan process. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what has happened. Members were asked for their suggestions. All ideas were thrown on the table. And, Mr. Speaker, every idea was considered. In fact, we had hoped to have this bill on the floor earlier, but we were determined not to short-circuit debate and this process. We wanted every idea and every provision to be fully and carefully deliberated.

At the Rules Committee we conducted three original jurisdiction hearings. We heard from 12 outside expert witnesses, and we took testimony from many Members. The bill moved through regular order, and five different committees held markups.

Mr. Speaker, this entire process has been thorough, deliberate, and bipartisan. It has included a tremendous amount of input from Members on both sides of the aisle, from our constituents, and from experts on this institution and from a number of outside organizations. We have followed a legislative path that is fitting for our goal of enhancing the integrity of this great institution. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my Democratic colleagues and to my Republican colleagues for their involvement and their input that they have had in this process.

Today we will consider the result of this nearly 4-month-long, bipartisan reform effort, H.R. 4975, the Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006. This legislation aims to uphold the highest standards of integrity when it comes to Congress's interaction with outside groups. This legislation focuses on transparency and accountability.

□ 1115

It makes it harder to abuse the rules and easier to enforce them. It focuses, Mr. Speaker, on bright lines of right and wrong and tough consequences for crossing those lines.

With every single provision, we are erring on the side of integrity. We are focusing on the need for the highest level of integrity. And with every single provision, we take an approach of the more information the better.

Specifically, lobbyists will be required to file their disclosure forms more often, with more detail and online.

This bill fulfills the public's right to know who is seeking to influence Congress. Putting lobbyist disclosure reports on the Internet will empower voters and improve oversight much more effectively than adding pages to the already thick book of rules. Unlike today, when lobbyist reports are hard to find and hard to follow, this bill will make the information easy to access, easy to search and easy to sort on the Web.

We have also added tough consequences for not playing by the rules. The penalties for lobbyists who fail to disclose have been doubled from $50,000 to $100,000, and a criminal penalty provision has been added. Knowingly and willfully failing to comply with the provisions of the act could result in up to 3 years in prison.

And because these reports are only meaningful if they contain accurate information, we have increased oversight. The House Inspector General will perform random audits of reports and is empowered to refer violations by lobbyists to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

H.R. 4975 also reforms the earmark process by building on the procedural reforms being implemented by the Appropriations Committee, reforms, Mr. Speaker, that under the leadership of Chairman JERRY LEWIS have seen a reduction of earmarks by 37 percent.

As it stands now, earmarks can be added to bills anonymously and without debate. This fuels public mistrust and encourages inflated spending in Congress. This bill requires sponsors of earmarks to be listed in appropriations bills. It also allows a point of order to be brought against appropriation bills and conference reports that do not include a list of earmarks and their sponsors. Mr. Speaker, if a Member feels strongly enough about a proposed earmark, they need to be willing to attach their name to it.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel very strongly about this, and I will not be supportive of a conference report that comes back on this issue that does not include broad earmark reform, including not only appropriations, but the authorizing process as well.

H.R. 4975 enhances disclosure with regard to Members who seek jobs in the private sector. The bill requires more transparency during employment compensation negotiations to avoid the perception and possibility of unethical behavior.

This legislation takes a tough line on privately funded travel by banning it for the remainder of the 109th Congress. Many privately funded trips are serious, educational, and valuable. Some are not. We need to arrive at reform that allows Members to get out from under the Capitol dome, while at the same time draw the line on trivial junkets.

There are strong opinions on this provision. Many Democrats, including those with whom I serve on the Rules Committee, do not want a travel ban. But there is widespread agreement that the current system is ripe for abuse and needs to be tightened. In fact, there is a strong bipartisan amendment to address this issue, and again we will have a very rigorous debate and a number of amendments that will be considered that will address concerns like the issue of travel.

Another important piece of this reform package concerns pensions of former Members convicted of specific crimes committed while serving in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill, if Members commit crimes, such as bribery or fraud, they lose the government's contributions to their congressional pension. Taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize the retirement of former Members who are convicted of crimes.

Finally, because one of the primary aims of this legislation is to increase accountability, we have greatly enhanced ethics training for staff and Members. Our aim is for everyone to know and understand the rules and the guidelines. Member and staff familiarity with ethics requirements will go a long way toward making sure rules are not broken in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the product of intensive study and deliberation. It is bold; it covers a lot of ground; and it restores balance to a system that has and was being abused.

We have done all of this while making sure that we protect the first amendment right of every American to petition their government. Input from constituents and advocates is essential for effective governing, and I am confident that as we seek to level the playing field and facilitate open government, we have not undermined the constitutionally protected right for the public to interact with their elected leaders.

Mr. Speaker, as with all legislation that reaches the floor, compromises have been made along the way that reflect the will of both Democrats and Republicans. Every attempt to address Members' concerns has been made over the past 4 months. I should also note that this rule will provide the opportunity for, as I said, further debate on

amendments that deal with some of the larger issues that have been brought forward.

Now, despite this outreach and attempt to find consensus, I am fully aware that some misgivings about specific provisions remain. I would simply ask each Member to look at the bill as a whole and answer these questions: Does this bill increase transparency? Does it increase accountability? Does it put more information in the hands of the American people? Does it protect the first amendment right of citizens to petition their government? And does it strengthen the integrity of the United States Congress?

I am absolutely convinced that the answer to every single one of those questions is an overwhelming ''yes.'' This bill is a vast improvement over the status quo.

Mr. Speaker, today, Members of the House can show that our desires for meaningful reform and for upholding the integrity of Congress are stronger than partisan divisions and political calculations. We have the opportunity and we have the duty to turn our voices for reform into votes for reform.

I urge my colleagues to vote for an ethical and effective Congress that is worthy of the public trust. I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, after an interminable era of scandal, this Congress was given the greatest opportunity in a generation to change the way business is done in Washington. We were given a chance to truly make a difference and to do something lasting. We were given the chance to help the citizens of this Nation believe in their government once again.

But that chance has been squandered, because this Congress has failed. And in so doing, the hypocrisy and cynicism displayed today by the majority of the House will be neither missed nor forgotten by the American people.

We have before us the Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006. It is supposed to be a reform bill. But you can't be bold enough to reform if you don't muster the courage to address the problems.

The corruption of this Republican-led Congress is beyond debate. The American people don't trust it anymore. Fewer than 30 percent approve the job it is doing. The only remaining question was how the members of the leadership were going to respond, how committed were they going to be to reforming their bankrupt philosophy of government?

This rule and this bill give us the all-too predictable answer to this burning question: This leadership doesn't want reform, and they just aren't going to allow it.

As virtually every outside observer has noted in recent days, this legislation is a sham. It won't do anything to reduce influence peddling in Washington or to purge this body of the corruption that has infected it so deeply.

I know we are going to hear much more on this later, but what I really want my fellow Americans to focus on right now is something just as telling as the contents of this bill, and that is the process by which it was created.

As I and my Democratic colleagues have said again and again throughout the entire Congress, a corrupt legislative process produces corrupt legislation. If bills are written and changed behind closed doors, then there will be no way to know what is hidden in them. If amendments to bills are rejected, not because of their contents, but because of the party they come from, then democracy will have been denied.

If the Members of the body are committed to undermining the two-centuries-old rules of the House, they are also intent on undermining the will and the needs of the citizens of this country. And so it has been with this rule, and with this bill.

When the bill faced an original jurisdiction markup on April 5, Democrats presented numerous amendments to it in an attempt to actually give it some substance, and all of these amendments were defeated on a party-line vote.

During its markup, the Judiciary Committee was the only body that adopted any bipartisan amendments on this legislation. Democrats successfully introduced amendments in the Judiciary Committee requiring lobbyists to disclose more of their activities, such as fund-raisers for candidates and parties that they fund honoring Members of Congress.

But the bill we thought we had when we left for recess 2 weeks ago is not the one we saw when we came back. Most of the amendments accepted by the Judiciary Committee had mysteriously disappeared while we were away. The one that survived was done away with last night, a self-executing rule. The majority decided to do this on their own, without telling anyone and while nobody was looking. It was an indefensible abuse of power.

My Democrat colleagues and I also offered a substitute to this bill that addressed the many errors it is silent on. Among its many components, our legislation would establish a new Office of Public Integrity to audit and to investigate compliance with lobbying disclosure rules, because it doesn't matter if you have transparency if no one is enforcing the rules and making sure that they comply.

It would have prevented special interest provisions from being added into bills in the dead of night by requiring all legislation to be made public 24 hours before it is voted on.

Last night in the Rules Committee, my Republican friends had one last chance to open up the process and allow some real debate on the bill. But in typical fashion, they blocked a host of significant amendments, including 20 of the 21 amendments submitted by Democrats. They wouldn't allow our tougher substitute on the bill to even be considered, which means, frankly, that half of the country is disenfranchised in this debate today and we are only able to debate this hollow sham of a reform bill.

So I ask my friends in the majority, what kind of reform is that? What conclusions are you asking the American people to draw from this kind of behavior? When you don't even allow the body to consider and debate alternative approaches to reforming Congress, what are you hiding from? When you subvert our democratic process and at the same time pretend to be the party of reform, how can you possibly expect us to trust you any longer? When your leadership doesn't even have faith in the legislative process, how can the American people have faith in them?

Lobbyists are not the reason our Congress no longer works for working Americans. Congress is the problem. No lobbyist can get into the room unless a Member allows it.

We heard so much in January about reform that was coming. But here we are, 4 months later, doing exactly the same thing and producing exactly the same result: bad bills passed through a broken House; bills just like this one, that have a catchy name but don't deliver what they promise; bills that aren't written for the people of the Nation, but rather for special interests.

No wonder the American people are so angry. Their congressional leadership is so clearly out of touch. Every member of the majority should be ashamed of this bill today. At least then you will have something in common with the American people that you profess to serve.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. This legislation, while not perfect, is a step in the right direction. What it does is begin to draw brighter lines for Members and for staff and for lobbyists and the public. It increases oversight, and it increases accountability.

The bill also addresses earmarks. Too often earmarks are placed in legislation at the behest of lobbyists, many times at the last minute to avoid scrutiny. This bill would require that lists of earmarks in legislation be made public before votes on bills or conference reports, and that any Member could bring a point of order against the list of earmarks and subject it to a 30-minute debate.

□ 1130

Reform would be meaningless without changes in the way earmarks are

handled. We need fiscal restraint. We need common sense when it comes to the budget.

The future of all Americans depends on an economy free of crippling deficits, free of crippling tax hikes, and free of a skyrocketing national debt. The extent of which earmarks unnecessarily burden the American taxpayers is unprecedented. Last year's earmarks amounted to nearly $100 for every man, woman and child in America.

While lobbying reform is necessary to preserve the integrity of our government, earmark reform is vital to our long-term fiscal well-being. Bringing earmarks to the light of day will promote fiscal responsibility, and it is going to promote more effective government as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for lobbying reform.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for the United States House of Representatives. This rule, quite frankly, is an insult to every single Member of this body. This rule should be open, and instead this rule is typically restrictive. This rule should be defeated.

The underlying bill, contrary to what you have heard here today, is not a reflection of bipartisan deliberation, because the truth is that deliberation is all but dead in this House. What everyone knows, and this leadership does not want to acknowledge, is that there is a direct connection between the corruption that has become so commonplace and the breakdown of the deliberative process.

The sweetheart deals for special interests, liability protection for big drug companies, tax breaks for big oil companies at a time when these companies are gouging Americans at the pump, they get slipped into bills without the knowledge of the majority in this House, Democrat and Republican. Why? Because the Rules Committee regularly waives the rules that requires that Members have at least 3 days to review the legislation.

They waive the rules that allow us to read the bill before it comes to the floor. Conference committees meet in secret. Big-ticket items are even put into bills after conference committees are closed. You can pass all the rules you want, but if you don't follow them, what good are they?

The Rules Committee did hold a series of hearings on this bill, and speaker after speaker expressed their concerns with the way this House is being run. And yet the underlying bill does nothing to open up the process. The underlying bill does nothing to shine some light on this corrupt process. Nothing will change as a result of this bill. Norm Ornstein, the congressional scholar, testified before the Rules Committee and he said, the problem goes beyond corrupt lobbyists or the relationship between lobbyists and lawmakers. It gets to a legislative process that has lost the transparency, accountability and deliberation that are at the core of the American system.

The failure to abide by basic rules and norms has contributed, I believe, to a loss of sensitivity among many Members and leaders about what is and what is not appropriate. Three-hour votes, 1,000-page-plus bills sprung on the floor with no notice, conference reports changed in the dead of night, self-executing rules that suppress debate along with an explosion of closed rules are just a few of the practices that have become common and are a distortion of regular order, and yet this bill does not even address any of those issues.

I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if you want to show some bipartisanship, if you want to promote a process that has some integrity, this should be an open rule. All Members should have an opportunity to come here and offer amendments to this bill to improve the quality of deliberations on this House floor. They should be able to come and to offer amendments to clean this place up.

This rule is an outrage. Of all of the bills that we have considered here, if any one of them deserves an open rule, it is this. This is about the rules that govern this House. Vote ''no'' on this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). The resolution is withdrawn.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1541

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

VACATING ORDERING OF YEAS AND NAYS ON H. CON. RES. 357 AND H. CON. RES. 349

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ordering of the yeas and nays be vacated with respect to the motion to suspend the rules and adopt H. Con. Res. 357, and the motion to suspend the rules and adopt H. Con. Res. 349, to the end that the Chair put the question de novo on each.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 357.

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.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

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. 349.

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. 4975, LOBBYING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 783 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 783

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 4975) to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, 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 Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for

amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on the Judiciary, Rules, and Government Reform now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print dated April 21, 2006, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further 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. 2. In the engrossment of H.R. 4975, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 513, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 4975;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 4975 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 513 to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

SEC. 3. After passage of H.R. 4975, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table S. 2349 and to consider the Senate bill in the House. All points of order against consideration of the Senate bill are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4975 (as engrossed pursuant to section 2 of this resolution). All points of order against that motion are waived. If the motion is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

□ 1545

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 the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it was 11:00 this morning that I first called up the rule for consideration of this extraordinarily important lobbying and ethics reform measure. As I began my remarks, I talked about the fact that over the past 4 months, we have been meeting with outside organizations. We have been meeting with Democrats and Republicans in this House. We have been meeting with congressional experts to glean as much information as we possibly can from a wide range of sources.

The point I want to make is we began at about 11:00 this morning. I felt at that point we had a great deal of input over the past 4 months since we began dealing with this critically important issue which has to do with the credibility of this institution. As we began that debate, I thought why don't we get a little more input; and so for that reason, I moved to withdraw the resolution, and that is exactly what we did. We decided to proceed with more input from Members on this issue. And having gained more information, more input from our colleagues, we are now reconvening and further considering this important measure.

You know, the issue of reform is something of which I have been very, very proud over the years I have been privileged to serve here. The Republican Party is the party of reform. We have led reform initiatives for Congress after Congress, and what we are doing here today is another indication of our strong commitment to the issue of reform.

We know that there is a problem of corruption. We also know that it is not a one-party issue. It is a problem that has existed on both sides of the aisle. I remember a quote from our very distinguished former colleague who served as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dan Rostenkowski, who one time said, You know, if everybody is unhappy with a piece of legislation, it is probably a pretty good bill.

And that is exactly what is the case right here. I do not know of anyone who is ecstatic with this piece of legislation. I have read the editorials out there from some of the people who have provided me with input on this issue.

I have listened to Democrats, and I will tell you, since January, I could not come to the House floor without a Democrat coming up to me and saying, You cannot ban privately funded travel. We must continue to maintain privately funded travel. It is critical. And yes, I have heard similar statements from our side of the aisle.

I mention the fact that there was input from outside organizations. Some have been very critical of this legislation, Mr. Speaker. But I am pleased that some of the harshest critics of this legislation have been able to have a great deal of input in this legislation. I have been very proud to have had meetings with the leadership of Common Cause, Democracy 21 and other organizations.

One of the recommendations that came to us from Mr. Wertheimer was that we prevent registered lobbyists who are former Members of Congress from having access to the House floor and the gym. We, I am very happy to say, with a strong bipartisan vote, were able to make sure that we prevented former Members of Congress who are registered lobbyists from having access to the floor and to the gym.

One of the concerns out there has been the lack of transparency when it comes to the campaign contributions that lobbyists make and the lobbying activity that they engage in. That was another recommendation that was put forward by the leadership of Democracy 21 and Common Cause. I am very pleased that in this legislation we include that issue, and we address it to make sure that transparency and accountability is addressed, and we do bring this forward.

Could we do more? Of course we could do more. I hope in conference we will be able to address these issues when we move ahead with this. I also want to say that the issue of reporting from lobbyists, and it is done right now under current law on a semiannual basis, it was the recommendation of the leadership of Democracy 21 and of Common Cause that we go from semiannual reporting to quarterly reporting.

I know there were a wide range of other recommendations that those and other organizations made that have not been incorporated, but I get back to the argument that we have been able to take a number of very important issues that have been put forward by Democrats and Republicans and include them in this legislation.

Would I like to do more? Sure, I would like to do more. I hope very much that as we take this bill, passing it out of this House and go to a conference with our colleagues in the Senate, that we will be able to do more.

I see the distinguished former chairman of the ethics committee Mr. HEFLEY here, and I know he has a number of concerns. I have already told him that as we take this first step in addressing the issue of moving ahead to a conference, I want to address the concerns that Members have that have not heretofore been addressed in this first process in the legislation and do that.

Now, over the past 4 months we have seen five committees of jurisdiction hold hearings and markups on this issue. The Rules Committee, with which I am the most familiar, held three original jurisdiction hearings, and we held a markup on this legislation. We had 13 outside witnesses who came and provided their recommendations to us, and we had input from a wide range of Members as we went through this process.

I know that our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, on the Government Reform Committee, Mr. HASTINGS, who is chairman of the ethics committee and also has been very involved working with the Rules Committee on this,

and also Mr. EHLERS, chairman of the Administration Committee, have all worked diligently so we can put together a piece of legislation which will allow the American people to have a greater opportunity to see what it is that takes place here, to ensure that the tragic problems of corruption that we have witnessed will never happen again. That is our goal. I believe this legislation provides bold, strong, dynamic reforms which will move us in the direction towards doing just that.

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

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

I would love to ask my good friend from California what great insight he did gain in these last 5 hours, and if it led him to want us to be able to be part of this input and that you would reconsider turning down a Democrat substitute?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say again, as we know very well in this institution, listening to Members talking about a wide range of issues is a very important thing. We have been talking about, over the past few hours, some of the concerns that were raised by a number of our Members.

The issue of increasing transparency and accountability is very important, and I will say that I believe this package with this excellent rule that we are coming forward with to allow us to debate a wide range of issues is the right thing to do and will provide the best structure for our first step as we prepare to move to a conference with our colleagues in the Senate.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry it did not lead to input from our side.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I would say that input from her side has been very important. And, yes, I have over the past few hours been talking to a number of Democrats who have been providing recommendations to me as well, and I thank my friend.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, who does have some input.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California for being able to give that speech with a straight face. I really admire him for it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I was smiling as I presented it.

Mr. OBEY. Well, I thought you were gritting your teeth; but, nonetheless, that is fine.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say I really regret days like this in the House because I love this institution, and I love what this institution is supposed to represent to the American people.

The public wants us to pass significant House reform. Instead, this legislation before us, in my humble view, constitutes consumer fraud masquerading as lobbying reform, and there are two spectacular examples of that.

The most egregious example of the corruption of the process in this House is the way in which conference committees have been substantially corrupted by some of the most powerful people in this body. When you have a package that does not prevent powerful people in this body from adding 30 and 40 pages of new legislation to a conference report without ever having a vote on the conference report, as happened last year on the defense appropriation bill, when you have a reform bill that still allows that to occur, I do not think that is much of a reform bill.

This bill ought to require that any time any item is inserted in a conference report, that that cannot be considered by the House unless there is an open public vote of the conferees beforehand. That is the way you prevent the pharmaceutical industry from being shielded from suit, as happened on the defense bill last year at the behest of the majority leader of the other body.

Let me also say that with respect to earmarks, this bill purports to deal with the problem of earmarks by only going after appropriations earmarks; and yet last year on the authorization bill on highways, there were some 5,000 earmarks, seven times as many as were contained in the comparable appropriation bill. To not do something about authorizing committee earmarks in the process is a joke, in my view.

And then I would point out, to not lay a glove on the special goodies that are tucked into tax bills is even more outrageous. The 1986 tax bill, for instance, included 340 separate transition rules each benefiting a small set of individuals and small, ''little'' businesses like General Motors, Chrysler, Phillips Petroleum and Commonwealth Edison. It provided special deals for sports stadiums in Tampa, San Francisco, Denver, Cleveland, and Los Angeles. It provided a special rule for a millionaire stockbroker who had the largest private collection of Rodin sculpture in the Chicago area, and a family listed by Forbes Magazine as one of the 400 richest in America.

Any bill that allows those kinds of earmarks to continue is a bill that is not worthy of the name. It is a joke. It is an embarrassment, and I would urge that this House get serious and pass real reform.

□ 1600

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that we are, with this package, going to implement real reform.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), the very distinguished vice chairman of the Rules Committee who has long been a champion of institutional reform.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time and for his hard work in bringing forth this piece of legislation today.

The Speaker of the House announced last January that this difficult subject, difficult but important, and it is difficult, Mr. Speaker, because any time that you deal with institutional reform, you deal with reform of the practices of Congress, obviously there is much tension and controversy and difficulty. And we are seeing it in the debate today, and we are going to continue to see it in the debate today. So it is not an easy task.

But the Speaker in January announced that he was going to deal, and we were going to, pursuant to his instruction and his leadership, deal with this issue of further creating transparency in this process and in this House, this respectable, this House that needs to be respected because it merits it. And yet, obviously, it can be improved.

And Chairman DREIER, pursuant to the instruction of the Speaker, has done tremendous work in listening time and again to the concerns of Members on both sides of the aisle and formulating this piece of legislation that is before us today that seeks to be before us based on this rule with which we bring it to the floor today.

So I urge all colleagues, first, to realize that their vote on the rule is going to be a vote on whether they are serious about considering lobbying reform. This is the vote on the record of whether or not one is serious about considering, about dealing with the issue of lobbying reform, and we will have an opportunity to go on the record.

We can always talk about how we would prefer to do other things. But perfection is sometimes, Mr. Speaker, the enemy of progress. This is the real thing, the real vote. If you are for lobbying reform, you will vote for the rule. If you are not, even if you have all sorts of excuses, then you vote ''no.''

I am confident that the majority of this body will vote for this rule so we can further consider and further improve this important piece of legislation that we bring to the floor today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this oppressive, undemocratic rule, a rule inconsistent with the great traditions of the people's House. So many amendments that were proposed by good Members of this body were not allowed to be considered today. And let me give you three examples. Number 1, no amendment was allowed to deal with the issue of Members getting rides on corporate jets. Let me put this in perspective for you

with real numbers. Today my wife is 35 weeks pregnant. A few weeks ago, I priced what does it cost if this happens in the middle of the night and I need to try to get home quickly to be with her when she goes into labor: $12,000 on a charter service for me to get home to Little Rock to be with my pregnant wife. Do you know what the first class ticket costs with Northwest Airlines? $680. So an alternative for me is to call up one of my good corporate friends and say, can I catch a ride on your plane? I will give you $680, and neither one of us will say, oh, by the way, that means you gave me an $11,300 gift. I think that people should be able to ride on planes. But they should pay the fair market value. That amendment should have been allowed to be discussed and brought on the floor.

Second, the chairman and I had a discussion at the beginning of this session about my feelings. I had an amendment proposed in the Rules Committee yesterday to greatly restrict the ability of former Members who are registered lobbyists to be on the floor and participate in some of these activities that we know as the Members dining room and the parking garage and the gym and all these kinds of things. Because here is the issue: when my constituents come from Arkansas, they have to go through the security. Members who are registered lobbyists do not. When my constituents come from Arkansas, they don't get to go to the Members' dining room. When my constituents come from Arkansas they don't get to roam through the halls and go in the back rooms of the committee rooms. Former Members who are registered lobbyists do.

My amendment was not allowed on the floor to be considered. If you don't like it, vote against it; but let me have this discussion.

Third, an amendment that deals with lobbyist-funded meals was not allowed. An amendment to deal with the ban on lobbyists-paid meals was not allowed. Are we so dependent on lobbyist-funded meals for our lunch money that we won't even let an amendment come on the floor of the House? Well, I have got a solution. I have got $5. I will leave it over here on this podium. If any Member is so dependent on not having lunch money, so dependent on lobbyist-funded meals, take the $5. But let us have a vote on these very important amendments.

Vote against this rule. It is a bad rule, undemocratic.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to first congratulate my friend. And I know that he is going to have a wonderful baby boy or girl before too terribly long.

And I will say in response to the issue of corporate aircraft, that is an issue that is addressed by the Federal Election Commission, and those are regulations which are promulgated by them. And that is the reason that we have not addressed this issue there in light of the fact that those regs come forward there.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. SNYDER. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, me going back to Little Rock, Arkansas, to be with my wife as she goes into labor is not a campaign event. That is not the issue. We are talking about people catching rides for all kinds of reasons.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about is the use of corporate aircraft for campaign events that is handled by the Federal Election Commission. The Federal Election Commission is the one that promulgates those regulations, because those corporate aircraft are used for campaign events for the political process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished former chairman of the House Committee on Ethics, my good friend from Ft. Collins, Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I don't know who left me the $5 up here to buy my vote. I am not sure here.

Mr. DREIER. My recommendation is that you not touch it.

Mr. HEFLEY. I will keep my hands up here where you can see them.

Mr. Chairman, I have enormous respect for you and the committee, and you know that I do. But I am not happy with this rule. And I am not happy with this rule because I think it doesn't allow the House to consider real and meaningful ethics reform.

Now, you do lobbyist reform. But in terms of the ethics process reform, I don't think we really have much of that here. The rule does not allow the House to consider many of the provisions that would strengthen the integrity of the House and help restore public confidence. And I think actually we are missing an opportunity here.

I introduced a bill, along with Representative HULSHOF, who was my colleague on the Ethics Committee, to strengthen the Ethics Committee in ways not allowed under this rule. Our bill is cosponsored by many Democrats and Republicans, and not just Democrats and Republicans, but the left and right wing of both parties. So philosophically it crossed lines too. And yet our amendment will not be considered in this rule.

Our amendment had broad and sweeping disclosure across the board. All gifts over $20 disclosed, all privately funded travel disclosed, all lobbyist registrations, all passengers on corporate jets, all Members' financial disclosure statements, all disclosed on the Internet in real-time. Most of this is not in the bill. And yet it would allow Members to, our bill that we wanted as an amendment, would allow Members to continue privately funded travel, which I think is important.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. HEFLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I would simply say to my friend that he has brought forward a wide range of very, very important issues, many of which he addressed as chairman of the Ethics Committee himself. And I will, again, as I said in my opening remarks, I am very happy to make the commitment that we recognize that this process is the first step on our road towards dealing with this, and it is our goal that as we move beyond this rule to consider the legislation that we get into a House-Senate conference.

I am happy to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HEFLEY. I won't belabor the point any more, except to just simply say there was a lot of good opportunity here, I think, to really strengthen the ethics process. And I know there are some who would like to do a commission to that again. The ethics process works. It did work and it worked very well for a long time. It needs to be tweaked a little bit, and that is what this bill would do.

I see the majority leader on the floor. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague for yielding, and suggest to my colleague from California, I am as concerned as you and many other Members on both sides of the aisle that the Ethics Committee process is not running the way it should. For the benefit of this institution, for the responsibility of this institution, the Ethics Committee should be functioning and should be enforcing the rules of the House. Unfortunately, one side of the aisle has decided that they don't want the process to continue.

Now, the gentleman from Colorado and I, yesterday, had a conversation about the ethics process. I am interested in seeing it up and running. I am interested in working in a bipartisan way to fix the problems that are there so that it will run for the benefit of Members and the institution; and the gentleman has my commitment to work with him and Members on the other side of the aisle to make sure that the ethics process works, because it is important for the integrity of this institution.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEFLEY. You said one side of the aisle is not interested in the Ethics Committee proceeding and working. There is enough blame to go around, I have to say. Both sides of the aisles have fouled this process up now. And we need to work together to get it back together. The Ethics Committee needs to work, and anything we do in the Ethics Committee reform process has to be bipartisan, or nonpartisan. You can't have an Ethics Committee that is partisan, and it has to be nonpartisan. So I would like to work with the majority leader, and I would like to ask

that if we are not going to have this as an amendment to this bill, that we have the opportunity to have a free-standing bill on the floor in the foreseeable future, in the near future, which would encompass much of what I have described here.

Mr. BOEHNER. In responding to my colleague from Colorado, I am interested in working in a bipartisan way to come to an agreement on those issues that are necessary for the Ethics Committee to do its job on behalf of Members and this institution. And whatever I can do to help foster those changes and to initiate real action at the Ethics Committee, I will do everything I can to work with you to do that.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if Mr. HEFLEY would like more time, I can yield him another minute.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just lost my $5 here.

I don't want to take any more time because I know this is going to, we need to go ahead and get on with this thing. But I think we do have a serious opportunity here to do some really good things. And there are some really good things in this bill. I just don't think it goes far enough if we are really to have the reform kind of package that many of us would like to see.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield, if he has any time left. I will say that I agree with exactly what the gentleman said. I wish there could have been more in this bill too. But, again, getting input from so many on both sides of the aisle has been a challenge.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Reclaiming my time, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is all well and good to talk about we are going to work very hard to fix the Ethics Committee, but we are in the 16th month of this term, and I don't see much action taking place over there.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe we are losing our moral authority to lead this place. It has been over a decade since my party took over the majority, and I feel like we have forgotten how we got here. Republicans were united on three common issues, and one of them was reforming Congress.

It was amazing after the 2004 election we considered repealing the rule requiring a Republican leader to step down if indicted. Next we proceeded to remove the members of our Ethics Committee who had voted to hold our former majority leader accountable for his actions. Then we proceeded to make it more difficult to initiate an Ethics Committee investigation.

I think there is a tendency for power to corrupt, and absolute power to corrupt absolutely. We need bold action, and we need bold reform. Regretfully, this bill does not do it, and this rule does not allow us to make it better.

□ 1615

I asked the Rules Committee to consider 5 reforms that Congressman MEEHAN and I and others had proposed. Create an Office of Public Integrity. If you do not think it makes sense, debate it and then explain why.

Strengthen lobby disclosure requirements above what this legislation includes. If you do not think it makes sense, allow the amendment and then argue against it and vote it down.

Require disclosure of huge sums being spent by professional lobby firms and lobby organizations on grassroots campaigns to stimulate lobbying by Members of Congress. Allow that amendment. If you do not think it makes sense, argue against it and vote it down.

Require Members to pay for charter flights they take rather than pay a first-class fare. Allow this amendment, and if you do not think it makes sense, argue against it and vote it down.

Enact a true gift ban. If you do not think it makes sense, still allow a debate. Debate it, and if you do not think it makes sense, vote it down.

Particularly as it relates to charter flights, here we are going to ban Members from potentially flying to deliver a commencement address, but we are going to say to the leaders on both sides of the aisle, you can go on a corporate jet and only pay the first-class rate when it will cost that corporation literally tens of thousands of dollars. I do not understand how we, with a straight face, can say we are cracking down on the abuses of lobbying when we allow the corporations to fund where our leaders go.

The bottom line for me is why can we not have debate and vote on these issues and a number of others? I believe we need to defeat the rule and then do what my majority leader and the chairman have said: work on a bipartisan basis on a new bill, on new rules, that will allow some debate.

When I was re-elected 10 years ago and Republicans took over, I really believed, Mr. DREIER, that we would be allowed to have debates. Every year I see less and less of it.

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

Let me say once again that I am very proud of the reform agenda that we have implemented and continue to implement in a wide range of areas including institutionally right here on ensuring that we have a free-flowing debate on a wide range of issues, a guaranteed motion to recommit, which I know my colleagues will have on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the distinguished chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I commend the chairman of the Rules Committee for his outstanding leadership and no small amount of perseverance and courage in evidence today.

I also speak in commendation of Speaker HASTERT and our leadership for bringing the Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act to the floor in this rule.

After months of scandal and years of deficit spending, we have come to a moment of truth. We will show today on this floor in less than an hour who in this body is committed to reform and who is not.

This legislation has significant lobbying reforms: enhanced disclosure reporting for lobbyists, civil and criminal penalties for noncompliance, and imposes a moratorium on privately funded travel. But as we change the way lobbyists spend their money, this Congress also understands that we must change the way we spend the money of the American people, understanding that you cannot complain about the sharks when you are holding a bucket of chum.

This bill contains historic and significant budget reforms. Under the reforms we will consider, Members will have unprecedented opportunities to challenge so-called earmark spending at every stage of the legislative process. And we can do more earmark reform, applying it to all committees, as has been suggested, but we dare not do less. Lobbying reform must be married with spending reforms that give greater transparency and accountability to the process and the American people.

This country longs for a Congress that will renew its commitment to fiscal and ethical reform, and this is such a moment. This is a moment of truth. I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule for the Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I had an amendment that was adopted in the Judiciary Committee, and the adoption of this rule would eliminate that amendment.

That amendment would have created just a study of a practice where some lobbyists appear to be charging percentage contingency fees for getting earmarks. Now, when you combine this idea with the K Street Project where you are supposed to be hiring Republican lobbyists who are supposed to be contributing back to the legislators, you can see how ugly a practice this can get. I just asked for a study.

And, Mr. Speaker, these kinds of contracts are illegal for agents of foreign governments. They are illegal in some executive branch lobbying. The Congressional Research Service in a memorandum cited these as bad because they furnish the strongest incentive to the exertion of corrupting and sinister influences to the end that the desired legislation may be secured, and there is a long line of cases in which it

is utterly void against public policy. The CRS memo cites Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1906, saying that it is the tendency in such contracts to provide incentives towards corruption. An 1853 Supreme Court case said that it is an undoubted principle of the common law, that it will not lend its aid to enforce a contract such as this to do an act which is inconsistent with sound morals or public policy or which tends to corrupt or contaminate.

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of contracts are illegal in 39 States because of their corrupting influence. If we are going to have a bill that suggests it is going to do something about corruption, what is wrong with at least studying the prevalence of these contracts which do not appear to be illegal in the Federal Government but everybody knows have a corrupting influence?

I would hope that we would defeat the rule so that my amendment, which was adopted in the Judiciary Committee, can be reinserted back into the bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

As I listen to critics of this legislation, you would think that the package that we have is a huge step backward. Let me first say to my friend Mr. SCOTT that his amendment was not germane to the bill, and all of the amendments that we have made in order are germane to the bill. We, in fact, used that as a guide in proceeding here.

When one thinks about what has or has not happened, again, this criticism is leveled towards what is not in the bill, failing to recognize what is in the bill.

This bill doubles the fines for lobbyists who fail to disclose. It adds the possibility of jail time for failing to comply with the act. It adds oversight to make sure disclosure information is accurate, and it gives the public full on-line access to disclosure reports, all things that are needed and are improved with the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Scottsdale, Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for the time to speak on behalf of this rule.

And one of the challenges we confront in an institution that, yes, has a partisan composition and is made up of, admittedly, imperfect beings is that there are numerous examples of imperfection and, dare we say, partisanship brought to this debate.

But the question in the final analysis, despite the seeming inevitability of incrementalism, which in itself in this case is not fatal or does not flaw this positive action, is that the short-term temptation to attempt to gain partisan advantage is not completely negated on this floor. And, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, we would be naive if we thought that it were.

I listened with great interest to my friend from Virginia, a member of the Judiciary Committee, offer some legal case history, although his amendment was not germane to this bill. I could point out, just as a citizen, we could look at other challenges faced by other Congresses and other majority in a landmark work entitled The Ambition and the Power that dealt with the challenges of a previous majority.

What is past is prologue. What we have an opportunity to do in this House today, despite admitted imperfections, despite the temptation of partisanship, is to take a meaningful step forward for reform.

I listened to constructive criticisms from those who say the bill does not go far enough. I listened to other criticisms that perhaps are partisan in nature. But the question before this House is will we stand up clearly and take a step in favor of reform?

This Member says yes. Let it begin with this rule. Vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the legislation and ''yes'' for real reform.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be blunt. Washington is mired in corruption. In this last year alone, the Vice President's Chief of Staff was indicted for obstructing justice. Two of the former majority leaders top aides have pled guilty to bribery and conspiracy. And a senior Republican Member of Congress was convicted of accepting over $1 million in bribes from military contractors. Yet this so-called reform legislation, this incrementalism that we should accept, is a complete and utter sham.

In my committee, the Committee on Government Reform, we worked hard to pass true reform legislation of the executive branch, and on a unanimous bipartisan vote of 32–0, we reported legislation that would have closed the revolving door between K Street and the Federal Government. Our bill would stop lobbyists like the former Deputy Interior Secretary from using a high-ranking government position to benefit energy industry clients. It would prohibit senior officials, like the former Medicare Director, from seeking jobs representing pharmaceutical companies while writing prescription drug legislation. Our legislation would have ended secret meetings between lobbyists and executive branch officials like those that produced the deeply flawed White House energy plan. And it would have promoted open government, banned covert propaganda, and given national security whistleblowers long overdue protection.

But what does the Republican leadership do when Committee Chairman TOM DAVIS and I jointly proposed these landmark bipartisan reforms and we asked that it be included in this legislation or give us a rule to report it out as separate legislation? They reject it. They would not give us an opportunity to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor. And then they stand here and say, we cannot do more because we do not have bipartisan support. But when we give them a bill on ethics and lobbying reform with bipartisan support, they ignore it and will not give us a chance on the House floor.

A corrupt mentality governs in Washington, and there is no better metaphor for the contempt for reform that has infected this body than the treatment that our proposal received.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I would be happy to yield the gentleman time.

Mr. WAXMAN. If you yield me time, I would be happy to yield to you.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to engage in a colloquy with my friend.

□ 1630

I have the greatest respect for him as a fellow Californian. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, as we look at this issue, will the gentleman not acknowledge that the problem of corruption we face in this town is a bipartisan issue, that it crosses party lines and it is not just a Republican issue?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I certainly think what we have seen is a lot of corruption, and the resolution of how to deal with it ought to be bipartisan. We gave you a bipartisan proposal, which you would not bring to the House floor.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California will not yield further to me?

Mr. DREIER. I yielded twice as much, 100 percent more, than what the gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman will not yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). The House will be in order.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the gentleman from Minnesota to proceed, and then if my friend from California would like to ask me a question or something, as soon as we are done with the gentleman from Minnesota, I will be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this bill does include many important provisions, and I am thankful for that; but I feel that we have not gone quite far enough in terms of stopping the revolving door from public service to K Street. It does not extend the current 1-year ban on Members becoming registered lobbyists.

To fix the problems caused by competing public and personal interests, we must close the revolving door between Congress and lobbying. That is why I introduced H.R. 4685, to permanently ban Members from taking jobs

as registered lobbyists. We must make sure there is not the temptation for Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the things that are in the bill. I hope that we can continue to work on this further in the future.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would simply say in response to my friend, as he knows very well, we have really gone a long way toward making sure there is greater transparency on that issue, so the so-called ban on lobbying, the cooling-off period, is made clear with lines that we draw. I think it is really moving in the direction to which my friend has referred.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the clarity that was put in the bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture I would like to yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my good friend why, when the committee that has jurisdiction over executive branch lobbying has a unanimous vote on a bipartisan bill to try to stop some of these egregious problems of the revolving door, why we couldn't get it on the floor?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both gentlemen will suspend. Thirty seconds has been yielded. Please allow the 30 seconds to expire.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would simply say that this measure is designed to deal with lobbying and ethics reform for the first branch of government, the legislative branch; and it is for that reason that we have not gotten into the executive branch issue to which my friend referred.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 15½ minutes remaining.

The Chair would remind the House that when a Member who controls time yields a specific block of time to another, that time may not be reclaimed and should not be interrupted by interjection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that I have 8½ minutes remaining and my colleague from Rochester has 15½ minutes remaining, I think it would be probably useful for us to proceed with hearing some of her arguments.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the lobbying reform proposal drafted by the Republican leadership in the wake of the Jack Abramoff scandal and other recent instances of corruption by public officials is woefully lacking in many respects; but chief among them, however, is its failure to address the central weakness and the most corrosive aspect of the current lobbying rules, and that has proven to be this revolving door aspect we have heard so much about today, which involves public sector congressional folks, employees, going over to work for special interest groups. In the most recent instance with the Abramoff scandal, we had staffers for the former Republican leader going over to work for Abramoff.

However, the need to impose greater restrictions on the flow between key legislative and executive branch policymaking posts and business and lobbying firms was never more evident than during the days following the passage of the Medicare Prescription Drug Act. That was an absolute disgrace. We came to find out that the former chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee had taken the top job at the pharmaceutical industry's most powerful trade group only a couple of months after he had played an instrumental role in the bill's development and promotion.

We came to find out only days after passage of the Medicare act that the administration's chief congressional negotiator on the bill had landed a job at a top lobbying firm representing drug companies and health care providers with major stakes in the legislation.

As has been pointed out, that legislation has a provision that says the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall not negotiate lower drug prices with the pharmaceutical companies. Then one of the chief drafters of the bill goes to work for the pharmaceutical companies. It weakens our credibility as an institution here. Not only were seniors robbed, but also I think that the insurance companies were allowed to greatly benefit as a result of this revolving door situation, and we must correct it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this lobby bill began with grand talk and broad promises, and today it is ending with a whimper. The announcement was the high watermark. Since then, the Republican strategy has been on each of these reforms, let the weak get weaker, and to reject most every Democratic proposal that has been advanced, even some like my own that had no visible opposition.

So much has been stripped from this bill that if it remains here another week, there won't be anything left but the name, and the name is certainly appropriate, The Transparency Act, because you can see right through this bill, that it does not reflect any meaningful bipartisan reform of a very corrupt system.

Tragically, the party of Abraham Lincoln is becoming the party of Abramoff. No wonder you have blocked every effort we have made to investigate this wretched scandal. With all the special interest wining and dining, what a ''Grand Old Party'' it is. But it is a grand party for everyone but the taxpayers, who have to pick up the tab, because corruption is not a victimless crime. Ask those who bear the higher price at the gas pump, who bear the costs as taxpayers of no-bid Halliburton contracts, or the suffering of our seniors from a pharmaceutical bill written for the manufacturers, not for the seniors.

This bill represents no right step in the right direction, no true incremental reform. It is, instead, a phony, contrived maneuver to obstruct genuine change, to stop the greed and end the culture of corruption that is weakening our country.

We have come forward as Democrats with one proposal after another to reach across the aisle and to try to address this corruption, but at every turn our hand has been slapped away by those who are content with the corrupt system that is ruining this country and damaging this Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on a rule for a so-called lobbying reform bill that The Washington Post has said ''is simply a joke.'' ''Or more accurately,'' it goes on to say, ''a ruse aimed at convincing what the leaders must believe is a doltish public that the House has done something to clean up Washington.'' A ruse. That is what this is.

And to the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee, if you think that what is being proposed today maintains a high ethical standard for this House, either your standards are too low or you have no interest, no interest, in cleaning up the culture of corruption that the Republicans have in this House of Representatives.

This Republican leadership so-called Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act holds no one accountable and provides little transparency to the activities of lobbyists or anyone else. It is an embarrassingly trivial response to the culture of corruption that has thrived under the Republican Congress.

And this corruption has a cost to the American people, as others of my colleagues have said. This corruption has come at great cost to the American people in terms of prices at the pump, a Medicare prescription drug bill that does little to lower the cost of spiraling health drug costs, and waste and fraud in the gulf coast and in Iraq.

This bill is a missed opportunity, a missed opportunity. As House Democratic Leader, I would have hoped that we could have worked together with the leadership of this House of Representatives to put forth something

that truly threw up the windows and pulled back the shades to let in the fresh air. But that didn't happen because of this ruse.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I wouldn't even think of yielding to you. You have all the time in the world.

I come to this floor with great sadness. I come here as one who has served on the Ethics Committee for 7 years, at a time when we worked in a bipartisan fashion to maintain a high ethical standard. I take very seriously our responsibility to the American people to do their business here, not the business of the special interests of the lobbyists.

That is why it is such a pity that we really don't have transparency in this rule and in this bill, where we can come to the floor with an open rule, where all points of view can be considered and all positive initiatives can be considered and voted up or down. Let's leave that up to the debate.

We certainly can do better than this. That wouldn't be difficult.

Democrats are offering a motion to recommit that breaks the link between K Street lobbyists and the Congress of the United States. It says it ''bans.'' It is unequivocal. It is unambiguous. It bans gifts and travel from lobbyists and from organizations who employ lobbyists. It prohibits use of corporate jets for official travel. It just prohibits it. You can't do it. It shuts down the K Street Project, in which lobbying firm jobs are traded for legislative favors. And it shuts down the revolving door. What a disgrace, this revolving door that is spinning so fast. It prohibits Members, senior staff and executive branch officials from lobbying their former colleagues for 2 years after leaving office. Two years. I think it should be longer, but that is a compromise.

Today, the Republican majority brings forth a rule that is itself an abuse of power. The Republican Rules Committee has refused to let this House debate bills that 165 Democrats cosponsored. The Republicans have refused to let this House debate even Republican serious proposals directed at cronyism and corruption in government contracting. The Republicans have refused to let this House debate any serious attempt to end the culture of corruption.

They call this bill the Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act? The Washington Post calls it a joke. The sad thing is, it is not a very funny joke, because, once again, the American people are paying the price.

My colleagues have listed some of the abuses of power. Mr. WAXMAN in particular talked about what the impact is on the American consumer from some of those abuses of power.

Imagine that the person managing the bill on prescription drugs left this House and soon was representing the pharmaceutical industry for $2 million a year in salary. How much does it cost to sell the seniors down the river? Well, about $2 million a year, if you are the manager of the prescription drug bill. That is why Americans, middle-income seniors, will be paying more at the pharmacy because of the corruption that was involved in writing this bill, a bill where the pharmaceutical industry insisted that there be a prohibition in the bill against the Secretary of HHS for negotiating for lower prices. It was in the bill because the pharmaceutical industry insisted upon it. They had their representatives at the table. America's seniors did not. Who do you think came out on top in that bill writing?

We have talked about a time when the American taxpayer has the burden of that, plus paying a price at the pump because of the corruption in writing the energy policy for this country, behind closed doors, refusing to reveal what went into writing that legislation.

□ 1645

And that legislation, do not take it from me, the Republican Department of Energy stated at the time that the energy bill proposed and passed by the Republicans in this Congress would increase the price at the pump. They said it at the time.

So not only are the consumers paying the price at the pump and an increased cost in their home heating oil and cooling oil as we go into the summer months; they gave a gift, they, the American taxpayers, we gave a gift to the oil companies.

That same bill that increased the price at the pump that people are now paying nearly $3 a gallon for, they, those oil companies, those same oil companies got subsidies of $12 billion in the energy bill. They got royalty relief, royalty holidays of several more billion dollars.

And to make matters worse, in the most recent tax bill that is being prepared to come to this floor, they will get $5.5 billion more in tax breaks. What are they taking the American taxpayer for? What are they thinking of? It is such an insult to the intelligence of the consumer and the taxpayer.

Wait a minute, at a time of record, of record profits, historic and obscene profits, these companies are paying enormous fees. The CEO of Exxon is getting a retirement package of $400 million. Record profits. High subsidies from the taxpayer, and high prices at the pump, a very raw deal for the American consumer.

All of it born from the culture of corruption in this House of Representatives. We must break that link. We are here for the interests of the American people, for the public interest. The Republicans are here for the special interests. They are the handmaidens of the pharmaceutical industry. They are the handmaidens of the energy companies. They do not know any other way to do it.

And that is why we get not only bad policy, not only corruption in this House, not only a cost of that corruption to the taxpayer and to the consumer, but we have a ruse of a bill that tries to masquerade as reform on this House of Representatives.

I feel really sad about this. I feel sad for the American people. They expect and deserve better. And we can give that to them in our motion to recommit that I talked about earlier. It bans the gifts and travel. It breaks the link. It stops the revolving door. It also says that if you are convicted of a felony in the performance of your duties as a Member of this House, you do not get your pension. You do not get your pension.

And as I said, again, this whole thing about jet travel and the rest, our motion to recommit would prohibit corporate travel for official purposes. So I hope that our colleagues will understand that we certainly can do better and that the American people are watching; that we can present substantive reforms, some that we should be debating today. I can assure my colleagues that these reforms, that if we have these reforms, we will end this culture of corruption. I also assure you that if the Democrats win the Congress next year, they will be implemented on the first day, the first day of the first session of this next Congress.

So let us start fresh with this. The American people, as I say, expect and deserve better. We can clear the slate by rejecting, all-out rejecting this ruse, this pathetic, pathetic little tiny step that is a missed opportunity for a high ethical standard and is an excuse to keep the culture of corruption that is here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule, and if the opportunity presents itself, to support the Democratic motion to recommit. I want to in closing commend the ranking Democrat on the Rules Committee, Congresswoman SLAUGHTER. She has been a relentless crusader for a high ethical standard in this House for not only lobby reform and all kinds of other reform, but for injecting a level of civility into how we should have debate on the floor of the House that respects the views of Democrats and Republicans, because we respect the people who sent all of us here, not just having Republicans heard and Democrats blocked out.

So Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, I commend you for your leadership. I thank you for your courage. I urge our colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my dear friend from California, the distinguished minority leader, to whom I am happy to yield at any time whatsoever, that on the issue of prescription drugs, we are very proud of the fact that more than 30 million Americans, many more than had been anticipated, are today saving millions and millions of dollars because of the Medicare prescription drug package that we put into place.

On the issue of energy issues, we are outraged at the increase in gasoline and fuel costs. But I will tell you, I am really perplexed, because as they decry the issue of global warming, you would think that they would be ecstatic at the fact that gasoline prices have gone through the roof.

But, unfortunately, it is their policies, their refusal to pursue ANWR in a responsible way to deal with the issue of boutique fuels and to deal with the issue of refinery capacity that has been a problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to a very hardworking member of both the Rules Committee and the Committee on Ethics, my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise to support the rule and the underlying bill. And I want to first, Mr. Chairman, commend you. I have watched this process unfold in front of us as we have worked, as you and the Speaker committed we would, through regular order, through five different committees, over 4 months, entertaining dozens of amendments.

I have watched you struggle with the numerous amendments we had, and yet try to get them down to a manageable level, things that actually counted and made a difference in the legislation that let us debate things.

I have watched as you and the Speaker and others have tried to craft a bill that moved us forward, and indeed this bill does move us forward. After all of the smoke and all of the rhetoric and everything is said, the real basic question is simply this: Will we be better off with or without this bill? There is no question we will be better off with this bill. We will be more transparent, we will have more reporting by lobbyists, stricter supervision, higher penalties for those who transgress, whether they be those amongst us or others in the lobbying and the political community.

We have a measure of campaign finance reform that could be triggered by this legislation. And indeed as you pointed out, Mr. Speaker, this is simply the first step of a long journey. And it is very important. I appreciate the way that you have dealt with the dilemma of having some who want to go further than we are able to go, and actually enact legislation, and those who do not want to do anything at all.

And it is always easiest to take one of those two positions, because you are always right. You never have to answer for anything. But at the end of the day, the Speaker and the chairman have to craft a package that will pass and will put them in a position to negotiate with the Senate. I think they have done that.

I also wanted to highlight just briefly an amendment that may come up later in this debate, which is indeed bipartisan in nature, and which I think takes us in the right direction in appropriately regulating private travel, something that has been an abuse, and where I have had the good fortune of working with my friends across the aisle, Mr. MILLER, Mr. BERMAN. I had the opportunity to also work with Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. LUNGREN, and we think we have crafted an amendment that everybody in this House can be pleased with.

That would not have happened without your help, Mr. Chairman, and without your support. Let me conclude by saying, I am very proud to have worked with my friend, the chairman on the Rules Committee. I appreciate his support as we have worked through difficult issues.

I know we are at the beginning of a long debate. I am very confident at the end of the day we will have a legislative package that will be a marked improvement.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Speaker how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes. The gentlewoman from New York's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to a hardworking member of the Rules Committee, the distinguished chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his hard work on this issue. This is another situation where the Democrats were for it before they were against it, before they were for it, before they were against it again.

It has been interesting to watch this debate unfold as fingers have been pointed now since the end of last year about a culture that they have described as being corrupt, and yet here they come today to oppose a bill that addresses many of the same issues that they have been screaming about for the past 4 months.

The Policy Committee did exhaustive work, Mr. Speaker, in bringing together groups of Members to talk about these issues. Reforming the institution is among the most important and also among the most difficult issues to do, because everyone involved has an innate understanding of the issues that we are dealing with and the needs of the House from the perspective of their particular district.

There was widespread agreement that disclosure, sunshine, accountability should be the three pillars upon which we build this reform effort. And we did that. When it comes to issues like travel, as Mr. COLE has described, who has been a leader in a bipartisan effort to reform those practices, it has been a very difficult path, but one which has yielded bipartisan results in the form of the amendment that we will be considering later.

When it comes to making sure that there is an opportunity for the public to know what goes on in this institution and what interest groups that are attempting to lobby the Congress are doing, we increased the reporting requirements. We increased the penalties for those people who would take advantage of the public trust that they are given by the voters and by the electorate.

When it comes to the issues of making sure that we have a functioning ethics committee, that is the most important piece of this process, increasing the leverage to make sure that that committee is one that is functioning appropriately.

So in sum, Mr. Speaker, it is appalling to me that people would say that in this case, after 4 months of decrying the status of things, that nothing is better than disclosure requirements, that nothing is better than transparency, that nothing is better than greater accountability.

The foundation upon which this bill is crafted is something that every Member can go home and talk to their constituents about. It is something that will improve the work of this institution and begin the process of restoring the public trust in the people's Chamber.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

As many of my colleagues have said, this has been obviously a challenging time for us. We are dealing with some very serious problems in this institution. They are bipartisan. They cross party lines. And that is why the Speaker and I and others felt very strongly about the need to do what we can to do what we possibly could to ensure that we reached out to both Democrats and Republicans and a wide range of individuals and outside groups and all for recommendations.

I am happy that many of those issues have been addressed, and I think it is very important for us to ask each Member to look at the bill as a whole and answer these very important questions: Does it increase transparency? Does it increase accountability? Does it put more information in the hands of the American people? Does it protect the first amendment right of citizens to petition their government? Does it strengthen the integrity of the United States Congress?

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely convinced that the answer to every single one of those questions is a resounding ''yes'' on every single count. No matter what some have argued on the other side, if they want to maintain the absolute status quo, it creates the potential to continue many of the problems that we have faced.

□ 1700

Virtually everyone has acknowledged that while they may not believe that this bill goes as far as we would like, this is the first step in a process that will allow us to join with our colleagues in the other body to deal in a conference with the measure that I hope is even stronger than this very important first step that we are taking.

I think that the vice chairman of the Rules Committee Mr. DIAZ-BALART put it very well when he said that anyone who casts a vote against this rule is saying no to the issue of reform. No, I don't want to proceed with bringing about the kinds of institutional changes that will play a role in enhancing the level of integrity to which the American people can hold this great deliberative body.

We hear everyone talking about reform. Voices for reform are out there, and they are very prevalent in the media, here on the House floor, day after day after day. But in just a few minutes we are going to have the opportunity to transform those voices for reform into votes for reform. This is our opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, with that I urge an ''aye'' vote on this rule so that we can move ahead with this very, very important reform effort.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join my colleagues in making a point that seems to be lost on the leadership of this House: this is not simply a ''lobbyist problem'' we are facing. Ensuring that lawmakers comply with existing ethics rules and enhancing lobbyist disclosure requirements are important goals . . . and even on this measure, . . . the so-called ''Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act'' falls embarrassingly short.

What started as a limited but seemingly earnest attempt at reform has been progressively hollowed out over the past several weeks in—you guessed it—closed-door meetings with lobbyists. The result is not surprising. Reporting requirements for lobbyist-hosted fundraisers? Gone. No more bargain rates on corporate jets? Gone. A study to examine lobbyist employment contracts? Gone.

But again, this is not simply a lobbyist problem. House Democrats have tried in earnest to offer a plan for reform that takes a hard look in the mirror and examines what Congress must do to clean up its own house.

My colleagues DAVE OBEY, BARNEY FRANK, TOM ALLEN and I have introduced a fourteen-point plan that would address not only individual abuses, but also the abuses of the legislative process. Our proposal would end the practice of keeping votes held open long enough to twist recalcitrant arms into compliance. It would prevent legislation from being slipped into conference reports without conference approval. It would require House-Senate conferences to actually meet and vote. And it would give Members of Congress at least a full day to examine the contents of any legislation we are voting on.

We have testified before the Rules Committee in favor of this comprehensive approach. During Rules Committee markup of this bill and again during the hearing on the rule last night, numerous amendments were offered and defeated—mostly on party-line votes—that would have implemented these reforms. The Democratic Substitute, which was also denied a fair hearing last night, recognized the need to take a comprehensive approach to lobbying and ethics reform. At each step in the process, our attempts at genuine, bipartisan reform were turned away.

So what did we get instead? It's no surprise: a bill that could serve as a case study in everything that is broken in our legislative process—of everything we should be ''reforming.'' We get a so-called ''Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act'' that offers neither accountability nor real transparency. We get a minority party—and many Members of the majority—completely shut out of the process once again, their amendments denied, their advice and concerns unheeded. We get a restrictive rule that makes in order just nine out of the 74 amendments offered—and only one sponsored by a Democrat without a Republican cosponsor—and allows for only one hour of debate on what should be one of the most significant bills we consider all year.

This leadership had a real chance to enact real reform, not for the sake of an aggrieved minority . . . not for the sake of election-year politics . . . but for the sake of our institution, for its integrity and its capacity to govern. Instead, they seem to think they can convince the American people that they're cleaning up our House, when all they're doing is sweeping our problems under the rug.

Well Mr. Speaker, the American people will not be so easily fooled. And I assure you that those of us in this body who want real, comprehensive reform will not rest until we have successfully enacted such a measure. But this is not such a measure. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I rise today in opposition to the rule before us.

The ethics process in this body is broken. In all candor, there is plenty of blame to go around as to why we find ourselves in this situation. We undermine the public's faith in this great institution when we let petty politics erode the very processes meant to preserve the public's trust in Congress.

I have met with the Majority Leader on this issue, and I sincerely believe that he has a genuine desire to have an effective, functioning Ethics process in the House. I thank him for his willingness to listen, and I hope we can perhaps address this issue in the future.

Having previously served on the Ethics Committee, I firmly believe that the ethics process can work. For the sake of this institution—it must work. And as we begin consideration of the Leadership's ethics and lobby reform package, I will say there are some provisions in the base bill before us that should ultimately be adopted—earmark reform, denying Congressional pensions to convicted felons, enhanced disclosure and improved ethics education are common-sense proposals that I would hope that we can all support.

That being said, I cannot support this rule. Ethics reform is incomplete absent changes to improve the enforcement of House rules. My colleague JOEL HEFLEY and I have put forward legislation to strengthen the ability of the Ethics Committee to dispense with ethics matters by expediting the review of these issues and insulating committee members and non-partisan staff from the political pressures that can pollute the ethics process. We do this by giving the Chair and Ranking Member on the committee subpoena power earlier in the investigative process and prohibiting the arbitrary dismissal of Members and technical staff. We also require ethics education for Members and staff, and we dramatically improve disclosure associated with gifts and travel. All of these common-sense reforms would greatly improve the ethics process in the House.

We sought to offer our legislation as an amendment to the bill we are to consider today. This proposal was not made in order under the rule. Thus, we are faced with the prospect of passing an incomplete ethics reform package that lacks enhanced enforcement.

I think this is a mistake, and for this reason, I must reluctantly oppose this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on two questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to instruct on H.R. 4297;

Adoption of House Resolution 783.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 4297 offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—190

Abercrombie	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Ackerman	Berman	Brown (OH)
Allen	Berry	Brown, Corrine
Andrews	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Baca	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Baird	Boswell	Capuano
Baldwin	Boucher	Cardin
Becerra	Boyd	Cardoza

Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
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
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—232

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
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
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
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)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
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
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
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
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer
Evans
Fattah
Gilchrest
Hastings (FL)
Jefferson
Millender-McDonald
Ortiz
Paul
Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1727

Messrs. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, ROGERS of Alabama, OXLEY, INGLIS of South Carolina, LINDER, Ms. HART, Messrs. SIMMONS, CANNON, SOUDER, LAHOOD, and FOLEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. SPRATT, GUTIERREZ, and SERRANO changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4975, LOBBYING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 783 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 207, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—216

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
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)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
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
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
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
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
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—207

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chabot
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
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hefley
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden

Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kolbe
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
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer
Evans
Fattah
Gilchrest
Hastings (FL)
Jefferson
Millender-McDonald
Ortiz
Paul
Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1746

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, on the day of April 27, 2006, I was unable to vote due to an important prescheduled engagement with the President of the United States for which I was granted a leave of absence. I would like the RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 109, and "nay" on rollcall No. 110.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency, I was unable to vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below.

Rollcall No. 109: "Yes."

Rollcall No. 110: "No."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader for the purposes of inquiring about the schedule for the balance of the week and the week to come.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague for yielding. Given the hour and the commitments that Members have tomorrow, it is the intention of the majority leader to finish the bill under which the rule we just passed on ethics and lobbying reform on Tuesday. And so the House will convene at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 o'clock for legislative business. There will be some suspensions. Votes will be rolled until 6:30.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider H.R. 4943, the Prevention of Fraudulent Access to Phone Records Act. In addition to H.R. 4943, we will do H.R. 4954, the SAFE Port Act, which the Committee on Homeland Security completed yesterday, and we are continuing to work with other committees to assure that this bill will be ready. I would expect this bill to be considered on Thursday.

The committees of jurisdiction have also begun to hold hearings on energy, and Members should expect votes in the coming weeks addressing America's energy needs. That completes my report on what next week looks like.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, could you comment perhaps on the Communications Opportunity Promotion and Enhancement Act, the Telecom Act.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. There is a possiblity that the telco bill could get out next week. The committee acted. There are other committees of interest, and we are working with them. It is too early to give a hard commitment that it will be up next week.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that information. Of course, there was expectation that we were going to pass the lobbying reform act that was offered. We are obviously not doing that. You mentioned that it would be up on Tuesday. My question is, is that accurate? I am sure that you would tell the truth, but, I mean, I want to make that clear.

Mr. BOEHNER. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me work with you on whether that is actually Tuesday or whether we do it first thing Wednesday morning.

Mr. HOYER. I think that is very important, Mr. Leader, for us to know and maybe we can work on that because obviously Members want to speak on amendments and they would have to know whether they have to be back before the 6:30 voting if you were going to take it up prior to that.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. Does the gentleman want to agree right now that the first thing, the first order of business on Wednesday morning will be to take up the lobby and ethics reform package?

Mr. HOYER. Yes. We have not discussed that, but I am sure that would be fine.

Mr. BOEHNER. If it meets with your approval, I would be happy to do it.

Mr. HOYER. That is acceptable to us. We think the bill needs a lot of work, and that will give you some more time to work on it.

I am sorry. I couldn't help myself.

Now, Mr. Leader, the budget. We have not voted on a budget yet. And you did not mention it in your schedule. Is there any expectation that you might have, Mr. Leader, that the budget might be on the floor either next week or some week after that?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I am hopeful.

Mr. HOYER. Still?

Mr. BOEHNER. Still.

Mr. HOYER. I presume the Appropriations Committee, at some point in time, will proceed without the budget. Would that be your expectation if we don't pass a budget in the near term?

Mr. BOEHNER. I would hope that we would have a budget.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, let me turn the page here. The other bills that you and I have talked about, one in particular we think is extraordinarily important. I know you feel it is important, and that is the pension bill. There are literally millions of Americans and thousands of companies very concerned about the status of the pension conference. Can you bring us up to date on whether or not you have any expectation that the pension conference would be completed in the near term and come to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate my colleague for yielding. It is important that we protect America's pensions and that we protect the pension system that we have. And having spent some 6 years working on this proposal, trust me, there is no one wants this finished more than me.

There was some progress last night amongst the principals, and I remain optimistic that we will have this finished before the Memorial Day District Work Period. I am hopeful that it will be finished before then. But there has been some movement. There is some cooperation with the Senate. And I have talked to Members on both sides of the aisle, both the House and Senate, that are working together to get this issue passed. And I am very optimistic.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time. Mr. Leader, again, I say this with all due respect and seriousness. I read in the paper today that the conferees met last night. With all due respect, Mr. Leader, the conferees did not meet last night. Apparently, the Republican conferees met last night. You indicated both sides of the aisle. It is my understanding, from our conferees, that they are not being included in the discussions of the conference. Again, it is our perspective that cuts out about 125 million Americans that we represent on this side of the aisle from discussions about an issue that you have worked very hard on, Members on our side have worked very hard on, and that we all agree is critical to our country and to millions of Americans individually. I would hope, Mr. Leader, that you would prevail on the chairman of the conference to include our side of the aisle in the discussions.

Mr. BOEHNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. We can't be helpful or, frankly, we can't know what is going on if we are not in the room.

I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate my friend yielding. The gentleman has been involved in a number of conferences himself over his long and distinguished career here in the House. And you realize that at some point, getting the basic framework or at least some beginning framework together amongst the principals, the committee Chairs, is essential before bringing other Members into this.

The chairman of the conference, Senator ENZI, and I have talked about this on several occasions, and I am very confident that you, all Members will have an opportunity to participate because it has been clear, as it is in all conferences that I am in, that nothing is agreed to until everything is agreed to. And so the gentleman should have no fears.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, I hope that is accurate. I understand that in any conference, the chairman of the conference ought to take the position that unless all things are agreed to the conference is not closed on other issues that might have been tentatively agreed to. But if, frankly, our side of the aisle is not included, does not have the opportunity to put our input into the issues, very frankly, too often, I have been here a long time. You are right, and I have been in a lot of conferences. And those have been real conferences. They have not been conferences that one side has agreed on, comes to the conference and says it's done.

The leader looks at me somewhat disparagingly or at least incredulously that there haven't been such conferences that occurred prior to the leadership of the Republican Party. I understand what he is saying, but this is a pattern, Mr. Leader. We have talked about it on a regular basis. And it is not good for this institution.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate the concerns raised by my friend from Maryland, but I need to remind my colleagues that the Pension Protection Act passed right before Christmas with almost 300 votes. There was broad bipartisan support for this bill, and it is my intention to maintain that broad bipartisan support for an eventual conference report. And the gentleman has my word that all Members will have their opportunity to be engaged in this conference report.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the representation of the leader, and I take him at his word. I have found his word to be good in the past. I certainly take him at his word, and I thank him for that.

Mr. BOEHNER. It still is.

Mr. HOYER. No doubt in my mind. I am not going to quote Ronald Reagan.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4943, PREVENTION OF FRAUDULENT ACCESS TO PHONE RECORDS ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The Committee on Rules may meet the week of May 1 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 4943, the Prevention of Fraudulent Access to Phone Records Act. The Committee on Energy and Commerce ordered the bill reported and filed its report with the House on March 16.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee in room H–312 of the Capitol by 2 p.m. on Tuesday, May 2, 2006. Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 1, 2006, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2006

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next, and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 2, 2006, for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE NATIONAL ARBOR DAY FOUNDATION AND NATIONAL ARBOR DAY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 383) supporting the goals and ideals of the National Arbor Day Foundation and National Arbor Day, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in 1872 an outstanding Nebraskan, J. Sterling Morton, began the tradition of Arbor Day to encourage tree planting. One hundred years later, another outstanding Nebraskan, John Rosenow, founded the National Arbor Day Foundation to promote Morton's original goals. Today, I have the pleasure of honoring the fruits of their labor. There are over 1 million members of this organization nationwide.

These two visionary leaders recognized that the simple action of planting a tree can protect the environment and provide resources and beauty for generations to come. Thanks to their efforts and inspiration, today America is a much greener, healthier, and more beautiful place. Because of their foresight, people from around the world enjoy a better quality of life. The planting of trees is a great reminder of our duty to take responsible actions now that will benefit our children and our grandchildren later.

□ 1800

As J. Sterling Morton noted, ''Each generation of humanity takes the Earth as trustees.''

The resolution I introduced, House Concurrent Resolution 383, supports the goals and ideals of National Arbor Day and the National Arbor Day Foundation. I would like to begin expressing my sincere appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform; and the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the committee, for their help in bringing this resolution to the floor.

This resolution honors National Arbor Day, which our country will celebrate tomorrow. I encourage my colleagues and others to join in the celebration by planting a tree or by taking part in Arbor Day activities nationwide. By doing so, we can carry on the spirit and the tradition of J. Sterling Morton, who once observed, ''Other holidays repose on the past. Arbor Day proposes for the future.''

I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 383

Whereas the National Arbor Day Foundation was founded in 1972 and now has nearly 1,000,000 members;

Whereas John Rosenow, President of the National Arbor Day Foundation, has provided outstanding leadership of the organization since its founding;

Whereas the mission of the National Arbor Day Foundation is to ''inspire people to plant, nurture, and celebrate trees'';

Whereas the National Arbor Day Foundation works to protect and enhance the global environment by promoting rainforest preservation, urban and community forestry, and the planting of trees throughout the world;

Whereas the National Arbor Day Foundation manages the 260-acre Arbor Day Farm to serve as a model of environmental stewardship;

Whereas National Arbor Day Foundation distributes more than 8,000,000 trees annually through its Trees for America program;

Whereas the National Arbor Day Foundation has worked with the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service since 1990, helping to plant nearly 4,000,000 trees in National Forests damaged by fire, insects, or other natural causes;

Whereas J. Sterling Morton recognized the need for trees in Nebraska and proposed a tree-planting holiday called ''Arbor Day'' in 1872;

Whereas it was estimated that more than 1,000,000 trees were planted in Nebraska on the first Arbor Day in 1872;

Whereas the observation of Arbor Day soon spread to other States and is now observed nationally and in many other countries;

Whereas J. Sterling Morton once observed that ''The cultivation of trees is the culmination of the good, the beautiful, and the ennobling in man''; and

Whereas National Arbor Day, the last Friday in April, will be celebrated on April 28, 2006: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the National Arbor Day Foundation; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe National Arbor Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF PERSONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE CONFLICT IN SUDAN'S DARFUR REGION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109–101)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the ''order'') blocking the property of persons in connection with the conflict in Sudan's Darfur region. In that order, I have expanded the scope of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, with respect to the policies and actions of the Government of Sudan, to address the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the actions and circumstances involving Darfur, as described below.

The United Nations Security Council, in Resolution 1591 of March 29, 2005, condemned the continued violations of the N'djamena Ceasefire Agreement of April 8, 2004, and the Abuja Humanitarian and Security Protocols of November 9, 2004, by all sides in Darfur, as well as the deterioration of the security situation and the negative impact this has had on humanitarian assistance efforts. I also note that the United Nations Security Council has strongly condemned the continued violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Sudan's Darfur region and, in particular, the continuation of violence against civilians and sexual violence against women and girls.

United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1591 determined that the situation in Darfur constitutes a threat to international peace and security in the region and called on Member States to take certain measures against persons responsible for the continuing conflict. The United Nations Security Council has encouraged all parties to negotiate in good faith at the Abuja talks and to take immediate steps to support a peaceful settlement to the conflict in Darfur, but has continued to express serious concern at the persistence of the crisis in Darfur in UNSCR 1651 of December 21, 2005.

Pursuant to IEEPA, the National Emergencies Act, and the United Nations Participation Act (UNPA), I have determined that these actions and circumstances constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, and have issued an Executive Order expanding the scope of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13067 to deal with this threat.

The order blocks the property and interests in property in the United States, or in the possession or control of United States persons, of the persons listed in the Annex to the order, as well as of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State,

—to have constituted a threat to the peace process in Darfur;

—to have constituted a threat to stability in Darfur and the region;

—to be responsible for conduct related to the conflict in Darfur that violates international law;

—to be responsible for heinous conduct with respect to human life or limb related to the conflict in Darfur;

—to have directly or indirectly supplied, sold, or transferred arms or any related materiel, or any assistance, advice, or training related to military activities to the Government of Sudan, the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army, the Justice and Equality Movement, the Janjaweed, or any person operating in the states of North Darfur, South Darfur, and West Darfur, that is a belligerent, a nongovernmental entity, or an individual; or

—to be responsible for offensive military overflights in and over the Darfur region.

The designation criteria will be applied in accordance with applicable domestic law, including where appropriate, the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

The order also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to designate for blocking any person determined to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the activities listed above or any person listed in or designated pursuant to the order. I further authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to designate for blocking any person determined to be owned or controlled by, or acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person listed in or designated pursuant to the order. The Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, is also authorized to remove any persons from the Annex to the order as circumstances warrant.

I delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, the authority to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA and UNPA, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All Federal agencies are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

The order, a copy of which is enclosed, was effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on April 27, 2006.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 27, 2006*.

BROWNWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the centennial anniversary of the Brownwood Texas Chamber of Commerce.

Brownwood began as a pioneer town in the 19th century. As the town's population flourished, the cotton industry dominated. With the building of the West Texas District Alliance Cotton Yard and the establishment of the Freeman's Journal, Brownwood became the center of the Farmer's Alliance. In 1906, local farmers chartered the Brownwood Commercial Club, later renamed the Brownwood Area Chamber of Commerce.

The Brownwood Chamber is instrumental in helping the community

flourish. In 1940, they negotiated the home of Camp Bowie, a World War II training camp for the Army, housing 57,000 soldiers and civilians. After the camp closed, the Chamber created an industrial park that today houses 3M, Kohler, and other corporations which employ hundreds of people at their Brownwood facilities, greatly contributing to the prosperity of the community.

The Brownwood Chamber continues to serve as a vital organization within the community. I congratulate them on their centennial anniversary, and I am proud to represent Brownwood in Congress.

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.

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.)

IRAQ FORUM

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, just a few hours ago, I heard moving testimonials about the impact of the Iraq war on real people, real families and real communities, both American and Iraqi. I organized a forum precisely to get beyond the statistics, the strategy, and the abstractions, to understand the devastating human cost of this war.

We heard from Charlie Anderson, a former marine who suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder and now is a regional coordinator for Iraq Veterans Against the War. He spoke of the Government of the United States having failed the men and women it sent to war.

He said, ''I was completely untrained and unprepared for what I experienced in Iraq.''

He told us, ''In the 7 years preceding my deployment to the Middle East . . . I had not set foot in the desert or had any training on how to fight or survive there. I had fired my 9-millimeter service pistol exactly once.''

And this is the part that blew my mind, Mr. Speaker: Mr. Anderson added that after firing his weapon during one ambush, he said, ''I was told I would not be issued replacement ammunition because there was none to be had. My platoon sergeant told me 'do not shoot unless your death is imminent . . .' ''

Can you imagine that? The mighty United States military, the greatest fighting force in the world, essentially rationing bullets?

Dahlia Wasfi, a doctor who is half Jewish and half Iraqi, offered a powerful historical analogy. She spoke of her mother's relatives being driven from their native Austria to avoid Nazi concentration camps. ''Never again'' is the refrain we use when talking about the Holocaust. She then spoke of her father's relatives who are ''not living, but dying, under the occupation of this administration's deadly foray in Iraq.''

She went on: ''From the lack of security to the lack of basic supplies to the lack of electricity to the lack of potable water to the lack of jobs to the lack of reconstruction to the lack of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, they are worse off now than before we invaded. 'Never again' should apply to them, too.''

An Iraqi civil engineer named Faiza also spoke to us. She fled occupied Iraq last summer after her son, a student, was detained for several days by the Ministry of the Interior without any charges being filed.

''He has a beard; so he was a suspect terrorist,'' she said.

Although they said he had committed no crimes, his family had to pay thousands of dollars to secure his release. How is that for the transformation of power to freedom?

Now she and her family are living as exiles in Jordan, driven away from everything that was once familiar to them. But the only other choice was to live in a country whose infrastructure has been completely torn down and never rebuilt.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of these three brave souls, for the sake of human decency if nothing else, it is time to end this war, bring our troops home, and give Iraq back to the Iraqi people.

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

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

THE CONGRESSIONAL CONSTITUTION CAUCUS

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of several caucuses here in the House. I am very proud to be so. But none of those caucuses, I think, are more important than the Congressional Constitution Caucus.

All of us when we came here took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. It is one of the greatest documents ever written, and one that has guided this country and stood us in good stead over the time that we have been a country.

The Congressional Constitution Caucus has a statement of its belief: We ''will be an effective forum to ensure that the Federal Government is operating under the intent of the 10th amendment of our Bill of Rights.''

Those of us on the Congressional Constitution Caucus are very much concerned about the overreaching of the Federal Government. I have spoken on this issue before, but I think it is important that we continue to highlight it for the American people. And I want to read the 10th amendment:

''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

These historic words penned by our Founding Fathers, some of the most ingenious political minds this world has ever known, set forth an important principle. The Federal Government may exercise its specific powers listed in the Constitution, and the States and the people may exercise all remaining powers.

Unfortunately, as the authors of the Constitution have long since passed, so, too, have many of their foundations for our system of government. Between an ever-expanding Federal bureaucracy that for decades has crept into many facets of traditionally locally controlled government to a Federal judiciary that time and time again completely ignores the intent of the 10th amendment, the Federal Government has become wildly inefficient and is hemorrhaging tax dollars.

Our caucus will point out that not only is State and local control over programs in line with the Constitution, it is a much more cost-effective and efficient way to provide many domestic services to American citizens. It is imperative that we highlight the need to return to a system intended under the reserve clause of the Constitution.

And I want to point out several bills that have been introduced in this session that are initiatives we hope that will move us forward in this regard. The first one is the Sunset Commission legislation. Congressman KEVIN BRADY has introduced two bills, both of which would establish a Sunset Commission to review the continued need for executive branch agencies and programs on a regular basis and make recommendations to the President to rein in the inevitable mission creep.

□ 1815

Federal consent decree legislation, H.R. 1229. Congressman ROY BLUNT has introduced this legislation, the Federal Consent Decree Fairness Act, that

would level the playing field for State and local governments faced with activist Federal judges that are legislating from the bench. Federal consent decrees can be an effective judicial tool, but too often activist judges use them to lock in policy changes long after the State or local official that agreed to the decree has left office. H.R. 1229 would make it easier for State and local governments to amend such decrees.

Local control of education. Congressman JOHN CULBERSON has introduced legislation that would restore State sovereignty over public elementary and secondary education in H.R. 3449. The bill would require that a State specifically authorize operation of any Federal education program for which it accepts Federal funds, waiving the State's rights to act inconsistently with any strings attached to that Federal funding.

I am proud to be a cosponsor on all three pieces of this legislation, and in the next few weeks the Congressional Constitution Caucus is going to call attention not only to these bills, but others that we are bringing to the attention of the leadership and the American people to get us back into compliance with the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). 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.)

STOP OIL COMPANY PROFITEERING AND PRICE GOUGING

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, gas is bumping 3 bucks a gallon in Oregon, I know it is well over $3 a gallon in other parts of the country; and people are saying, oh, it is just market forces, supply and demand.

Well, you know, there is no free market in oil: from the production by the OPEC countries, with the cooperation of Mexico and Russia, where they conspire to restrict supply, to the oil companies themselves, who have created a black market, that is, a market where 75 percent of the oil is traded and retraded and retraded, driving up the price for no good reason just to facilitate profits, and then it is delivered to the refineries. We see now that we have a refinery shortage.

Well, why do we have a refinery shortage? Actually, that is pretty interesting. Ten years ago, the American Petroleum Institute sent a memo to its members saying, hey, you are not making much money with refineries. If you would facilitate the closing of refineries and squeeze down the availability of refinery capacity, you could increase profits. And then they did. In fact, in the last decade, through mergers and by action of individual corporations, they have closed 55 refineries in America.

Now they want to blame the environmentalists and say there isn't enough refinery capacity. Those darn environmentalists. Guess what? Not one of the 55 refineries was closed because of environmental issues. They were closed to increase profits.

The industry has become wildly profitable. Back in 2004, the refiners got 27 cents on each gallon of gas we bought. Last year, they got 99 cents on each gallon of gas we bought, four times higher. That has nothing to do with supply and demand. That is extortion of the American consumer.

The Valero Company, now the biggest refiner in America, their chief operating officer was asked about building more refineries, and said, why would we want to do that? We are doing very well the way things are.

The President claimed it was environmental restrictions, still does, and then he offered to allow any oil company to build a refinery on a closed military base with no environmental restrictions. He had no takers. It is working exactly the way the American Petroleum Institute predicted when they recommended the closing of refineries a decade ago.

Now this administration says they are not going to go with the windfall profits tax, despite the fact that Exxon-Mobil last year had the largest profit of any corporation in history, $36 billion in one year, $10 million a day. They were so awash in cash, giving it back, buying stock back, giving out dividends, and $400 million to their CEO, who wasn't there very long. It averaged out to a $135,000 pension a day for the time he worked at that company.

But there is no price gouging or profiteering going on here. So the administration says no windfall profits tax. They are going to look at gouging. But they are not going to look into the corporate boardrooms. They are going to go out and look at the corner gas stations, that are getting record low margins as they are squeezed by this noncompetitive industry.

It is past time for Congress to take definitive action. First, Congress should subject the trading of oil to the same regulations as any other commodity. Wipe out the black market in oil where they are jacking up the price. Experts say that one simple step, saying oil will be traded like every other commodity, it will be regulated and overseen by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, something the Bush administration doesn't want to do, would drive down the price immediately by 25 cents by squeezing out the speculation.

Impose a windfall profits tax on Exxon-Mobil and others unless and except they use some of their obscene profits to build new refining capacity. That could be exempt from the windfall profits tax. Give them a strong incentive to undo this little game they are playing on the American consumers.

Make price gouging a Federal crime. Right now you have to prove two companies colluded, not just one set out to price gouge. Change the law.

And then OPEC. Remember the President told us he was going to take on OPEC? He was going to jump on OPEC. He was going to do something about their restriction of the supply of oil. We have done nothing. Six of the OPEC countries are in the World Trade Organization. This President is big on free trade and rules-based trade. They are breaking the rules. They are violating all the rules of the WTO. File a complaint.

To be fair, I asked the last President, Mr. Clinton, to file a complaint against OPEC. He was as scared as George Bush to file a complaint against OPEC.

It is time to take on the international cartel and the price gouging. We need relief for American consumers now. Stop the price gouging, stop the profiteering, and take on this big industry.

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

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

IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR THE FLIGHT 93 MEMORIAL

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the fallen American heroes on United Flight 93, heroes like Tom Burnett, Jr., from Minnesota, who put country ahead of self on September 11, 2001, as he made the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Tom Burnett and the other brave American heroes that day overpowered the terrorist hijackers who sought to crash Flight 93 into the United States Capitol. America owes all the brave passengers on Flight 93 a deep debt of gratitude for the remarkable bravery.

And, Mr. Speaker, those of us who work here in this building, in this Capitol, literally owe our lives to the heroes of United Flight 93.

This week, as family members of the 33 passengers and seven crew of Flight 93 have been here on Capitol Hill, it is time to say ''yes'' to funding the Flight 93 National Memorial plan for the site in Pennsylvania where the plane ultimately crashed. Tom Burnett and the other brave passengers deserve this fitting memorial, and we should move ahead with the project immediately so the land can be secured.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in frequent contact with Tom Burnett's parents, Tom, Sr., and Beverly Burnett, about the site and about the memorial. They have long expressed concern that this sacred ground was still in jeopardy of purchase by other parties and not properly protected.

On that fateful day, on his last phone call to his wife, Deena, Tom Burnett said, and I am quoting, ''We have got to do something. I know we are all going to die. There's three of us who are going to do something about it.''

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what Tom Burnett and the other passengers of Flight 93 did. They stepped forward in an amazing show of patriotism and self-sacrifice. Now it is time for Congress to step forward and do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely outrageous to continue to block this memorial to honor the heroic actions of the passengers of Flight 93. Let me repeat that: it is absolutely outrageous to continue to block this memorial to honor the heroic actions of the passengers on Flight 93. It is time for Congress to come together and do what is right, just as the passengers of Flight 93 did what was right at the cost of their own lives.

Mr. Speaker, we should live up to our commitment now. Flight 93 family members have passionately explained to us again this week why the 1,200 acres are needed to properly tell the story of Flight 93. Now it is our turn to do our part.

Tom Burnett, Jr., and the other heroes of Flight 93 showed us what bravery is all about. Now we need to step forward to honor their courageous legacy. We must never forget the ultimate sacrifice made by the passengers and crew of United Flight 93 on September 11, 2001. Let's do the right thing. Let's do the honorable thing. Let's support full funding for the Flight 93 memorial.

MAXIMIZING OUR MEDICAL RESEARCH DOLLARS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, for over a century the Federal Government has had a strong commitment to biomedical, behavioral, and population-based research conducted at National Institutes of Health centers around the Nation.

The research conducted at these facilities, which include several in my congressional district in New Jersey, is responsible for the continued development of an ever-expanding research base and has contributed to medical advances that have profoundly improved the length and quality of life for millions of Americans.

Over the years, I have vigorously supported efforts to increase funding for NIH, including efforts to double NIH funding in recent years. However, I am now concerned the President and House Republicans are abandoning their commitment to NIH. Last year, they cut overall funding for medical research, and this year the House Republican budget proposal would only provide the same funding for NIH as last year. This would result in an even larger cut than last year in which all but three NIH institutes and centers would see their budgets fall for the second year in a row.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when Republicans are retreating on their commitment to health research, we must remain vigilant in demanding the necessary funding to continue groundbreaking research. We must also work to ensure that those entities receiving NIH funding grants are utilizing them to the best of their ability. And I think we must explore ways to consolidate research efforts around the Nation so that we can eliminate any duplication and maximize every research dollar.

In my congressional district, we are fortunate to host some of the finest research and health care institutions in the country that receive NIH grant funding. The city of New Brunswick, nicknamed the Health Care City, is home to Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, Johnson & Johnson, the Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital, and the Cancer Institute of New Jersey, among many other world-class facilities. Our State government also has committed to moving forward with the Stem Cell Institute of New Jersey New Brunswick.

Crucial to this continued success, however, is ensuring that we have a coherent structure in place to fully maximize our ability to secure Federal research dollars, corporate investment, and human talent.

I strongly believe that merging the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School and the School of Public Health with Rutgers University in New Brunswick is critical to achieving this goal. Although the medical school is now part of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, it shares many facilities, faculty, and research responsibilities with Rutgers. In fact, it was once called the Rutgers University Medical School.

In addition, the Cancer Institute of New Jersey, a national leader in cancer care and research, is comprised of faculty from the medical school and Rutgers in nearly equal numbers.

Strengthening these relationships and eliminating the duplication and disorganization that results from administrative separation of health sciences at Rutgers and UMDNJ will go a long way toward increasing the scarce flow of Federal research dollars to New Jersey.

By unifying our medical education institutions under one umbrella, we will not only have a better chance of competing for large medical grants and contracts, but also attract the best faculty and students from around the Nation.

Furthermore, we will create a stronger platform from which new intellectual property can be generated in close proximity to the largest concentration of health care companies in the Nation. We can reinvigorate the cooperation between the medical experts at these companies and the academic leaders at our new unified medical school. With these companies already in place right in our backyard, just imagine the economic growth that we could foster by simply bridging all of our health care academic minds into one institution.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that we should explore similar consolidation plans at other research institutions in New Jersey and around the Nation to maintain our momentum in the field of medical discovery and invention. Our State government in New Jersey has to explore the possibility of integrating the other medical schools and research facilities in New Jersey with nearby institutions.

Mr. Speaker, by combining the best of Rutgers and the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, I am confident New Jersey will remain a national leader in medical care, education and research so that we can build a stronger State economy, and even more importantly, improve the health care of all New Jerseyans.

□ 1830

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). 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.)

PROTESTS IN BELARUS

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the disturbing reports that I have been hearing out of Belarus over the past 24 hours.

Yesterday was the 20th anniversary of the Chernobyl disaster, and also the day of the first major demonstration against President Lukashenko since the fraudulent elections on March 19. Early on Wednesday, opposition candidate Aleksander Milinkevich was brought to police headquarters before the rally and warned by the KGB the consequences of holding the rally and asked to sign a document stating that he knew what would happen should the rally continue.

Mr. Milinkevich boldly refused. And then today around 12 p.m. in Minsk, Mr. Milinkevich was giving an interview to reporters when the police showed up and took him to the police station. He was charged with organizing an unsanctioned rally with regards to yesterday's rally in Minsk and received a 15-day sentence.

Also this morning, two other UDF leaders, Sergiy Kalyakin, the Chairman of the Communist Party, and Alexander Bukhostov, leader of the Belarusian Labor Party, were summoned to the City Executive Committee of the Minsk Interior Affairs regarding their application to hold another prodemocratic rally in Minsk on May 1. They were then taken by police to the police department and charged with organizing yesterday's unsanctioned rally in Minsk. Mr. Bukhostov received 15 days in jail, and Mr. Kalyakin received 14 days.

And perhaps the most terrible and intimidating incident I have heard of occurred yesterday prior to the rally in Minsk. Prior to a speech at the rally, opposition activist Anatoly Lebedko was kidnapped, beaten and interrogated for several hours by members of the KGB, which we can only assume was ordered by the office of President Lukashenko. Mr. Lebedko was given a message by these thugs when he was shoved out of the car outside of Minsk. All they had to say was, we hope you have drawn the appropriate conclusions from this.

However, the conclusions that I and the Belarusian people have drawn is that despite these continued threats from Lukashenko, the spirit of freedom has not died in Belarus. All these people wanted to do was hold a peaceful rally to honor those Belarusians who died in the Chernobyl accident, and to come together as a country.

President Lukashenko may have tried to stop the rally through these intimidation tactics, but even if only one person had shown up despite this ongoing threat of violence, it means that freedom lived within the hearts and minds of these people, and someday it will come to them again.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday in Minsk, thousands of Belarusians rallied in support of freedom.

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

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

THE WAR IN IRAQ

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago the American people stopped to remember the third anniversary of the beginning of the Iraq war. We thought first and foremost of the selflessness, patriotism and heroism by our troops, our National Guard and Reserves.

We also remembered those who have been wounded in battle, and who need our support more than ever. And we never forget those whose service meant giving their lives for their country.

Americans are united in this remembrance, but so, too, Mr. Speaker, do Americans understand that we need a new direction in Iraq, that Congress must take up its responsibility and demand that our policy be based on honest assessments from our own military.

For too long the U.S. military's leadership has been ignored and stifled by a White House motivated by its own political and ideological agenda. Indeed, when General Eric Shinseki told Congress in 2002 that we would need almost 400,000 troops to ensure a short and peaceful occupation, administration officials said he was wildly off the mark and quickly forced him into retirement.

Earlier this year, when General Casey conceded that U.S. forces were stretched, the Pentagon rushed to issue a clarifying statement. And when six former generals who worked closely with Secretary Rumsfeld called for his resignation, the President wasted no time reiterating his unyielding support for Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had confidence that this White House and Secretary of Defense could look beyond their ideological agenda to do what is right for our national security and our troops, but I do not, which is why I believe the responsibility to take the lead on Iraq now falls to the Congress.

Yes, Congress was delinquent for too long in its oversight responsibilities in the prosecution of the war, writing blank checks to the administration with no requirements for progress or accountability to the taxpayers, but in declaring that 2006 should be a year of transition in this year's defense appropriation bill, and in finally requiring regular status reports from the administration, Congress at last showed that it might be serious about handing over the security of Iraq to the Iraqi people.

Unfortunately, 4 months into 2006, as insurgent violence occurs daily, that process has still not begun, with no regular hearings, calls for accountability or investigations. The result is that American troops find themselves increasingly in the crossfire of warring religious groups. Just last weekend eight more U.S. troops lost their lives. And the President now says our troops will be in the middle of this Iraqi civil war at least until 2009.

Mr. Speaker, as we go into the fourth year, it is well past time for a firm plan to redeploy our troops. This is consistent with the views of our troops, nearly three-quarters of whom say 2006 is the year to succeed or reassess. It is the view of the top U.S. commander in Iraq, General George Casey, who told Congress, our troops are ''one of the elements that fuels the insurgency.''

So the starting point for new policy is to be serious about making 2006 a year of transition, and signaling to all of the parties in Iraq and the region that they must take responsibility.

We must hear the advice of our own military about how to best reduce troop levels without fear of reprisal from the administration. We must have a timetable for a phased reduction of our troops, ensuring a minimal presence within 12 months, with most redeployed by the end of 2006. We must expand the training of Iraqi military and police units, and demand that they be linked to a reduction in American forces.

We must establish a contract, as we did in Bosnia, requiring the key powers in the region, including Saudi Arabia and Jordan, to be more actively involved in security and reconstruction. Iraq's neighbors must understand that they have a stake in its success.

We should redeploy our National Guard to help with homeland security efforts. In coping with disaster, bird flu or another terrorist attack, our National Guard must be prepared. But a third of Louisiana's Guard was in Iraq during Katrina, slowing relief efforts with deadly consequences. And over 500 of my State's National Guard troops are deployed in Afghanistan, because the regular Army remains in Iraq in such large numbers.

And with respect to Afghanistan, where the Taliban is resurgent since U.S. troops were diverted to Iraq, we should refocus our efforts there and resume our work to stabilize a country that has provided the base for global terrorism.

Taken together, this new policy will produce a minimal but flexible U.S. troop presence in Iraq within a year. That is how we best maintain a strong military, while making America more secure. Our troops deserve a Congress that takes its oversight responsibilities seriously, not one that acts as a rubber stamp for a White House who is clearly off track.

Our troops are bearing the burden of our indecision. We owe them a full and open debate and a new direction. It is not a matter of partisanship, but a matter of patriotism of our country's stewardship and security.

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

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

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

(Mr. STUPAK 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

FEDERAL SUNSET COMMISSION

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Constitutional Caucus headed by Mr. BISHOP and Mr. GARRETT, who are determined to make sure that government in Washington and in this country is limited to the constitutional role. I appreciate their leadership, because that is too often forgotten in this Chamber. One of the pieces of legislation that helps underscore that need is legislation to create a Federal Sunset Commission, legislation I authored 10 years ago.

I have watched and worked in the State legislature in Texas to promote, and here is the benefits of it. What this does is this Commission seeks to abolish obsolete agencies and eliminate duplication by putting an expiration date on every agency and program where they must justify their existence to taxpayers or face elimination.

What it does, in practice, is eliminate agencies that duplicate each other. And the last study showed that Federal programs, on average, duplicate five others. So we are wasting money terribly.

As President Ronald Reagan said, the closest thing to immortality on this Earth is a Federal program. Our goal is to end immortality, make sure that Federal agencies are responsive to taxpayers and they need our precious tax dollars today; not what they were created for 100 years ago or 80 years ago, but do they deserve our tax dollars today?

The fact of the matter is there is so much duplication, there is so much waste in this government, and we have 500-and-some different urban aid programs, 350 different economic development programs, more than 100 different job training programs, the war on drugs, multiple programs over about 17 different agencies.

It is a terrible waste of tax dollars, and in this day and age when we are fighting a war against terrorism, when we have major deficits, we cannot afford this type of wasteful government.

Our Constitution requires us to trim the Federal Government. In fact, Thomas Jefferson, our third President, wrote a letter to a friend at that time in his Presidency lamenting the fact that he was having trouble cutting back agencies that had outlived their usefulness.

So the fight that we have is an historical fight. We have actually brought this bill up to a vote before in the House. It passed with 272 votes. It did not move further than that. But I am convinced that by assigning agencies, there will be no sacred cows, every agency has to justify their existence.

In Texas we have eliminated 44 State agencies, saved over $1 billion. I am convinced here at the Federal level, done right in a bipartisan way with real commitment, we can save tax dollars. We can make Federal programs accountable to taxpayers and save dollars.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back, again with thanks to Mr. BISHOP and Mr. GARRETT for leading this caucus at such a key time in our Nation's history.

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

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

REMEMBERING THE HOLOCAUST

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to pay my respects, and ask my colleagues to join me, in observing Holocaust Remembrance Week.

This morning the Congress, in a bipartisan manner, gathered in the Capitol Rotunda, to remember a period of history that will resonate forever, and which we must never again see occur. We grieve for the loss of life, and the dismissal of humanity.

Around 280,000 Holocaust survivors live in Israel, constituting 40 percent of the population over age 60. It may seem like time progresses, but the Holocaust remains present and an ongoing warning. After over 60 years, the Holocaust is still a presence, and there are living memorials all over the world dedicated to the memory of those who so cruelly lost their freedom and their lives and to the continuing education to conquer prejudice, hatred and injustice.

I am reminded of the time I spent with the Holocaust Museum and a Holocaust Museum family in Houston, Texas. Just recently we commemorated the bringing over of one of those heinous and horrific rail cars that took the Jews in Germany to their death. It is there in Houston for remembrance and an understanding that we should never, never allow that horrific act to occur again.

□ 1845

On April 25, the bustling society of Israel observed 2 minutes of silence while sirens sounded to remember the Holocaust. Traffic paused, individuals stood still on sidewalks, the background then of a robust society waned, and the haunting echo of the sirens cried out for relief and justice and acknowledgment.

Hundreds of people participated in the March of the Living at the Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp in Poland. Triumphantly walking through the infamous gate that still has an ominous dominance over the camp: Arbeit Macht Frei, Work Will Make You Free.

Memorial services around the country at synagogues, schools, churches, community centers and workplaces read aloud the names of children who perished or reflected on the legacy of uprooted families or the meaning of a cultural identity after genocide. As we walked through the Holocaust Museum in Israel, we were again reminded of the millions of children that died.

The Holocaust's magnitude of destruction numbered more than 12 million deaths, including 6 million Jews and 1.5 million children, more than two-thirds of European Jewry, and the ramifications of racism, prejudice and stereotyping on a society.

We must never, never sit idly by while another country or people are suffering. We must never have patience or tolerance or apathy for others who will commit crimes against humanity. A haunting quote in the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum refers to the story of Cain and Abel. The Lord said, ''What have you done? Listen. Your brother's blood cries out to me from the ground.''

The Holocaust forces society and our prosperity to face uncomfortable questions such as the responsibilities of

citizenship and the consequences of indifference and inaction and the importance of education and awareness. The victims of oppression and genocide, whether in Germany, whether dealing with the Armenian people or the people of Sudan, are heard when the world demands justice and accountability. We must speak for them, those who cannot speak for themselves.

The Holocaust is a testament to the fragility of democracy. We must reaffirm the fight against prejudice and intolerance in any form all over the world, no matter what your religious background or ethnic background. It is time for the world to link arms against intolerance and genocide and fight for justice and accountability.

It fills me with grief to know that the leaders of nations can destroy their own, and yet I hope that we can strengthen the means by which we continue to pursue justice. Hope springs eternal, and I hope for us it is of real meaning as we fight for justice and equality and the elimination of genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to pay my respects, and ask my colleagues to join me in observing Holocaust Remembrance Week.

This morning, the Congress gathered in the Capitol Rotunda to remember a period of history that will resonate forever, and which we must never again let occur. We grieve for the loss of life and the dismissal of humanity.

Around 280,000 Holocaust survivors live in Israel, constituting 40 percent of the population over age 60. It may seem like time progresses, but the Holocaust remains present, and an ongoing warning.

After over 60 years, the Holocaust is still a presence, and there are living memorials all over the world dedicated to the memory of those who so cruelly lost their freedom and their lives, and to the continuing education to conquer prejudice, hatred, and injustice.

On April 25th, the bustling society of Israel observed two minutes of silence while sirens sounded to remember the Holocaust. Traffic paused, individuals stood still on sidewalks, the background din of a robust society waned and the haunting echo of the sirens cried.

Hundreds of people participated in the March of the Living at the Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp in Poland, triumphantly walking through the infamous gate that still has an ominous dominance over the camp: Albeit Macht Frei (Albeet Mahkt Fray), Work Will Make You Free.

Memorial services around the country, at synagogues, schools, churches, community centers, and workplaces, read aloud the names of children who perished, or reflected on the legacy of uprooted families, or the meaning of a cultural identity after a genocide.

The Holocaust's magnitude of destruction numbered more than 12 million deaths, including 6 million Jews and 1.5 million children (more than 2/3 of European Jewry), and the ramifications of prejudice, racism and stereotyping on a society. We must never, NEVER, sit idly by while another country or people is suffering. We must never have patience, or tolerance, or apathy, for others who would commit crimes against humanity. A haunting quote in the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum refers to the story of Cain and Abel: "The Lord said, "What have you done? Listen! Your brother's blood cries out to me from the ground (Genesis 4:11).

The Holocaust forces society and our posterity to face uncomfortable questions such as the responsibilities of citizenship and the consequences of indifference and inaction, and the importance of education and awareness.

The victims of oppression and genocide—whether in Germany, whether dealing with the Armenian people or the people of Sudan—are heard when the world demands justice and accountability.

The Holocaust is a testament to the fragility of democracy. We must reaffirm the fight against prejudice and intolerance in any form.

It fills me with grief to know that the leaders of nations can destroy their own—and yet I hope that we can continue to strengthen the means by which we can pursue justice.

MINIMIZE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to, first of all, commend the work of a gentleman from whom we will be hearing shortly, the gentleman from Utah, for his efforts to come to the floor on a regular basis to lead the charge of the Constitutional Caucus to return the focus of this House and also the American public on what our Founding Fathers intended, and that is the basis of this country, the U.S. Constitution; and also to rise to commend the work of a Member from Texas who has just previously spoken on his efforts toward that goal and his aim on his legislation that he spoke to previously just a few moments ago on setting up a Sunset Commission in order to try to rein in this ever-growing government that we have today.

We know this government has been growing over recent years. If we can go back to 1925 when then-President Calvin Coolidge said then, when the government was as small as it was at that point in time, he said, quote, government is growing, quote, to encumber the national government beyond its wisdom to comprehend or its ability to reach alternatives and to advocate for the people, end quote. Even then in 1925, Calvin Coolidge realized the government had far exceeded the merits the Founding Fathers intended for this country.

Today we see it as well. Today, of course, we have official reports to confirm the same thing. GAO recently came out with a report and certified and stated that the GAO cannot certify the government's financial records for the last 8 years in a row. They say there are weak accounting practices, mismeasurements and mismanagement of assets and liability and costs. We see that today.

Why is this that we see this? Because of certain problems in different areas. The size of government has grown tremendously, we have cause to understand. There is a sense today that a larger government will meet the requirements of the citizens today because one size fits all. We know that in practical life that does not ring true, nor does it ring true when we have a country today of over 300 million people and a government that has tried to meet it with one-size-fits-all philosophy.

We see it also in a sense that a government is not like a business. You know, in the private sector, there are certain economies of scale. As a business grows bigger, there are economies of scale that makes it more efficient. That is not the case with the government. There are no such economies of scale.

Instead, there is a lacking of coordination. There is an overlapping of agencies, and, again, what we have to do is look to recent GAO reports that just recently came out. This case, in the case of FEMA, overlapping of the agencies, of other agencies, mismanagement in the agencies, we saw that this agency could not deal with the circumstances that came before it.

Our Founding Fathers understood this. Thomas Jefferson realized that as the government grows, he said, quote, the natural process of things in government is for liberty to yield and for government to gain ground. Government has gained ground in too many specific areas, and our liberty has been yielding. Again, I commend the gentleman from Texas for his efforts to try to rein in that size of the government.

I would just make some suggestions as we go forward with that piece of legislation. What we need to do, I believe, is make sure that legislation has some real teeth to it to be able to get the job done. We know that there is already outside organizations that are always looking at the Federal Government to see to it whether it is being efficient or not.

We need an agency within the Federal Government that will have teeth, be able to get the job done. It needs more than just to analyze it. One of the ways we can do that is to have that Sunset Commission have a BRAC-like formula to it so that way it will be easier for the proposals to come to Congress, just like we did with the BRAC Commission to have simply an up-or-down vote on those agencies that are no longer doing their job and those agencies are just simply not getting the job done.

But we have to go a little bit further than that, because we are not simply looking at duplication of services and efficiencies. We also have to add one additional criteria to that BRAC-like commission for the Sunset Commission. That is a very fundamental one, and that is the question, are the agencies that this Commission is going to be looking at, are the agencies doing something that they have the legal right to do? That is to say, do they

have the constitutional right to do what they are doing right now?

You know, it is not enough to say that it is efficient. It is not enough to say that it is not duplicating services someplace else. It has to be legal in what it is doing. When Members of Congress come to vote each day on floor, we bring out these little cards, and we put them in the little slot here. I think every Member of Congress every time he votes should be asking that question: Is it legal, is it constitutional? And that is exactly what the Sunset Commission should be doing as well.

I will just conclude on this, Mr. Speaker. A former Member from years ago, Barry Goldwater, came to speak once, and he said that when he came to Washington, he did not come to Washington to make it more efficient or to streamline it. He came to Washington to eliminate it. The Founding Fathers had the exact same idea. They did not mean that our Federal Government should be simply an inefficient government of exceeding abilities of powers, but should be a limited one by our Constitution. That is what the Constitutional Caucus is all about. That is what the Sunset Commission can do as well. I applaud the Member for advocating that and moving along with that legislation.

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.)

PROPER BALANCE BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL POWERS

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Justice Brandeis, as we have talked once before, has said States are the ideal laboratory for democracy, for indeed they have the better ability of being creative, and, if the creation goes wrong, can move back from that, from the Federal Government. For indeed when we try to be creative, and it goes wrong, the entire Nation has an impact with it.

The idea of a Sunset Commission is one which has been experimented on by various States, various times for a several or a few years now. As our good friend Mr. BRADY from Texas clearly said, it has proven effective in cutting away bureaucracy, eliminating inefficient agencies, letting go of outdated programs, and also saving the taxpayers money.

Another way of saying that is this Commission can make citizens of America more free, can keep government within its proper bounds and help us to keep more of our own money and rule our own lives, which is another reason why the Constitutional Caucus is supporting the creation of this Sunset Commission.

The administration actually started this ball rolling several years ago with the introduction of their Program Assessment Rating Tool, or PART, the results of which have been the basis of administrative decisions on budget proposals every year now. The key now is to give these recommendations some legislative teeth, which is something that the former Director, as well as the Budget Director of OMB, has urged us.

He wrote, one time, we need to involve Congress more directly in holding agencies and programs accountable for their performance through a Sunset Commission which provides regular formal scrutiny of Federal programs. This bipartisan Commission would review each Federal program on a schedule established by Congress to determine whether it is producing results and should continue to exist. Programs would automatically terminate according to the schedule, unless the Congress took action to continue them.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest also that one of the things we might want to do is expand it to one other role. Many States, including mine, have a regulatory oversight committee, which means a committee of the legislative body which meets on a regular basis to review all rules that are established and step in where rules established by the bureaucracy become egregious.

Let's face it. All legislative bodies are sometimes sloppy. Sometimes we have a grand idea, and then we will empower an agency to implement that idea. Oftentimes those implementations, those rules and regulations, they go awry. When there happens to be nobody directly accessible or accountable to citizens who can then go to that and attack and change that rule, well, that is when problems develop. That is why we need to have legislative bodies who could step in and set things right.

Much of the erosion of States rights in our country's history has come from unaccountable Federal agencies that grow and then wrap their arms around States and people and don't ever want to let go. Congress has certainly done its part to ignore 10th amendment issues. Courts have also siphoned off some power. But a slow and insidious encroachment of Federal agencies is perhaps the worst of these influences.

A Sunset Commission would put us on the road to solving this. It would force every Federal agency to its usefulness, review its own mission, justify its own existence, or face some kind of elimination. It would also allow a review of regulations and standards to make sure they are logical, legitimate, and within the scope of the legislative empowerment that created them in the first place.

I appreciate the opportunity being here on the same evening when Mr. BRADY, the gentleman from Texas, reintroduced his bill to the American people of having a Sunset Commission. I appreciate also being here when the gentleman from New Jersey Mr. GARRETT talks about the Constitutional Caucus and the effort it is to try to reestablish the right and proper balance between government; for indeed the purpose of that is to ensure that the power belongs to people to rule their own lives, to States to be in their sphere of government, and the Federal Government to maintain its balance and its purpose where it was constitutionally designed to be.

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

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

GENOCIDE IN SUDAN

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to condemn the genocide that is taking place in Darfur, Sudan and to voice my support for the individuals and organizations throughout the United States who work tirelessly to stop this crime against humanity. I would like to recognize the "Teens Against Genocide" organization—also known as "TAG," in particular, for its efforts in Los Angeles, California.

Among many other events, TAG has joined with religious, advocacy, and charity groups in the area to organize "Camp Darfur." Camp Darfur is an "interactive awareness and education event that [brings] attention to the ongoing genocide in Darfur and [gives] individuals the opportunity to discover their own power to make a difference."

On April 7, 2006, Camp Darfur first opened in Lennox, California, on the sports field of Lennox Middle School adjacent to LAX. In addition, TAG organized a rally and brought Camp Darfur to Westwood, California last Sunday, April 23, 2006. Through candlelight vigils, interactive presentations, video, photography, speeches from experts, legislators, and educators, simulated refugee camp exercises, the groups joining TAG are expanding the awareness of the atrocities taking place in Sudan to bring about peace. It is even more significant that teens are undertaking such mature efforts of advocacy for issues in which they truly believe.

I applaud these young adults and organizations and would like to let the American people know that Camp Darfur will be brought from Los Angeles to Washington, DC in the near future. We must offer our continued support for these efforts and others in order to bring about action. In fact, this coming Sunday, April 30 at 2:00 p.m. in front of the Capitol, the "Save Darfur Coalition" will hold the

"Rally to Stop Genocide." The murder, rape, and torture that have occurred—and still occur—in Sudan must stop.

In July of 2004, the House of Representatives and the Senate declared that the atrocities occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan constituted genocide. On September 9, 2004, Secretary of State Colin Powell declared that "genocide has been committed in Darfur, and that the government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility." It is estimated that 200,000 people were killed by government forces and militias from 2003 through 2004, and an additional 200,000 people died as a result of the deliberate destruction of their homes and livelihoods.

Nevertheless, almost two years later, these atrocities continue unabated. The government of Sudan continues to carry out air strikes against civilians in Darfur, and the Janjaweed militias, with the support of the government, continue to terrorize the people of Darfur.

Earlier this year, I traveled to Sudan as part of a bipartisan congressional delegation led by my good friend from California, Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi. We visited the camps. As far as the eyes could see, there were crowds of displaced people who had been driven from their homes, living literally on the ground with little tarps just covering them. It is unconscionable that this should continue.

Our delegation also met with Sudanese Vice President Taha. He was unapologetic, he was arrogant, and he was uncompromising on their position in Darfur. Sudanese government officials don't like the use of the word "genocide," but Vice President Taha admitted that they had funded the Janjaweed in order to retaliate against the rebels of the south who were resisting the Sudanese government.

There can be no doubt that what is taking place in Darfur is genocide, and the government of Sudan is responsible. There are two million displaced people in camps in Darfur and another 200,000 in camps in neighboring Chad. Each month, it is estimated that another 6,000 people die.

On April 5, 2006, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. This bill imposes sanctions on the government of Sudan and blocks the assets and restricts travel for individuals who are responsible for acts of genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity in Darfur. I urged my colleagues to support this bill, which passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 416 to 3. This legislation was long overdue.

The world stood by and watched the genocide that occurred in Rwanda. The world has noted over and over again the atrocities of the Holocaust. Yet we cannot seem to get the international community to move fast enough to stop the genocide that is taking place in Darfur.

The world cannot continue to turn a blind eye to genocide when it is staring us in the face. We must put an end to these atrocities, or millions more will die.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to encourage and support the work done by advocacy groups such as Teens Against Genocide and to continue legislative action to stop these crimes against humanity.

ENERGY PRICES IN AMERICA

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the privilege to address you. In addressing you, I recognize the American people's ears are tuned as well. It is a precious right we have, our freedom of speech we have in this country, and we exercise it on the floor of this Congress on a regular basis, and I appreciate it on both sides of the aisle.

I came to the floor this evening, Mr. Speaker, to address the energy situation that we have in the United States of America. We have watched our gas prices go up to $3 a gallon and more in the last few weeks. There was a time when it was headed in that direction, and it headed back down again, and now it is back up, and who knows where it is going to stop. We never know where it is going to stop.

The American people are concerned about this, Mr. Speaker, and they should be. We have debated energy on this floor many, many times, and we have kicked back and forth issue after issue that has to do with how we are going to provide an adequate energy supply to keep this economy churning.

This economy is churning, Mr. Speaker. It is churning consistently. It has got some really unprecedented growth. Ten of the last eleven succeeding quarters have had more than 3 percent growth in our gross domestic product. That is a growth rate that one has to go back to the early Reagan years to match.

Yet this growth rate that we have in this environment, this more than 3 percent growth of our gross domestic product for 10 of the last 11 succeeding quarters, or preceding quarters, is matched back to those Reagan years. But in those years, we were under high inflation, high unemployment and high interest rates.

□ 1900

It was a lot harder to make a predictable profit back in those early years than it is in this environment. Today, this is 3 percent growth-plus. It is more than 3 percent growth, but we are doing this in an environment of relatively low interest rates and lower unemployment rates and lower inflation rates. So this economy has had perhaps the longest run and been the healthiest economic environment I have seen in my lifetime.

I am thankful President Bush stood up and took the lead after the bursting of the dot-com bubble, which sent the United States toward a recession. As the dot-com bubble burst, we had speculators that were investing in our new technological ability to store and transfer information faster than ever before without regard to what that value was worth in the marketplace. And so the economy, the dot-com bubble burst, and that sent us towards a recession, and some will say in a recession.

And then right in that recession we saw the September 11 attack on the United States, on our financial centers, on the Pentagon, and of course on the plane that crashed in the field in Pennsylvania. And that was an attack, again, on our financial centers with an attempt to cripple our economy. Well, not only did it hit a difficult hard blow to our economy but, at the same time, this Congress made the decision to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in homeland security, so we also had to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in our Department of Defense funding to carry out this global war on terror.

So we increased our spending in defense, we created a Department of Homeland Security, and we dramatically grew the spending in homeland security all at the time when our economy was being compressed and reduced because of the hit on our financial centers of September 11 and because of the bursting of the dot-com bubble. And the vision of President Bush was that we had to cut taxes to stimulate the economy, and so we did that.

We did that in two rounds here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. And we said today that last year our revenue increase by 14½ percent greater than anticipated, and this year it is going to be double digits again, greater than anticipated. These tax cuts have worked. They have brought us out of this recession that was caused by the bursting of the dot-com bubble and the September 11 attacks.

But into the middle of all of this we have the energy issue, the energy issue that has gas prices up to $3 a gallon or more as it becomes closer and closer, potentially, to an energy crisis. Now, someone once asked, what is the solution to $3 gas? All of America is asking that question today. What is the solution to $3 gas? And some wag responded, well, $3 gas is the solution to $3 gas. Now, I am not sure that $3 gas brings us the answer to this, but I do believe $4 or $5 or $6 gas will bring solutions to a lot of our energy problems in this country and energy problems around the world.

We have been, really, beneficiaries of a fairly cheap fuel over the years. We have had good access to resources here in the United States; and our oil companies, especially American oil companies, have gone overseas, developed the oil supplies in the Middle East, for example, the Libyan oil fields and the Iraqi and Iranian oil fields, and the list goes on. Our American companies have been integral to the development of the oil supply that is coming to the United States today, and that oil is coming out of the ground cheap, and it came to the United States cheap.

Not very long ago we had gas at a $1.07. I don't remember anyone in America saying since we have such cheap gas prices, we ought to pay a little extra to these oil companies that have invested their capital to go out and drill and explore around the world so that we have an adequate supply of

energy. No, American consumers did what consumers do: they pumped the $1.07 gas in their cars, they drove a little more, and maybe bought a car that burned a little more gas and got a little less mileage than they might have otherwise and looked at that as something that was going to go on, cheap gas into perpetuity.

But we know that those situations have a way of coming home to roost. We are the beneficiaries of an energy policy that was driven globally by capital investment of American oil companies and the people who invested in those American oil companies. And the import oil that was coming in was coming in to America cheap. But today it is a different environment. That environment has turned.

And as we saw our prices go up during Katrina and Rita, when our refineries were shut down, down in the gulf coast, a good number of our platforms were wiped out in the hurricanes in the gulf coast and a large percentage of America's energy supply was shut down during and in the aftermath of Katrina. It took us a while to get back on line, and it is going to take us a while longer to get our production back up to where it was prior to Katrina. Some of the refineries are not back up to speed yet; and some of the platforms, I understand, are not quite up to speed yet either.

So we don't have the American supply of either oil or natural gas coming that we had prior to Hurricane Katrina, and yet there is work to be done. We passed some energy bills here in the last couple of years. We passed two that I recall. One of them addressed the situation of not having enough refineries. But in the United States we have not built a new oil refinery since 1976. Now, that works out to be 30 years, Mr. Speaker, without building a refinery.

It is true we have expanded some of the ones we had, but we have also shut down a significant number of those that we had. Our ability to refine our oil for our consumption here in the United States has diminished to where we cannot meet that demand of refining all of our own today. And that is an important component. It is important we are able to refine all the oil that we consume in America, that we produce and consume in America. That gives us at least a modicum of independence from the price of foreign oil.

So we took some steps here in this Congress to site some new refinery locations and to provide so that we could build those refineries and get them up on line. It takes a little while to do that. We just initiated that, and along came Rita and Katrina, and it set us back again. So we find ourselves in this situation where our domestic supplies have been reduced at the very time that the threat of violence around the world has slowed down some of the oil supply that is coming through, and it has diminished the optimism of the investor market.

I look at what is going on in Iran, for example, and the nuclear threat that they have become. They have clearly stated to the world over and over again, we are going to enrich our uranium, and they claim that they have. They put on a play where they had dancers dancing around on the stage each with a vile of enriched uranium to demonstrate that their 164 centrifuges are now producing this enriched uranium. And they need dozens and perhaps hundreds more to be able to produce a large enough quantity to produce a bomb.

But if they are telling the truth about their ability to enrich the uranium, and I believe they are; and if they are telling the truth about their conviction to move forward to develop a bomb, and I believe they are, then it is just a matter of time. And the time question is whether it is months or years before they get to that point where they will be able to have a nuclear weapon.

It was just announced this morning that they have purchased the means to deliver it, a means that would give them as much as a 2,000 mile range if they could put a nuclear warhead on top of the missiles that they allege and announced today that they have acquired from North Korea. So this is a serious threat to the world, and not just the peace of the world. It is a threat to the survival of Israel. And that, Mr. Speaker, might be another subject; but it is a threat to the entire energy production and delivery system of the world.

So we have a rogue nation, an evil empire, if they are not quite an empire yet, Iran, which is sitting on those massive supplies of oil and developing nuclear capability because, they claim, at least they used to claim, that they need a nuclear capability to generate electricity in Iran. That an oil-rich nation would develop a nuclear capability to generate electricity never was a believable allegation, especially when you are considered a nation that doesn't have the ability to refine its own crude oil for the gas that goes into the cars they drive around in cities like Tehran.

One would think, if they wanted to move into the future world, they would do so by building refineries so they could refine the crude oil that they pump out of the ground in Iran, burn the gas and the diesel fuel in the nation of Iran, and export a refined product rather than a crude oil product. But, no, Mr. Speaker, their priorities went towards developing a nuclear capability.

It has put the world on notice that we are at great risk today, and that risk is missiles that will soon be aimed at, if not today, aimed at places like Tel Aviv, probably not Jerusalem right away. But the threats to annihilating Israel will force them, I think, to take action if there isn't some other solution.

Well, the energy world is looking at this volatile situation in Iran, and they understand that Israel cannot, if they are going to survive as a nation, sit back and wait and walk through this diplomatic jungle and allow Iran to have a nuclear capability. They cannot wait. And we here in the United States must also take a responsibility to eliminate a nation's ability to conduct a nuclear strike against their neighbors. This cannot be tolerated.

Yet as the world markets look at this, they understand also the risk that there will be some military action someday in Iran. If that action takes place, and some say when that action takes place, there is a high risk that the oil production out of that region between Iran and potentially Iraq could be shut down. If that is shut down, there will be a tremendous impact on the energy prices all over the world.

That tremendous impact will affect the global prices for oil that are now at all-time highs and have gone from, not very long ago, $15 a barrel to, the last I checked, $75 a barrel. And you think how can we have $3 gas? Well, think in terms of $75 a barrel and there is 42 gallons in a barrel. When it gets up to $84 a barrel, if you have 100 percent gas out of a barrel, then you would still be at $2 just to purchase the crude. Then you would have to go through the refinery process and peel out the oil and the diesel fuel and pay for the energy consumption that it takes to crack out a gallon of gas. But $3 gas is not a price gouge if you are buying the oil at $75 a barrel.

I will say, in defense of the oil companies, that they have invested their capital. They have done the research and development. They have done the field exploration. They have identified their reserves of oil. And when they have done so, that has been their capital that was invested. They had to invest on the prospects of being able to find new oil fields and then expand their wells into those and set up a distribution system that could come back to the market. And in this process of doing that, they need to make a profit if they are going to have the capital to do any more exploration.

So I am not one, Mr. Speaker, that would say that we should put a windfall profit tax on the very people that are producing the most oil for us, because they are the ones that are contributing to the overall supply of energy. And those that contribute to the overall supply of energy are the ones doing the most to keep the price down, Mr. Speaker.

So a windfall profits tax acts in the opposite direction. If I am Enron, for example, and I made $10-something billion in a quarter, and if we are making noises from the floor of this Congress like, way to go, Enron, you produced a lot of oil and we know you made some money; we hope you invest that back in oil exploration in places in the world so that there is a supply for us this year, next year, a decade from now, a generation from now, so that oil comes

back to the United States and we can consume it. We need this energy supply. If we just go out there and starve the goose that lays the golden oil, or golden barrel of crude oil, eventually we will find the prices of crude going up higher and higher and higher because there will be less supply.

So we have done some things in this country that were not very smart, and it has been because our hands have been tied here and over in the Senate by environmentalists. It isn't so much that they are concerned something is going to happen to the environment. I have a difficult time looking around the oil fields and finding damage to the environment. It is more, I think, just a belief system, almost a religion, if you will, Mr. Speaker, that if you label it green, more than half the Members of this Congress will vote against oil exploration or oil development or energy development. If you label it something green is against, I should say. If you label it renewable, then they are for it, whether it is practical or whether it isn't.

We need to do a lot of things in this country; and when I look around at the oil exploration in America, it has diminished dramatically. The offshore drilling in America is almost shut down entirely, and that is for both oil and natural gas.

Now, we have developed our natural gas fields in the Gulf Coast, around New Orleans and the coast of Texas. But when you go east and start along the Mississippi and Florida and Alabama, I need to get those people in there, you find that the panhandle of Florida runs along the Gulf Coast quite a ways. But to drill for even natural gas offshore in Florida, even 199.9 miles out offshore has been blocked and banned by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans from Florida, a coalition of Democrats from America, and some people that have jumped on board there that are northeastern Republicans that don't seem to understand that their homes need to be heated, their cars need gas in them, and their factories need natural gas.

□ 1915

If they are going to produce anything from a factory standpoint, they need natural gas to fire that. And the food that they eat is all grown with nitrogen, Mr. Speaker, and our nitrogen fertilizer that is the backbone of our corn-producing industry in America, 90 percent of the cost of our nitrogen fertilizer is the cost of the natural gas that it takes as a feedstock to produce the natural gas.

So as we shut down our exploration and drilling here in the United States under the misguided notion that somehow we are protecting an environment, an environment that, let me say, Mr. Speaker, in the history of the world, of all of the offshore wells that have been drilled or the onshore wells that have been drilled for natural gas, I cannot find a single incident where there has been a pollution caused by that gas that came from the drilling. Not offshore or onshore.

We saw natural gas escaping down off the gulf coast of New Orleans. As it bubbled out of the water, only two things can happen. One is it evaporates into the air and dissipates. And the other is if you strike a match to it, you will burn that gas off. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not a pollution to our environment.

Yet the environmentalists want to block all of the drilling that we can possibly provide here in the United States. They want to block it on land and on sea. And if we could find some natural gas in the air, they would try to block that, too.

There is enough natural gas beneath the nonnational park public lands in America to heat every home in this country for the next 150 years, and yet there is an environmentalist barrier into tapping into that natural gas. There are 38 trillion cubic feet of natural gas up on the North Slope of Alaska, in the oil fields that we have already developed, those oil fields that feed the Alaska pipeline. That is 38 trillion cubic feet already developed oil there. We need to build a pipeline to run that down to the lower 48 States, and there is more undiscovered gas up there without a doubt, and it is right next door to ANWR.

But I mentioned a little earlier the delegation from Florida, and with a coalition of Democrats and Northeastern Republicans, they have blocked all drilling offshore for natural gas and oil. But the Outer Continental Shelf, that area from the shoreline to 200 miles out, which is where we make claim to the mineral rights, out to 200 miles, the people who are the tourist trade in Florida are afraid that if someone goes out there to drill a well way beyond the line of sight of anyone sitting on a beach in Florida, the mere mention of that will, even though it is beyond the line of sight of people sitting on a beach in Florida, will keep people from going on vacation in Florida.

You know, they have to burn something in their homes to heat them. They have to do something to generate electricity in Florida. I am told, and I have not verified this to my satisfaction or I would tell you that I know it to be factually correct, but conceptually I believe it is, that there are 33 electric generating plants planned for the State of Florida for this year, and that 28 of them are natural-gas-fired; natural-gas-fired electrical generating plants sitting in a State that is surrounded by natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf, but we cannot tap into that gas, Mr. Speaker, because someone might find out that we drilled a well offshore out of sight of the beaches and not go to Florida to sit on the beach. That is the rationale that is going on.

There is no threat to the environment, none whatsoever. Historically there has been no damage at all.

Mr. Speaker, 38 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on the North Slope of Alaska and 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States. That is 406 trillion cubic feet, and a lot has still not been properly inventoried.

So we have this massive supply of natural gas. We have seen our natural gas prices go up as many as five times the retail price. I will say it has gone up five to six times in the last 5 to 6 years is the best way to describe that.

So we are all paying the price of high natural gas. We are paying a price for higher fertilizer in the Corn Belt. It is costing us more to heat our homes, and it is costing us a lot more to produce our plastics, which require natural gas in their production. The list of the burden on the economy goes on and on.

Every component of this economy, everything that we sell and buy in America, all has an energy component. It takes energy to produce everything that we do, and it takes energy also to deliver it; that is, the transportation component. So if you are going to produce a widget, it is going to take energy to produce the widget, and then you have to ship it to a warehouse and to a retail outlet. You have to send a salesperson, and that takes energy. If you just do this by telephone and over the Internet, assuming you can compete that way, that takes energy as well.

Here sits the United States of America, the number one consumer of energy and the number one producer by almost every broad measure that there is, and we have not provided to produce an adequate amount of energy in the United States of America when we are sitting right on top of it.

Listening to me talk, Mr. Speaker, one would think that I am for drilling in ANWR, drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf; and, Mr. Speaker, I am. I will go back to ANWR in a little bit, but I want to add that I am for another concept here entirely, and that is we need to grow the size of the energy pie.

But on the ANWR issue with the crude oil aspect of this, the environmentalists will say, no, there is not enough oil there to bother to poke a hole, so we are just going to block it here on this floor.

I remember we had a vote here on the floor on an energy bill a couple of years ago. The vote was on whether we would allow drilling in ANWR. The language read that they would disturb no more than 2,000 acres of ANWR. I read that language, and I think about 2,000 acres conceptually. I am from farm country, and I look at a square section of ground or a 40 or an 80, whatever it is, and I think in those terms.

In my mind's eye when I think 2,000 acres, I think three sections, a little more. But with only 2 minutes left on the vote, I had Members come to me and say, This is drilling in ANWR, and it is limited to 2,000 acres. You are from Iowa; how much is 2,000 acres? Excuse me. How much is an acre? That

was the first question. How much is an acre? It is 208 by 208 feet, or the same size as a country school. This list went on. I tried to describe it some other ways. None of that seemed to register.

Well, what is 2,000 acres, they would ask me. I said, it is not even a big farm in Iowa anymore; a little more than average, but not big. They seemed to absorb that information, go down and put their card in and vote ''no'' on drilling in ANWR. That was the information and research that seemed to be a deciding factor.

They did not want to disturb 2,000 acres out of 19.6 million acres, and this is just going on the 2,000 acres of the coastal plain itself. You do the calculation, and it turns out to be the 2,000 acres just of ANWR. Not even doing the calculation of all of Alaska, but just of ANWR is 0.01 percent. That is 1/100th of 1 percent of the ANWR region. Of the 19.6 million acres that is the ANWR region, that is all that would be disturbed to pull out of it this massive supply of oil that I happen to have on this chart.

Now, this is the reserve that is ANWR. All of U.S. proven reserves total a little more than 21 billion barrels of oil. When we add ANWR to this, it adds another 10.4 billion barrels of oil. That adds another 50 percent to the supply, and this piece up here would go almost off the charts. If you can add half again to the U.S. oil supply, why wouldn't you do that?

If anyone went up to the North Slope of Alaska and would see where we developed the oil fields and see where we set up the Alaska pipeline and pump that oil down here for years now, and that began in 1972. Yes, 1972 is when the construction began. So we are 34 years into this. We have been delivering oil for 30-plus years down here to the United States, and we have had a spill of a tanker. We have had a couple of small spills on the ground, all cleaned up. I have not heard the news about it being anything else. It has been a good, sound environmental approach that came up there in Alaska, and they created a lot of the science and technology. The environmental compatibility has been developed up there.

If you look at the North Slope of Alaska, the identical topography of ANWR, it is right next door, what I see up there is you have to show somebody where the oil fields are. The oil fields on the North Slope of Alaska, people are thinking they are going to go there looking for pump jacks sitting there pumping, and maybe see an oil derrick, and maybe they are thinking of oil spilling out of the pipe. They do not see it as a neat, green, environmentally friendly region.

But on the trip up there to the North Slope when we flew over those North Slope oil fields, and I have worked in the oil fields, I looked down, and they said, we are over the oil fields now. I said, I do not see them; can you point them out to me? They had to point them out to me.

It turns out there are no roads that go to these wells. You cannot see the collector lines that are the smaller pipelines that have to be collecting this oil from the wells that go to the main terminal, or collection stations before they go to the main terminal. What you will see from the air if it is pointed out to you is a work-over pad that is perhaps white rock, limestone rock. I am not sure what kind of rock it is up there, but it is piled 2, 3, 4 feet above the Arctic tundra. It is perhaps 50 feet wide, 150 feet long. But it is a small pad. That is all that designates where the well is. There is not a derrick sitting there. There is not a pump jack sitting there. These are submersible pumps. There is zero clearance, and there is nothing that sticks up out of the ground. That pad is there so in the wintertime, if they need to work on a well, if a pump fails or they want to do some maintenance, they build an ice road in the wintertime.

It is easy to come by ice in the wintertime in that country. They send the trucks out, they pull the truck over on the pad, set up the work-over rig, pull the pump out, fix the pump or replace it and drop it back down in, trip the pipe in, hook it back up, and they are good to go. They have quite a few months of the year that they can work there, but they do not go into that region and work during the period of time when it is a thaw. So it is a very environmentally friendly oil field on the North Slope.

ANWR would be even more environmentally friendly because we have the ability to directionally drill. So we can set up on one of those pads, set the drill rig out, and we can drill out in directions in a radial pattern, however the geology directs it to be drilled, and pull a lot of oil into one location without having to go set up a pad here and a rig there and without having to disturb some tundra.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of disturbed tundra, I would add also that I saw some tundra that had been disturbed, and we are told by the environmentalists that it cannot be reestablished. Once you put a track in the tundra, with a bulldozer or a truck or a caribou, that that track is there in perpetuity; that it never comes back again; that it is such a fragile environment that any damage to any plant life, any depression that would be pushed into the thawed surface of the tundra is there almost forever.

Well, if that is the case, I do not know how they can tolerate allowing caribou to walk across that country because they definitely put tracks in there and leave those tracks behind them. Mother Nature has a way of recovering from these things.

The president of the corporation that represents the city of Kaktovik up in ANWR right on the shore of the Arctic Ocean told me that they have reestablished tundra. They will go out there and drag it smooth. They can seed it. Actually, the soil has seed that is already in it, and in 5 to 6 years that tundra is reestablished and grown back. I saw some of that. It had a little brighter green than the older tundra, just like new seeding in your lawn has a little brighter green than the more established seeding of a lawn that has been there for awhile. But we have not damaged any tundra. Any bit we have has been reestablished.

The risk to the wildlife is nonexistent. That has always been a farce. The caribou herd that is on the North Slope that everyone was so concerned about was 7,000 caribou back in 1972. Today it is over 28,000 caribou that are there.

One reporter told me of course there are all those caribou, the pipeliners shot all of the wolves. Well, I guess you can reach a long way to make an argument if that is what you want to make, Mr. Speaker; but, no, the pipeliners did not shoot all of the wolves.

I was signed up to go up there. It was a difficult contract that one had to agree to.

□ 1930

They sent only men up there into that region back in 1972. And there were some pretty tough rules that one had to live by. One of them was no alcohol. The other one was no guns. The other one was no gambling, and the other one was no women. So you know with those kinds of restraints on there, they had to pay a lot of money to get people to go up there and work, and they did. It was a good-paying job then. But no guns was part of it. They didn't want violence to erupt up there in the camps. So with no guns it is kind of hard to shoot all the wolves. In fact, it is kind of hard to shoot a wolf anyway if you are busy trying to make a living and working seven days a week as was scheduled there.

And so the caribou herd now has gone from 7,000 to 28,000 head and the environment, if it were damaged at all, if there was any proof of it all, you can bet we would have heard about it on the floor of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. But we did not. And we didn't hear about it because there hasn't been significant damage.

And so here we have a north slope oil field that is winding down, and a pipeline coming down from Alaska that needs to have oil in it. If it doesn't continue to have oil in it, eventually, if it sits empty, it will degrade. And if sits empty very long, it will degrade to the point where it has to be replaced.

It is to our interest to keep oil flowing through that for a lot of reasons. One is just to keep the pipeline up so that it doesn't degrade and require us at some point to either replace it or simply demolish it or abandon it. But the other reason is we sit here with an ability to add another 50 percent to our overall American supply of crude oil, half again more; this 21 billion going to 31.4 billion, up to the top of the chart, Mr. Speaker. And we are watching this exploration of U.S. oil diminish, diminish, diminish because of regulations,

because of environmentalist concern, because of limitations on the U.S. going out and leasing larger tracts of regions to be explored, particularly offshore. We lease them a small tract instead of a large tract. And so if a company goes out and leases a tract for oil exploration, and they are looking at their competition that has surrounded them with their leases, and they all speculate and get a little grid here and a little grid there, if you are sitting there and you have got a grid that is maybe, say, 5 miles by 5 miles, and I am just pulling a number out here, and your neighbors are all around you like a checkerboard, if you drill down and you find a massive supply of oil, the people that are your neighbors are going to capitalize on that without the risk that you have taken to do the wildcat exploration in that area. They will realize, well, there is an oil find in that section. And they will set down around you and drill the oil, and they will be able to take advantage of the things that you have learned by taking the risk as a single oil company.

So the incentive to put millions and billions of dollars into oil exploration is diminished significantly because the opportunity to capitalize a good find has been diminished because of us leasing smaller tracts of land. Not so in a lot of other parts of the world where there are large areas that are leased out to large oil companies, and they can go in there and drill and come up with a find, and that returns then for them because they can continue to develop an entire field of oil.

Australia, for example. I happen to know of some drilling that goes on down there in the Bass Straits between Tasmania and Australia and high currents there and thousand feet deep water, American companies down there drilling for oil, not drilling here in the United States, not drilling up in ANWR, not drilling offshore of the United States because regulations, environmental concerns, small leases, all those things have shut down the incentive for exploration in America. So our highly competent, highly technical, highly capitalized American oil companies are exploring everywhere else that they possibly can in the world, and they are contributing to our oil supply, and we should be grateful that that helps keep the price down.

Now, if there is actually price gouging, and if there is actually a level of ethical corruption, yes, we need to find that, and we need to use the law to enforce it. But if it is supply and demand and people are working above board, a windfall profits tax on our oil companies will work against the interests of the United States. It will ultimately diminish the supply of energy here in the United States and perhaps in the world, and it will ultimately raise the price of gas, not lower the price of gas.

We have got to have more energy in this country, not less energy in this country. This supply and demand reminds me of a story that Steve Simms of Idaho told years ago, I believe from this floor, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, and that is the story about, shortly after our Constitution was ratified in the post-1789 era, we didn't have crude oil at that time. We were using whale oil to light the lamps in our houses, and that is what we read by. And so Americans were sensitive to the price of whale oil. And the whalers went out from places like Nantucket and brought the whales in and extruded the oil, processed the oil off the whales, and then packaged that up and sold that around the country. You buy a little bit of whale oil, bring it in your house, fill your little container in your lamp, light the wick on your lamp and then you could read into the night. But that price of whale oil went up and up and up due to scarcity of whales.

So Congress met and they had a bill before them that suggested that they would cap the price of whale oil, Mr. Speaker. And so they had an intense debate here on the floor of Congress. And the question was, should we limit the price of whale oil so that people can continue to afford to be able to buy the whale oil to light their lamps?

What they did, Mr. Speaker, was they came to their senses. And the debate finally won out that, no, they would let the price of whale oil go up because if it went up, there would be people who would use some alternative fuels. Some of them would just simply blow out the light and go to bed and get up with the chickens in the morning. But those that had to pay more would find another alternative.

Well, so the price of whale oil continued then to go up. And not very many years after that, oil was discovered in Pennsylvania. And you can guess what happened then, Mr. Speaker, to the price of whale oil. Once oil was discovered in Pennsylvania, there was a ready supply, a tremendous amount of oil available, and far more oil than they really had a use for in those years. And so it became very cheap to light some of that Pennsylvania oil. And the price of whale oil then dropped clear out the bottom because the demand disappeared because an alternative source of energy was discovered underground in Pennsylvania.

That is how supply and demand works. And there will be other alternatives of energy that are developed if we provide for competition to help drive this and help us come up with solutions.

So I want to talk about a solution here, Mr. Speaker. And this I consider to be a picture that gets us started on the solution. I have said for a long time, Mr. Speaker, that we can talk about one component of energy or another component of energy. But there is an overall demand for energy in quadrillion BTUs, and we should measure our overall supply and consumption of energy in quadrillion BTUs. And this is kind of how it is broken up today in the U.S. domestic supply. This is the energy that we supply in America. It is not our consumption. That is a different chart. But the domestic supply. And it is broken out here, as you can see. Of all the energy that we supply, that we produce here, 10.8 percent of the BTUs are crude oil; 2.3 percent of the BTUs are natural gas. Nuclear is 8.1 percent. Our hydroelectricity is kind of frozen in place. We haven't been able to expand that in 30 or more years, but 2.7 percent. Biomass is a growing component of this, matches our hydroelectricity at 2.7 percent. The geothermal has a tremendous potential for us, and that technology is growing, I think, significantly and dramatically 3/10 of 1 percent is all. Our solar is 6/100 of a percent, a very small sliver, and that has good potential too, although it will take a while and a lot of capital.

And our wind, 1/10 of 1 percent. That also is a very much growing supply of energy. Our coal, we have been burning more and more coal, 23 percent. And this natural gas, 18.7 percent. So we have a couple of different components here, the natural gas and our crude oil again at 10.8 percent

This is, Mr. Speaker, this illustration, this is the energy pie. The size of this circle demonstrates the overall supply of BTUs, or British thermal units, of energy that we produce here in this country. Now, our alternatives become this. Energy prices are high. And of these different kinds of energy that I have talked about, the price of crude oil has gone up dramatically. The price of natural gas has gone up dramatically, both of those being, of course, the hydrocarbons.

Then the rest of these supplies, coal has gone up too. The freight on that coal has gone up dramatically in some cases. But overall, if you put more crude oil into the market, someone will decide, well, I am going to generate electricity with diesel fuel, for example. So they will decide if crude oil is cheaper, they might generate more electricity with crude oil. And this size, this percentage of the overall pie gets a little bigger. If the price of natural gas goes up, there will be people that will decide, well, I am going to go over here to this coal alternative. And I happen to know of a case where natural gas has gone so high that they are building an ethanol production plant that is going to burn coal to generate the heat, rather than use the natural gas which we have done in the rest of those that I am aware of.

Now, as we look at this, we have also the subject matter that comes up of biodiesel and also ethanol, those two big pieces. And I will talk about those a little bit too. But our overall mission, we need to understand, is this: we need more energy in this country. We need to grow the size of the energy pie. We need to make this circle a lot bigger than it is today. When we have more BTUs that are available, the supply will lower the cost of our energy. Supply and demand, whether it is whale oil versus Pennsylvania crude

oil, or whether it is this more complicated equation that we have today, the overall supply, if we can increase it, we will lower the overall cost of energy.

Now, some will be more competitive. Some will be less competitive. And as technology develops, it will change that as well. But growing the size of the energy pie is an essential thing for us here in America. We need to work on it every way we can. And that is why I say we need to drill in ANWR. We need to drill in the Outer Continental Shelf, both places, for gas and for oil.

We need to expand our ethanol and our biodiesel dramatically. And we have been doing that, especially in my district. And I am quite grateful and proud of the work that has been done there. The industry essentially has been developed, home grown. We looked at ADM and Cargill and would like to have had them taking the lead on ethanol production in America, and they have producing ethanol for quite some time. They are actually, at least one, and perhaps both, building a new plant or two around the country, perhaps more than that. But they didn't jump into this with the idea that they were going to create a market and then supply that market of ethanol or biodiesel.

And so, seeing the vision of this, and watching the brain child grow from within the region of the country that I come from, I happen to have shook the hand of the man who pumped the first gallon of ethanol in the United States of America the other day, State Senator Thurmond Gaskill from Corwith, Iowa. And I know they worked on that for years and years before they could get to the point where they could pump the first gallon of ethanol.

And now, in this congressional district that I represent, we are sitting there either in production for ethanol, under construction or on the planning stages and soon going into construction, we will be at, by the end of next year, 14 ethanol production facilities in the 5th Congressional District, the western third of Iowa. We will be at least five biodiesel production facilities in the same district in those 32 counties.

Now, those 14 plants will pretty much have the whole region, then I will say polka dotted with those locations where they can draw the maximum amount of corn to those plants. And we have an ability perhaps to go up to, I will say, a third or maybe even as much as a half, half of our corn crop going into ethanol. But the balance of that comes back in the form of feed. So you will see a truck come in to an ethanol plant with a load of corn on it, and he will go through and dump that load of corn in the pit; and while he is sitting there dumping that load of corn, as it is being augured out, right in the next bay you will see a truck pulling in to load a load of DDGs, dried distillers grain, high-protein feed stock that is a by-product that comes out of the ethanol production. And that goes off to the feed lots to be fed to livestock.

Then there is also CO_2, a by-product that also gets marketed for an industrial market. So we capture almost everything in there. And the corn comes in. And then out of that corn we take, make the ethanol out of the starch; and we send the protein to the feed lot in the form of dried distillers grain, and capture the CO_2 as a by-product and market that in the industry; and that process goes over around and around again.

Now, you have University of California Berkley and another institution joined together, or at least had concurrent reports that said that the production of ethanol takes several times more energy to produce than you actually get out of a gallon of ethanol.

□ 1945

And I looked at that. I did not actually read the study. It was not worth my trouble to do that. And I wondered why anybody would go to UC Berkeley to get some answers on ethanol when you could come to the Iowa State University or the University of Iowa or University of Northern Iowa or some Minnesota institutions where we have experience with ethanol, where we actually understand what goes on there, and we can give you some empirical data on the cost of the energy to produce ethanol.

So I began to ask those questions, and one of them is how much energy does it take to produce a gallon of gasoline from crude oil? And it works out that if you are going to measure the BTUs, for the BTUs that would be in a gallon of gasoline, you only get eight-tenths that much out of it when you process and crack that out of crude oil. So does it take a gallon of gas to produce a gallon of gas? No. It takes a gallon of gas to produce 80 percent of a gallon of gas is the way they would calculate that.

And ethanol works out far better. Once the corn is at the plant, and you have that in storage, and you process that through, if you consume the quantity of BTUs that are in a gallon of ethanol, you will produce 3 gallons of ethanol with it. Just a skosh less than that, but the numbers are coming right at 3.

So the return on energy is far more efficient to produce ethanol than it is to produce gas even out of crude oil. And all the energy has a composition component like that. It costs something to put it into a commodity that one can transfer, put into a tank and efficiently get a burn.

So, Mr. Speaker, the goal here is let us lower our energy prices in America by growing the size of the energy pie. Let us expand the utilization of our clean-burning coal technology. We have an almost unlimited supply of that. Let us dramatically expand our ethanol. Let us take the entire Corn Belt and build out ethanol production all the way across the Midwest and as far south as they can compete in the corn production down there, and then, on top of that, continue to build our biodiesel production facilities out. The five that are in my district, that can go to 10 or 12 or 13 plants within the next 4 to 5 years. I actually expect it will go there. And the biodiesel production that we produce, every time we do that, it shuts off another shipment of crude oil into the United States from the Middle East.

But I would say grow the size of the energy pie. Change the size, the proportion of the pieces. Let us shrink this piece, 10.8 percent of crude oil. Let us shrink this piece of natural gas, but let us grow the supply of natural gas dramatically so we can afford to grow it if we need to and save our fertilizer industry, which is very close to have all been pushed out of the United States because we are unwilling to develop our natural gas supplies. So we put Hugo Chavez in a situation where he could potentially be controlling the food supply in the United States by controlling the fertilizer that is made down there out of the natural gas that they have. Now, thankfully, we have some U.S. companies that are set up in Trinidad, Tobago, and as long as that would remain stable, they will be able to supply us fertilizer there more reliably and more stably than they would have out of Venezuela.

But then, as I said, expand the coal, expand the biodiesel, expand the geothermal. Expand the solar to the extent that it is economically feasible to do that. We are continuing to expand the wind. That is a renewable resource. And as our technology goes forward, we get a lot better return out of our capital investment there. This biomass, of course, is ethanol and biodiesel.

The hydroelectricity, I would love to build a few more dams in America, but I just cannot see a way that we can crack that environmentalist nut at this point. But at least maintain this, expand it if we can, because that is a renewable resource. It is as clean as any energy that you get.

Our nuclear capability, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me that it has been over 30 years, that I know of, that we have at least begun the construction on a new nuclear production facility in the United States. Those facilities are coming off line, and some of them are starting to reach the end of their life. We need to develop more nuclear energy, generate more electricity with nuclear. It is safe technology. It is the safest technology from a statistical basis than anything that we produce in America. You cannot generate electricity out of diesel fuel or natural gas or coal with as low an accident rate as you have out of the nuclear, Mr. Speaker. So I would say expand this percentage of nuclear.

Reduce the natural gas for electrical energy, but expand it for fertilizer production so our food supply is up, and

that fertilizer production feeds the biomass. And when the biomass goes from corn and soy diesel and the other parts of the biomass that produces diesel fuel to the cellulosic version, which we are 5 to 6 years away from becoming an effective means of producing ethanol, then our fertilizer supply out of natural gas becomes an essential component to our biomass up here. And one day not very far down the line, I want to see the size of this pie grow dramatically.

And I will be putting together a formula for this, Mr. Speaker, as time goes by and bringing it to the floor of this House and advocating to the Members of this Congress how important it is for us to grow the size of the energy pie and to change the proportions of the pieces of this pie so that there is a future for the economy in America. We can do a lot of it with renewable fuels. And the efficiencies that we have provided there, another one that is false information that seems to come from other parts of the country is that we cannot get very much ethanol out of a bushel of corn. Well, I do not know anybody who is producing ethanol at least in Iowa today that is not getting 2¾ gallons out of a bushel of corn, and that number is creeping up as our enzymes get better, our efficiency gets better. And we will be able to adapt to the cellulosic as well.

This region that I have the profound honor and privilege to represent in the Upper Midwest is a region that when the pioneers came, they settled, they turn the sod over, and they set up their farms, and they raised livestock and row crop and hay, and they were in the business of raising food and fiber for America. And that is the case from Canada down to the gulf coast, coast to coast. The agriculture communities in America were always in the business of raising food and fiber.

But today we are in the business of raising food, fiber, and energy, and I live in now an energy export center where 5 years ago there was not much sign of any of this energy production. When you drove along, if you saw some steam along the skyline, you would assume that it was smoke from a fire somewhere, and you would wonder why it had not been put out. Today you will see the vapors going up. Some people think it is smoke. It is the cleanest of water vapor coming out of the ethanol plants, and we recognize them on the horizon: Well, there is an ethanol plant there, there is one over there. And in between there are hundreds and hundreds of wind chargers sitting on the ridges.

An energy export center in western Iowa, a place where we have never been able to drill a successful oil well, but it will not be long before we will be producing far more energy out of that region than we are getting out of some of the oil fields across the United States. In fact, today I believe we are producing a lot more energy out of ethanol and the biodiesel.

Grow the size of the energy pie, Mr. Speaker. Do this for our economy and do this for America's security. And do so with the idea in mind that the places in the world where we are buying our oil are far too volatile for us to bet our economic future on.

Now, I have another chart here that helps illustrate that. It is really not all of the countries that we purchase oil from, Mr. Speaker, but it tells us a few things. What I see missing on this chart are countries like Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, the large oil-producing countries. But it tells us what is going on in Libya, 36 billion barrels of oil. And then here we are with ANWR at 10.4-, a third of the reserves of Libya. And some of the other countries here: The Congo, a small amount; Nigeria, a large supply, not that stable a place to be, but there is a lot of oil there, and I think their reserves might have been discovered some more since this chart was made.

Here is the United States with a respectable reserve of oil, 21.9 billion barrels. But we can add that to 10.4- here out of ANWR. It takes us up here in this stratosphere in the area of Libya. It does not take us into the levels of countries that are not on this chart, three, four, five countries that have more oil than this, and they are not listed here, Mr. Speaker. But what this tells us is if we go buy our oil from Nigeria, it is unstable, and we work for their stability.

Australia's supplies are far lower than one might think, although there is more discovery going on there all along.

Any of these other countries, Indonesia, Egypt, think about the stability. Brazil, for example, they do not have all that much.

Kazakhstan is a pretty good friend to us. There is a pipeline now being put together from Kazakhstan and into China, and so a lot of that oil is going to go into China. There is the China reserves there, 18.3 billion. And China is increasing their consumption of oil at a rate seven times the increase that we are here in the United States. So at the rate they are going, they will be the world's largest consumer of energy down the line somewhere.

But I cannot find too many places along on this list where I think I would rather trust the future of the economy of America to them and the lack of stability there than I would trust the future of America to an energy-independent America.

We can get there, Mr. Speaker. We need to work to get there, and we have the formula to do that. And many of the countries that we are purchasing oil from today are countries also that are working against our national interests. And Venezuela, for example, is taking an ever-more-hostile position, teaming up with Fidel Castro. And the funding that is coming from that oil is helping to fund Castro and Cuba, and it is funding subversive activities all over South America. If we look at the activities that are going on there, the elections that have taken place, country after country has had an election or a power change that has shifted more towards Marxism, away from freedom. And China is involved in the Panama Canal. They are invested down there, and we also have Castro who is starting to drill for oil 45 miles offshore of Cuba. And if you remember, from the lowest part of Florida to Cuba, it is 90 miles. So not having looked at the map, at least by those statistics, he has cut the distance to the United States in half, tapping into oil that we ought to be tapping into, at least very close to that same kind of region that is there.

How come we cannot, Mr. Speaker, look at this overall picture and realize that if we only do a little bit at a time, if we only decide we are going to open up a little bit of the lease down there near the Panhandle of Florida and drill for a little natural gas down there because the pressure on the prices are so high that we have to act like we are doing something, so we let a bit of drilling come in. And that little bit of drilling is the equivalent of just taking the lid off the pressure cooker just for an instant. So the pressure goes down, but the heat is still on, and the pressure will increase again. If we take the lid off a little bit every time, it is not enough to affect the markets. It is not enough to affect the market to the point where we are going to see lower energy prices. So energy prices creep up. We only do this incrementally.

We must be bold, Mr. Speaker. We must dramatically expand our ethanol production. We must dramatically expand our biodiesel production. America's farmers have stepped up to the plate with this. They are increasing their overall production of their grain. They have invested capital so that they can produce ethanol and produce biodiesel.

Let me add one more thing to this misinformation that has been going on around America, that the reason that gas is high because we have ethanol requirements in some of the gas that have just come on recently, and that the high price of ethanol is the reason that gas has gone up by 50, 60, 70 cents a gallon or whatever that number might be.

Let me point out that ethanol is 10 percent of a gallon of gasoline, and the spot market for ethanol, the highest I have seen is $2.50 a gallon. But you are only putting in 10 percent; so in 1 gallon of gas, there is only going to be 1/10 of that in there. So 1/10 of $2.50, you have to spread that across the whole gallon of gasoline is my point, Mr. Speaker. And it is not possible to take 1/10 of a gallon, add it to 9/10 of a gallon, and raise the price anywhere near the extent that is being alleged.

So it is not the price of ethanol that is driving up the price of gas, it is the instability in the world. It is the lack of building refineries. It is the lack of vision in an overall energy pie, Mr.

Speaker. And I urge strongly and powerfully for this Congress to step out boldly, grow the size of this energy pie, reduce the cost of energy, dramatically drive our economy, and take care of our security well into the future.

□ 2000

MILITARY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, our most important duty as Members of Congress is to ensure our Nation's security. National security is the single-most essential purpose of government. All of the other blessings of our liberty flow from it, our strength and vitality as a people depend upon it and, our economy and our way of life are reinforced by it.

A strong, bipartisan tradition has been at the core of America's national security policymaking for much of our history. A succession of American Presidents, from Woodrow Wilson to Franklin Roosevelt to Harry Truman to John F. Kennedy, guided this Nation through two world wars and some of the tensest days of the Cold War. Their leadership was based on asserting America's power in a way that advanced the ideals of our Founders and which made America a beacon to millions of people who were suffering under fascism and communism.

Most importantly, these men knew the limits of any one nation's ability, and they saw the wisdom of marshalling our strengths with that of other freedom-loving people, and they listened to the counsel of these allies abroad and Members of both parties here at home.

Harry Stimson, who served as Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of War throughout the Second World War, was a Republican. Harry Truman cooperated with a Republican Congress to pass the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine, which were instrumental in rebuilding postwar Europe and halting Soviet expansion.

But unlike these giants of the 20th century, who put the Nation's security before chauvinism or partisanship, the current administration has too often believed that it had all the answers and did not need to pay attention to the ideas of others.

This refusal to listen to other voices and excessively partisan and ideological approach has resulted in an America that is more isolated than it should be and less safe than it needs to be. Around the world, among nations that should be our strong allies, we are often seen less as a force for good in the world, and this has jeopardized the cooperation that we need in the war on terror.

In Iraq, a stubborn refusal to commit enough troops to save the lives and pacify the country in the months after the invasion has led to a protracted fight against Baathists and Islamic insurgents and increasing sectarian violence that has claimed more than 2,300 American lives and wounded thousands more.

At home we have wasted valuable time in making real strides to safeguard the Nation from terrorist attack. Most significantly, we have failed to reckon with the Achilles heel of our national security, our reliance on foreign oil to supply our energy needs.

Clearly, Americans want and deserve change. Last month, Members of our party from both the House and the Senate unveiled a comprehensive blueprint to better protect America and to restore our Nation's position of international leadership. Our plan, the Democratic plan, is called Real Security. It was devised with the assistance of a broad range of experts, former military officers, retired diplomats, law enforcement personnel, homeland security experts and others, who helped identify key areas where current policies have failed and where new ones were needed.

In a series of six Special Orders, my colleagues and I will share with the American people our vision for a more secure America. Two weeks ago, we discussed the plan as a whole and laid out the five pillars that make up that plan. I would like to go over some of these in summary before we turn to the pillar that we will discuss tonight.

These five pillars of security are the creation of a 21st century military, the successful prosecution of the war on terror, a more successful strategy to provide real homeland security, a way forward in Iraq, and the securing of energy independence for the United States of America.

One of the pillars of our Real Security plan focuses on the war on terror. It devises a strategy to destroy al Qaeda and finish the job in Afghanistan. It would have us double our special forces and improve our intelligence-gathering processes. It would eliminate terrorist breeding grounds. It would use preventive diplomacy and bring new international leadership, recognizing that we are strongest when we cause the world to join us in a cause.

Secure loose nuclear materials by 2010, this is one of the greatest vulnerabilities we have. You might recall in the debate between Senator KERRY and President Bush both acknowledged that the number one threat facing the country was that of nuclear terrorism. In fact, when we had testimony in the Nonproliferation Subcommittee, I asked Jim Woolsey, former director of the CIA, what was the most likely suspect if a nuclear weapon went off tomorrow in New York, Los Angeles or Washington? He thought about it for a moment and then he said, ''al Qaeda.''

I said, ''I think that is exactly right. But if al Qaeda is the number one threat, then the most likely delivery vehicle is not a missile, it is a crate, and why are we not doing more to secure those materials that al Qaeda has said they want?''

Osama bin Laden, who has called it a religious duty of Muslims to obtain the bomb and use it against the United States, who wants an American Hiroshima, at the pace it is going it is going to take years, if not decades, to secure the nuclear material in the former Soviet Union, and this makes our Nation at risk of calamity.

If you think the debates we have now over civil liberties and national security are difficult, imagine the world after a nuclear detonation here in this country or against our troops in the theater. All of that debate would be moot. This Nation would be a very different Nation. It would be one we would not recognize. It would certainly not be one we would want to live in.

All efforts must be made to deal with this threat, and too little has been done. Precious little has been done, and time is not on our side.

We must redouble our efforts to stop nuclear weapons development in Iran and North Korea. Too often the administration's policy in this area has been on-again off-again, as if we can only focus on Iran right now and we can take our focus off North Korea, where 6 months ago we could focus on North Korea to the exclusion of Iran, or we couldn't focus on either while we were focusing on Iraq.

The reality is we must continually focus on all of the above, and we must marshal the international community to stop this weapons program in Iran and in North Korea. Only through sustained and vigorous and dedicated efforts to pressure Russia, to pressure China and to bring that world community together do we have a chance to stop that nuclear weapons development in Iran and North Korea.

Let me turn to one of the other pillars of our Real Security plan dealing with homeland security. In the weeks to come, we will be going through the details of this pillar, which involves implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. We support the immediate implementation of those recommendations.

The 9/11 Commission, probably no other commission in the last half century has done a more valuable job, a more bipartisan job of analyzing the vulnerabilities of the United States and making good, strong and sound recommendations about what we can do to address them, many of which affect this body. In fact, it is an irony not lost to anyone here, or shouldn't be: those recommendations of the 9/11 Commission that affect how we organize our business in the Congress are the last to have been implemented. Most of them have not been implemented.

But a great many of their recommendations are being ignored at our peril, and, indeed, what I was talking

about a moment earlier, in terms of dealing with the loose nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union, this was something that the 9/11 Commission paid great attention to and is one of the great deficiencies in our response to their recommendations. We should put those recommendations into effect now. Under the Real Security plan, that is exactly what we will do.

Another pillar: part of this pillar of homeland security is screening all containers and cargo. Again, if the threat to this country comes in the near term, in the near term, in a crate and not on a missile, then why aren't we investing more in that portal technology to keep nuclear material out of this country, to keep a nuclear weapon out of this country, to keep a radiological weapon out of this country?

Why is it in terms of cargo coming in through our airports that when you go to the airport to get on a flight and you have to take your shoes off and your belt off and you have to be wanded down, that at the same time in the cargo hold of that plane, where half of the cargo on most passenger jets is commercial, it is not your luggage, it is commercial cargo, 98 percent of that cargo or thereabouts is never screened for explosives? So you have to take off your shoes, yes; but you could ship a bomb the size of a small piano in a crate, and it may never be inspected for explosives.

That doesn't make sense. That is a real deficiency that has to be addressed. We cannot afford to wait until there is a calamity. Terrorists don't need to fly planes into our buildings to destroy the economy of this country. It would be enough to destroy that plane in mid-flight. We simply cannot afford to take these risks, and we must screen all containers and cargo.

The job at our ports is an even more difficult challenge, but it is one that can be met. It can be met through a homeland security plan that is tough, that is smart, and where the priorities match the nature of the risk. That is exactly what we have to do in homeland security. We have to prioritize, what are the greatest risks facing the country, and that is where we need to devote our greatest resources.

We need to safeguard our nuclear and chemical plants, which still have not been adequately safeguarded.

We can't outsource our security of our ports or airports or mass transit to other interests. We have to train and equip first responders. I had a group of first responders from my district in to visit with me today from the cities of Burbank and Glendale and other parts of Los Angeles to talk about their lack of interoperable communications equipment. They can't talk to each other across the cities. They are starting to be able to. They are patching this system together.

But here we are, years after 9/11. Can it be that our emergency responders still can't talk with each other, don't have that capability? That is simply inexcusable. We saw on 9/11 the communication problems we had. The fact that we have not dealt with that problem still years later is beyond comprehension.

Finally, we have to invest in public health to safeguard Americans. You might recall it was just a few weeks ago the burning issue in the Nation was the avian flu. It still ought to be a burning issue in the Nation. Yet we saw when this was at the top of the news how unprepared we are.

We are still unprepared. That hasn't changed. The issue may have fallen out of the top of national news. It hasn't fallen out of the tomorrow of the national dangers facing this country. Those are not even man-made disasters.

Terrorists purposely attempting to spread a biological pathogen, perhaps at multiple locations in the United States at the same time, imagine the havoc that would ensue. Are we prepared? We are not nearly as prepared as we must be.

Let me turn to another pillar of the Real Security plan, that dealing with Iraq. The Real Security plan proposes that 2006 be a year of transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, that we have a responsible redeployment of U.S. forces, that we work harder to promote Iraqi political compromise to unite the country.

We saw this week that we had a change in the position of prime minister, and that is hopeful and we all hope that leads to the formation of a unity government. But those hopes have too often been disappointed. We must ensure that within the next 30 days that government is stood up, and it is a government that is representative of Sunnis, Kurds and Shiites that the Iraqi people will defend.

Ultimately, if the Iraqis choose civil war, if they choose to murder each other in large numbers, there is not much that we can do to stop it. But if they decide to be one country, if they decide as one country to take on the foreign jihadists and the terrorists, that is a fight they can win and a fight we can help them win. But if they are determined to squander this opportunity, if they don't form this unity government, then they have to understand that the patience of the American people is running out.

We must encourage our allies and others to play a more constructive role in Iraq, and we must hold the Bush administration accountable. We had a hearing in the International Relations Committee on Iraq this week. It was one of the first hearings we have had in years on Iraq.

I asked the panel, which included top level DOD, Department of Defense, and top level Department of State officials, I asked them, given the history of I think fairly well-recognized mistakes in the prosecution of the war, of course, the failure to find WMD, the standing down of the Iraqi Army, the failure to bring enough troops in to maintain order that allowed the insurgency to get out of hand, who has been held accountable? Who has been held accountable for these errors?

And I ask my colleague, Mr. INSLEE from Washington State, do you know what the answer to me was?

□ 2015

Mr. INSLEE. I do, actually. There is only one person that the Bush administration has fired involving Iraq policy. There is one single person. And that person was General Shinseki, who was right about Iraq.

He had the huge error in this administration of being truthful, forthright and accurate when he said we needed 400,000 to 500,000 troops to provide security in Iraq so it would not degrade into anarchy as it has done.

And as a result of that, the President, in the way they do this with the military, effectively fired him. He is the only person who the Bush administration has removed from office in Iraq, not the people really responsible for the problem at Abu Ghraib, not the Secretary of Defense, not Paul Wolfowitz who came to us and told us the incredible falsehood that this whole operation was going to be paid for, because Iraq was going to pump more oil, and it would not cost a penny to the American taxpayers. And you know how many billions of dollars now the taxpayers have suffered.

None of those people who have gotten almost every single thing wrong in Iraq that you can imagine. If you were going to design a train of errors, misjudgment, inefficiency, incompetence, acceptance of outright fraud in the contracting procedure, it would be hard to design a more inept train of abuses than this one, yet this President has sat there and done nothing.

Now, I have to admit he has not said they have done a heck of a job. He has not used that language. But he has failed to hold anybody accountable. And one of the things that I am very pleased that you have been a leader on, is holding the administration accountable for this, is accountable for U.S. tax dollars.

You know, there was a Democrat, Harry Truman, during World War II, who convened the Truman Commission in the U.S. Senate, and he insisted that during war time, even during war time, it is important to not allow the abuse of U.S. taxpayer dollars. And he ferreted out some of the fraud and abuse in military contracting that was going on in World War II even when our whole Nation was in jeopardy, in an existentialistic sense was in jeopardy, but he still said we need to be careful with these dollars.

We have had umpteen billions of dollars disappear into the sands of Iraq with nothing to show for it, no meaningful reconstruction, but tens of billions of dollars gone. We have seen multiple GAO reports, Inspector General reports.

We have seen multiple contractors, many of whom have been very closely

aligned with this administration; there is no secret about that. What we are saying as Democrats is real simple. The U.S. Congress needs to do its job to ferret out these abuses, find the people responsible, relieve them from duty, and hold these contractors responsible to the American taxpayers. That is not too much to ask.

This Congress has been a lap dog. It has been a see-no-evil, hear-no-evil group, while one of the greatest abuses of the American taxpayer ever happened in the sands of Iraq, despite the tragic loss, which of course is a thousand times worse of our men and women in Iraq.

So the Democratic Real Plan for Security is that it is the job of Congress to hold the administration accountable to the American people, and the American taxpayer, and we will do that job at the right moment. So I am glad that you have brought this issue up.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman. This was precisely the nature of the testimony in the committee. When I asked that question of the witnesses, who has been held accountable, it was really quite remarkable what happened. There was an incredible silence as the witnesses looked at me and then looked at each other, and then looked at me, and then looked at each other. And it seemed like an eternity before anyone could respond.

And I said, your silence speaks volumes. To me, and I expressed this to the committee, the only one who has been held accountable was General Shinseki, and he was accountable for speaking the truth.

Now you mentioned the Truman Commission, and I was thinking about just the same thing when I was mentioning just a few moments ago that as part of our homeland security pillar we intend to implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

And probably not since that Truman Commission have we had a group of former Members and elected officials, experts on national security, come together and had such a credible work product that was so deserving of our respect, attention, and implementation as the 9/11 Commission, not since the Truman Commission. Would you agree?

Mr. INSLEE. I certainly will. I will point out that Democrats do not claim to be the sole source of genius and wisdom in America. Republicans have great ideas too, and they did in the 9/11 Commission, chaired by ex-Senator Kean of New Jersey, a Republican. He was one of the co-chairs of the commission.

A group of Republicans and a group of Democrats got together and did an evaluation on what this country really needs to do. And they have since then, they have made their recommendations, have issued this score card to evaluate the administration's performance to see whether those bipartisan recommendations have been implemented.

And if it was your son or daughter's score card, the kid would not be going to any movies or watching any television, because it was full of Ds and Fs. The most amazing part that is important, I represent the area in Seattle, we have a huge port. And when I tell people that despite this bipartisan Republican and Democrat recommendation to do screening of all of our containers coming in, of radiological materials, either a dirty bomb, the makings of a dirty bomb, or worst case scenario, a fission bomb coming in through our containers, and we know the proliferation that has gone on in the last few years, when you report to people that despite that foreknowledge, the administration can only tell us a tiny little percentage of those are screened for radiological material, that is a sorry state of affairs. And there is no excuse for that failure. We have had a bipartisan consensus, at least on the commission, to get that job done. And the job simply has not been done.

And the administration has had its eye off the ball of this major league threat. This is the big threat, by the way, at least in my estimation, and I think of the 9/11 Commission, of a dirty bomb or some day a fission product coming into this country. That is the real threat.

By the way, it is probably 1,000 times more likely to be delivered in a container coming through Los Angeles or Seattle or Boston or Gulfport, than coming in from 10 miles up in space in an ICBM that none of these countries have, at least at the moment. That is where the real threat is.

But, instead, the administration has been off spending billions of dollars on the Star Wars Project, and refuses to do more than 3 or 4 percent of the containers, which is a known threat, which is a known vector of radiological material; and they refuse to act.

That is unconscionable. We Democrats intend to implement a bipartisan approach to this, which is what was in this 9/11 Commission. And people can look it up. It is on the Internet. You can look at the report card. You know, I thought, I was hopeful after that report card came out that the President would get his Cabinet together and hold that report card and say, what is going on here? This is absurd. I am President of the United States, the most powerful Nation in the world, and we are getting Fs on securing our ports, when we have got the technology to do this.

I thought that he would do that. Instead, you know what he did? He walked around handing out Medals of Freedom to Paul Wolfowitz who got every decision you could possibly imagine wrong on Iraq. He told his homeland security people they are doing a great job, when 95 percent of the cargo is not screened coming into our ports. That is not a heck of a job. And he has failed to respond to that report from this again bipartisan commission in any way that I can fashion.

That is one of the reasons Congress needs to act. There is a reason the framers set up a couple branches of government, so that when one branch was not doing the job, which right now is the executive, Congress can act.

Mr. SCHIFF. If I can interrupt the gentleman, this has, I think, precisely been the problem. It has been a shared responsibility. There has been the failure of the executive to act promptly on the 9/11 Commission recommendations that have put us at risk, and most probably, I agree with you 100 percent, most prominently that risk is something coming in through our ports or on the back of a truck across the border that has nuclear material in it. That is, I think, the chief threat that we face.

But it is a shared responsibility, because we here in Congress have done nothing about that. Because there has not been oversight of the executive; the majority has been allergic to doing oversight. I am on the investigations and oversight subcommittee of the International Relations Committee.

We have had 6, 8, 10 hearings. The majority of them I believe have been on what, are they on overseeing problems within our own government? No. They have been on the United Nations. When you do not want to oversee what you are doing, what do you do, you oversee the United Nations.

Now, admittedly the U.N. has got plenty of problems and is in desperate need of reform, but that cannot be the sole area of our oversight. We have had hearings in the subcommittee on Iraq, as our chairman recently pointed out. You know what it was on? How bad a man Saddam Hussein was. As I said at the outset of the hearing, I think we can stipulate that Saddam Hussein was a horrible man, was a tyrant, was a dictator, was guilty of crimes against humanity. That is not in dispute.

But what we ought to be overseeing is whether we are implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations that make us safe; we ought to be investigating the Inspector General's analysis that $9 billion in reconstruction funds in Iraq is unaccounted for. We ought to be looking into, this is something that has really troubled me, I raised it with the Secretary of Defense during our briefings, how is it that we continue to have problems with equipment and material to protect our troops.

How is that possible? I mentioned to the chairman of Armed Services that if this was a problem of production, my constituents would line up around the block to work on up-armoring vehicles, provide state-of-the-art body armor.

There was no lack of will. But none of the country, other than those people in uniform and their families, have been asked to sacrifice at all. And we are desperate I think around the country to make a sacrifice to be part of the greater good and the greater effort protecting the country. We have not been asked to do it. The Congress has not asked. The President has not asked. We have not done the oversight to even ask the hard questions.

And so we are a Nation at risk. A Nation that is not as well prepared as it should be, and as it really must be.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, I would agree with you. You have to ask, why has this happened? And I think it comes from an attitude of unbridled rose-colored glasses and feel-good politics. The administration wanted to have a war we could all just kind of feel good about, not have any personal sacrifice associated with it, not have any concern on our tax policy about that whatsoever.

It was feel-good politics, and the attitude is that we try to all feel good over here, and the only people who would be suffering are the men and women in Iraq. That is a wholly irresponsible way to fight a war, and that is what has gone on.

I wonder if I can address a little different issue of our Real Security plan, and that is what I like about the aggressiveness of the Democratic Real Security plan, because as you know, you have been a leader on this, we Democrats feel we need to be aggressive in disarming our enemy.

The most effective effort is offensive. And we want to be offensive, not meaning disliked, but offensive in being aggressive and assertive to disarm our enemies. And I want to mention two ways, one short and one not so short.

The short way we want to disarm our enemies, we want to make sure that they cannot get access to fissionable materials, which frankly are as loose and insecure tonight as we speak; it is roaming around places around middle Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, which is still secured with maybe a bicycle lock. I pay more attention to my Chinelli bicycle than some of these old failed States in the middle part of Europe to fissionable material.

And we need to secure that. And as numerous reports have indicated, the executive branch of this government has failed to secure the number one threat to this country, which is that fissionable material. And we will get that job done. We will make the investment it takes to do that, because that has got to be an extremely high priority for this country.

So one way you disarm your opponent is you take away their fissionable material that is laying around all over the world right now. And we will get that job done.

But the second thing is even bigger. We need to disarm our enemy from their financial resources to attack us, and that means that we have got to be energy independent and stop sending our dollars to the Middle East. We have got to start sending them to Middle Western farmers rather than Middle Eastern sheiks, in this regard.

Because of that $3-plus, one of my staffers paid $3.35 this morning, that $3.35 gallon, a good part of that goes to the CEO of Exxon, who just walked away with $400 million in a bonus package, and the rest, a lot, goes to the Middle East to arm our enemies.

And we know that many of those regimes have been playing footsie with al Qaeda and various other groups. We know that our money we are spending is going to arm our enemies, and so we believe what we need in this country is an energy independence program that is not just rhetorical, but is real. And I was pleased to have the President give us some rhetoric during his State of the Union speech.

□ 2030

He said, we have an addiction to oil. Well, welcome to the land of recognition, Mr. President. We have been waiting 6 years, but, nevertheless, it is good to hear the rhetoric. But the problem is we are not seeing the reality.

The week he talked about breaking our addiction to oil, he fired 100 scientists at our renewable lab in Boulder, Colorado. When the press suggested that seemed somewhat inconsistent, those pink slips were pulled back, and those scientists were back on the job.

But we think we need something as bold as John F. Kennedy about in the 1960s, we need an Apollo project, we are going to go the moon, we will invest in the capital and wisdom and technical brilliance in this country. We are going to take a big step forward, one big step for man, one giant leap for mankind.

We need now a giant leap in energy policy in this country to depend on the technical prowess of this country, because Kennedy knew, and he stood right behind you right there. We are in an historic place here. He stood there March 9, 1961, and he said, we are going to go to the Moon. That was an amazing point. Our rockets were blowing up on the launch pad. We had launched a little softball into orbit. We hadn't even invented Tang yet.

A lot of people thought that was an absurdly ambitious goal, but he understood a central tenet of the American character is that when challenged, we respond, number one. Number two, we are the greatest tinkers since, you know, whoever in Space 2001 invented the bone as a weapon. We are the people that can invent our way out of this.

We need to make the investments to do that. If you look at what the President has done in his budget, it is a pathetically insufficient commitment to this goal. We got so far two words from the President. We got energy independence.

We got two words, but we have no funds to do the job from him, no bold strategic challenge, no commitment to science, no commitment in our academic institutions. You look at the money, he came out, and I was listening carefully to the State of the Union address. He had this bold rhetoric and he said, therefore, I am committing a few million dollars to this project. He has committed to this budget for biofuels less than we spend in Iraq in about 18 hours. That is what we have committed to this project.

We have men over there fighting a war now for 3-plus years at about $80 billion a year, and he is committing less than 18 hours of what we are spending in Iraq to try to disarm our enemies. That is not a wise strategy. We need a significant energy plan to solve this problem.

We have it in the new Apollo energy project, H.R. 2828, that I have introduced and others. That is a bold step, leap for mankind that we will get this job done. So I am happy that the Democrats have embraced real policies and not just rhetoric.

Mr. SCHIFF. I have to take my hat off to my colleague from Washington, because no one has led more consistently and more strongly on this issue than you have.

Before our caucus had a strategy jointly that we have put forward before the President came forward, JAY INSLEE was there, and you have been just the most powerful advocate for years for an Apollo-like project to bring about energy independence.

Let me touch on the first point you made, and then I want to go a little bit more into energy independence and talk about some of the other pillars, and then get to the pillar we are going to focus on this evening.

You mentioned that the priority has to be placed on securing this nuclear material in the former Soviet Union. I agree with you exactly. When you look at what is preventing al Qaeda from detonating a nuclear weapon on our soil, you might look at the difficulty of getting the material in the country.

Well, that is not very difficult. Unfortunately, as we have discussed, we don't have the portal technology engaged to the degree that we need it, and how would you get a nuclear weapon in the country? Well, I like to quote the chancellor of UCLA, Chancellor Carnesale, who says, well, you could smuggle it in a bail of marijuana. That is one way you could get it in. That is sort of the magnitude of the problem of keeping it out. That is a tough strategy at the border.

Well, then, you might ask, what about the technology? Maybe it is tough to actually build the mechanics of the bomb. But that is not hard either. That is a 50-year-old technology. Cal Tech is in my district. I bet I could pick any two Cal Tech students and they could design a crude nuclear weapon for me using information on the Internet.

What is the obstacle? Is it the will of al Qaeda? It is not the will, as Osama bin Laden has talked very plainly about the imperative to bring about an American Hiroshima. I think those writings and those speeches he has given are basically his own Mein Kampf, and we ignore that at our own peril.

So if it is not lack of will or the lack of technological prowess or the lack of ability to get it into the country, the question is why hasn't al Qaeda brought this off? The answer is, it is hard to get the material. It is still hard to get the material. That is the only

real prevention we have. You know something? It is just not hard enough. It is just not hard enough.

As you point out, some of this material is secured with a chain link fence and a night watchman and a bike lock. Some of it is more secure. But much of it is in the form of highly enriched uranium at research reactors. Some are defunct or stockpiled. It is all too accessible. We cannot wait for a disaster.

Turning to your second point, one of the pillars of the real security plan is the energy independence by 2020, which would eliminate our reliance on Middle East oil and all of the distortions that accompany our foreign policy as a result of that dependence. It would increase production of alternative fuels in America, promote hybrid and flex-fuel vehicle technology and manufacturing. It would enhance energy efficiency and conservation incentives.

I believe exactly what you do. We are the American people. We are the best entrepreneurs and inventors anywhere in the world. This isn't like where we were in terms of putting a man on the Moon. It is not like we were when we had to embark on the Manhattan Project. We are so much farther along on this goal technologically. A lot of these technologies are already in existence.

It is a question of making sure that they are made better and that they are made much more use of, would be a large part of the solution. It is not that we can imagine these technologies; they are out there, many of them. It is just the lack of will and the lack of leadership, and it is having a crippling effect on our economy now with gas prices at the pump, on our foreign policy, and I just want to thank you again for your tremendous leadership on this issue.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, I appreciate your words, but in a sense it is easy in contrast to brand X. If you look at the energy bill that the Republican-controlled Congress that was promoted by this President, it is hardly a secret that this President had substantial history in the oil and gas industry, and it would not be surprising if that affected decisions, just like the secret meetings that the Vice President had when he designed the energy independence. In the secret meetings the President has always refused to tell us about, I doubt that they were hatching a plot to create biofuels and energy independence from the oil and gas industry. I suspect that was not a discussion, had we been a fly on the wall to listen to what they were talking about. Maybe they were talking about a way to increase the profits of the oil and gas industries that led to $3 a gallon of gas and the largest profits of any corporation in the solar system history in this quarter in the oil and gas industry. Maybe that is what happened. Can't be sure.

But in any event, the policy that this Republican-controlled Congress came out with that was promoted by the President of the United States, according to the Department of Energy, this is the Bush's own governmental agencies, will increase our imports of oil from the Middle East. I want to say that again because I think it is very, very important.

The President, in his State of the Union Address, said, I want to break our addiction to Middle Eastern oil. That is the White House, the President of the United States. The Department of Energy, which works for him presumably, their analysis of his policies have concluded that the imports from imported oil from the United States will increase after full implementation by a significant amount. I don't have the number off the top of my head, but I was shocked at how much they would increase when I looked at this report, under their policies.

Why is that? First off, to me it takes a little chutzpah to talk about it up there and out there in the real world have a policy that will increase your imports. But why is it such a grand failure? Well, it is because they refused to do the things that we know that works.

You know, we know it works. Brazil is now energy independent. Last week, actually, they achieved total domestic energy independence. The way they did it principally was to develop a biofuels industry. They didn't mess around. The President of Brazil didn't just give some nice speech and say, I believe we are going to break our addiction to oil. He actually did some policies.

What they did is they made sure that consumers in Brazil when they bought a car would have a car that would burn either gasoline or ethanol. They freed Brazilian consumers to make sure that you get to decide what you burn, not the oil companies and not the automobile manufacturers. They insisted that every consumer when you buy a car, you get a flex-fuel vehicle that can burn either gas or ethanol.

When they did that, that immediately created an enormous demand for an ethanol industry. Without subsidies for the Brazilian government, boom, 40 percent, 6 years later, 40 percent of all the transportation in Brazil is run on ethanol, which does not feed the Middle East and the sheiks, has zero emissions of global warming gases, because it is circular, it has no net increase of global warming gases.

Brazil achieved that not because they are smarter than we are, not because they have better natural resources than we do. We have got the Midwest, we have got Microsoft, we have got Intel, we have got Google. You know, they have got some smart people, too. But what they had was leadership that had actual policies rather than just rhetoric. That is what we need.

The second thing I just want to point out, we have had experience in achieving this in the United States. It was during the late 1970s. We improved the efficiency of our cars by over 60 percent in 5 years. We were on a path of doubling the efficiency of our cars while increasing safety, I might add, while increasing safety for 5 years in this country. Then those policies were stopped under a Republican President.

The fact of the matter is that had we continued on that path, if we had simply continued to improve the efficiency of our cars, as we did for those 5-year periods, today you and I would not be having this discussion because we would have been free of Middle Eastern oil today. That is the opportunity cost that we experience when we got off this bandwagon at doing smart things in energy.

I just point this out; you know, we have a history of success in this. We just need the policies to get it done.

Mr. SCHIFF. Well, you pose an interesting question. How can the administration's policy, which is dubbed a ''reduce our dependence on foreign oil,'' be a policy which, if you actually play it out over the years, will increase our importation of foreign oil? I can only say, because this is Washington.

This is the same place where 3 weeks ago the majority announced its deficit reduction package, which was, I don't know, $30- or $40 billion in spending cuts, and about $70- or $80 billion in tax cuts, which more than offset the spending cuts. So the net effect was increasing the national debt, and that was a deficit reduction plan? I guess if that is a deficit reduction plan, then the administration's energy plan is subject to the same logic.

Mr. INSLEE. We have seen some pretty amazing rhetorical epiphanies here in this Chamber. For the last year Democrats on three separate occasions have attempted to pass a bill to make sure that the Federal Trade Commission has the explicit authority to investigate and punish price gouging by the oil and gas industry. We wanted to make it real clear that we wanted that investigation, and even when there is a lack of complicity, where there is price manipulation, that should be shut down. I think Americans are with us 100 percent on that. Three times we tried to pass that. The Republicans blocked us every single time.

Now, last week I heard the Speaker of the House say, we demanded an investigation of price gouging in the oil and gas industry. Welcome, I guess; better late than never. But we will see if we really get that law passed here. It will be interesting. We heard the press conference. If we had the vote, we could have done that today. It will be interesting to see.

Mr. SCHIFF. I think this is part and parcel of the broader problem, where there is a lack of accountability, there is a lack of responsibility. The reality is that our friends in the majority have been in the majority now for years. They control this body, they control the Senate, they control the White House, they have got a pretty favorable Supreme Court, and there has been not only inaction on energy independence, but actually we have lost ground and are moving in the wrong direction.

There is really only one party to blame and one party responsible for that failure.

□ 2045

And for several years the blame was all placed on the Clinton administration. Everything that was going on years after the Clinton administration was the fault of the Clinton administration. But at some point you have to take responsibility when you are in the leadership. When you are in the majority, you have to take responsibility.

Let us take the pillar that we wanted to highlight tonight, and that is the 21st century military, the part of our Real Security plan that would strengthen our military and that would rebuild a state-of-the-art military; that would ensure that we have the world's best equipment and training; that will provide accurate intelligence and a strategy for success; that would bring about a new GI Bill of Rights for the 21st century, and that will strengthen the National Guard.

Let me talk briefly about a couple of those items, and then I would love to hear your thoughts as well. In poll after poll, the American people have demonstrated they have more faith in the military than in any other public institution in this country. I have been to Iraq three times, I have been to Afghanistan twice, I have met with our troops there and have spent a lot of time with military personnel here and around the world and other places, and that confidence in the troops is well placed. America does have the finest military in the world.

In Iraq and Afghanistan, our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen and marines have done everything we have asked of them and more. But since 9/11, our Nation's Armed Forces have become overextended. We have had recruiting goals that have not been met, forcing the armed services to enlist less qualified men and women.

Because of the poor planning by the administration, many units are on their second and third tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, and Army and Marine Corps personnel still don't have adequate body armor and sufficiently armored vehicles to the degree they should.

We are committed to ensuring that the United States military remains second to none and, more importantly, committed to building the Armed Forces to confront the threats of the 21st century. The Real Security plan, which I went over, has these elements that will rebuild the state-of-the-art military by making the needed investments in equipment and manpower so we can project power to protect America wherever and whenever necessary.

Second, we will guarantee our troops have the protective gear, equipment, and training they need and are never sent to war without accurate intelligence and a strategy for success.

Third, we will enact a GI Bill of Rights for the 21st century that guarantees our troops, active, reserve, retired, and our veterans and their families receive the pay and health care, the mental health services and other benefits they have earned and deserve.

Finally, we will strengthen the National Guard in partnership with the Nation's Governors to ensure it is fully manned, equipped and, available to meet missions at home and abroad.

Building this 21st-century military begins with the acknowledgment that we are in a new era with a new set of challenges and threats distinct from those we faced in the Cold War. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle delight in accusing our party of having a pre- 9/11 mindset. But their stewardship of the Nation's defenses makes it clear that it is the majority that has been living in the past.

We need a military that is highly mobile, self-sustaining, and capable of operating in small units. On the one hand, our ability to use air power has extended our global reach and allows us to engage enemies without large numbers of ground troops being employed, as was the case in Kosovo and Afghanistan. On the other hand, the war on terror, ongoing operations in Iraq and the increasing need for American forces to play a stabilizing role as peacekeepers and peace enforcers demands the sustained commitment of American forces.

Our friends in the majority used to deride these types of operations as nation-building. But in a post-9/11 world, we cannot allow states to fail and become havens for Islamists and other radicals to plot attacks against us. Clearly, we need to increase the size of the active-duty Army and Marine Corps.

These are just some of the steps we will take. There are others I want to highlight, but I will be happy to yields to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. I just want to preface my comments about the strategies and tactics, about the people we have in Iraq and Afghanistan. I think any discussion needs to center on them, at the point of the spear, at our request.

When I think about these issues, I think about the soldiers I met in Landshtul, Germany, just before Thanksgiving, where most of our badly wounded go after they leave Iraq. We have an amazing medical system, which I am happy about, taking care of our men and women. By the time they get to Germany, a lot of them are conscious, and so I had a chance to meet these folks. I met a couple of young men from Bremerton, Washington, just south of my district, both of whom had very severe injuries. Their legs were up and pins were sticking out and tubes coming every which way. One guy had both arms shattered, up and attached to pieces of metal. They were very seriously injured guys. I just wanted to say thank you to them and asked if there was any way we could help them.

I asked both, What do you have in mind? And both of them said, in fact all of them I talked to, said one thing: I want to get back to my unit as soon as possible.

Mr. SCHIFF. Just to interrupt for a second. I visited our troops in that very same hospital, as well as here in Bethesda at Walter Reed. That is exactly what they told me also. They just want to get back to their unit. These young people, and they are so young, that is the most striking thing when you meet them in the field. They are so committed, it just can't help but take your breath away.

Mr. INSLEE. Whatever you think of the Iraq operation, whatever you think of the strategy, I think anybody who met these people would be incredibly proud and reach one bipartisan conclusion, that they deserve the best that America can provide.

And you have to ask the question: Have they gotten the best that America could provide? And the answer is a resounding no, they have not. They have not gotten the personal body armor, they have not gotten the armored Humvees, they have not gotten basic equipment, on occasion, that we have talked about. The National Guard in particular has been shorted some important equipment. They simply have not gotten the best that America can provide.

And when you ask the administration, Donald Rumsfeld, why we sent these people in, not in cardboard, but essentially thin-skinned Humvees with no protection, his answer was, and I am paraphrasing, well, we didn't know anybody was going to be shooting at us in the rear. We have the armor up in front. But, geez, the guys in the rear? Who could have imagined that an Iraqi would be unhappy that a Western occupation army of 150,000 people roaming through might be unhappy about that, and might be shooting at our people, and might be doing improvised explosive devices? That was beyond our comprehension.

Just like it was beyond their comprehension that the levees could be topped during Katrina. Those two failures of obvious common sense I think have to go down in the top 10 of ineffective, incompetent, uncaring, rank mistakes, and that is too easy a word to use, in American history. Levees won't be topped and people won't be shooting at us back in the streets of Baghdad for the years we were going to be there. That was the working assumption of Donald Rumsfeld and the President of the United States when they sent our troops into harm's way.

I can't think of a possible excuse for that bone-headed assumption. As a result, our people aren't coming home, a lot of them. And the anger I feel is matched by a lot of my constituents who feel this way, whether they are for or against the Iraq war. They deserve better than they are getting.

And the Democrats are going to insist that when our people go into action they are going to be fully equipped, and we will not go in there

with sort of a hallucination that it is going to be like the film clip of the Champs Elysees in 1944. They should have anticipated that. So I wanted to get that off my chest.

But I want to say one thing about intelligence, if I can.

Mr. SCHIFF. If I can add one thing, before you do, and that is one of the things that really concerns me, and here again is the failure of us in this body to do the oversight we should, to have the majority support that oversight, and that is have we moved as quickly as we can, as quickly as this great Nation can to provide the technology to defend against these improvised explosive devices that have taken so many Americans lives? I think the answer is, no, we have not done all we can. We have not moved as fast as we could.

I know certainly in Congress, when these questions have come up, we haven't gotten the answers, I think, to go home to our constituents and say every rock is being turned over, every effort is being made, every resource is being expended to make sure we are protected against the IEDs. I think there is more we could be doing.

And the L.A. Times had an analysis recently of a promising new technology and the frustration of those that have been working on this program about how difficult it is to get that technology actually out into the field. That is inexcusable. If there is promising technology, it needs to be fast-tracked, and it needs to be put to immediate use.

The fact that we would lose a single life because of the failure of the richest Nation on Earth to provide the body armor, the up-armored vehicles, or the technology to defeat the IEDs is just inexcusable.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, I agree. And I want to, if I can, talk about intelligence for a moment because I think that in the nature of the warfare we are involved in with terrorism, intelligence, if not everything, is most of our ability to stop a terrorist attack.

What I want to point out is that we have an enormous shortfall of HUMINT, or human intelligence. We have an enormous shortfall of human agents around the world. And Democrats have committed to ramping up that capability in this country because we recognize that in the new threat environment we have, the new threat is much more likely to come from an al Qaeda ring personally delivered by a taxi cab and bus than it is by an ICBM from some particular other place on the planet.

You wonder why this administration is not ramping up the human intelligence around the globe. There are a couple of reasons. One, is they would rather put the money in the Star Wars projects by the tens of billions of dollars. That is number one. And number two, frankly, because this President worked so ineffectively with the rest of the world leading up to Iraq that we have had some difficulty in having as many alliances around the world as we need in this war on terrorism.

We are certainly experiencing that in Iran right now, when we are trying to rally the world on a sanction policy against Iran, and we are not getting as much cooperation as we should. And, frankly, one of the reasons is that the rest of the world is not particularly pleased that the President refused to work with the rest of the world in Iraq.

So what I would say about the Democratic approach to intelligence is there are two things we believe are the most effective in intelligence work, or at least two things we are vastly short in: electronic surveillance, very important, and we can talk more about that in a minute; but we have to boost the human intelligence, the number of effective agencies that have penetrated these cells around the world and can work with other governments in that regard.

Two, we have to rally the world to a global alliance that is against us. And when we have a chief executive officer that tells the rest of the world to go fish on Iraq and global warming and on the land mine treaty, and you name it, it doesn't make you a very effective rallier of troops. And that is a problem.

Mr. SCHIFF. And this is precisely the problem. When we discuss where we are in the rest of the world, what our standing is in the world, and some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will pejoratively say, well, we don't care about the court of public opinion, we are not in this to be popular. Well, it is true we are not in this to be popular. But when we alienate the rest of the world, it has a real cost to us in terms of our own security.

We are dependent, like it or not, on information about al Qaeda's operations from other nations. If we can't get their cooperation, that affects our security. If we communicate to the rest of the world that we don't care about their priorities, when we go to them about ours, when we go to them about North Korea or Iran or Iraq, how can we expect a warm and ready and welcoming response? We can't. And that puts us more at risk.

So this has had real consequences. When I consider where we were in the world's estimation and the kind of cooperation we could get pre-9/11, and I look now, when it should be that much greater given what took place on 9/11, but it is that much more problematic because these world leaders, even if they wanted to help us, and many of them do, because they recognize the threat to themselves from terrorism as well, but if our Nation is that unpopular, or our chief executive is that unpopular and politically they can't afford to do it, that is a real problem.

When people are running for office in foreign capitals of our allies on a platform of who will be most opposed to the United States policy, that is a problem for our security. It is not about popularity; it is about security. And this is why we need a change. We need a change that will, as you say, bring the world together in a great cause. Because in the end, this fight we have with terrorism unites us. It is an attack on civilization.

□ 2100

And was it Ben Franklin who said, ''We have to hang together or we shall all hang separately''?

Mr. INSLEE. I don't think it was Yogi Berra.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his great work.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

February 3, 2006:

H.R. 4659. An Act to amend the USA PATRIOT ACT to extend the sunset of certain provisions of such Act.

February 10, 2006:

H.R. 4519. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend funding for the operation of State high risk health insurance pools.

February 15, 2006:

H.R. 4636, An Act to enact the technical and conforming amendments necessary to implement the Federal Deposit Insurance Reform Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

February 18, 2006:

H.R. 4745. An Act making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for the Small Business Administration's disaster loans program, and for other purposes.

March 9, 2006:

H.R. 3199. An Act to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes.

March 14, 2006:

H.R. 4515. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4422 West Sciota Street in Scio, New York, as the ''Corporal Jason L. Dunham Post Office''.

March 16, 2006:

H.R. 32. An Act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in counterfeit marks.

March 20, 2006:

H.R. 1287. An Act designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 312 East North Avenue in Flora, Illinois, as the ''Robert T. Ferguson Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2113. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 McDonough Street in Joliet, Illinois, as the ''John F. Whiteside Joliet Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2346, An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 105 NW Railroad Avenue in Hammond, Louisiana, as the ''John J. Hainkel, Jr. Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2413, An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1202 1st Street in Humble, Texas, as the ''Lillian McKay Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2630. An Act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1927 Sangamon Avenue in Springfield, Illinois. as the ''J.M. Dietrich Northeast Annex''.

H.R. 2894, An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 102 South Walters Avenue in Hodgenville, Kentucky, as the ''Abraham Lincoln Birthplace Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3256, An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3038 West Liberty Avenue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the ''Congressman James Grove Fulton Memorial Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3368. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6483 Lincoln Street in Gagetown, Michigan, as the ''Gagetown Veterans Memorial Post Office''.

H.R. 3439. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 North 3rd Street in Smithfield, North Carolina, as the ''Ava Gardner Post Office''.

H.R. 3548. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located on Franklin Avenue in Pearl River, New York, as the ''Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr. Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3703. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8501 Philatelic Drive in Spring Hill, Florida, as the ''Staff Sergeant Michael Schafer Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3770. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 205 West Washington Street in Knox, Indiana, as the ''Grant W. Green Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3825. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Trumbull Drive in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the ''Clayton J. Smith Memorial Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3830. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 East Marion Avenue in Punta Gorda, Florida, as the ''U.S. Cleveland Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3989, An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 37598 Goodhue Avenue in Dennison, Minnesota, as the ''Albert H. Quie Post Office''.

H.R. 4053. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 545 North Rimsdale Avenue in Covina, California, as the ''Lillian Kinkella Keil Post Office''.

H.R. 4107. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1826 Pennsylvania Avenue in Baltimore, Maryland, as the ''Maryland State Delegate Lena K. Lee Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4152. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 High Street in Clinton. Massachusetts, as the ''Raymond J. Salmon Post Office''.

H.R. 4295. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12760 South Park Avenue in Riverton, Utah, as the ''Mont and Mark Stephensen Veterans Memorial Post Office Building''.

H.J. Res. 47. A joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

March 23. 2006:

H.R. 1053. An Act to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Ukraine.

H.R. 1691. An Act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Appleton, Wisconsin, as the ''John H. Bradley Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic''.

March 24, 2006:

H.R. 4826. An Act to extend through December 31, 2006, the authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the processing of permits.

April 1, 2006:

H.R. 4911. An Act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

April 11, 2006:

H.R. 1259. An Act to award a congressional gold medal on behalf of the Tuskegee Airmen, collectively, in recognition of their unique military record, which inspired revolutionary reform in the Armed Forces.

April 13. 2006:

H.J. Res. 81. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Phillip Frost as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 82. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Alan G. Spoon as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

April 20, 2006:

H.R. 4979. An Act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify the preference for local firms in the award of certain contracts for disaster relief activities.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

February 8, 2006:

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

February 27, 2006:

S. 1989. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 57 Rolfe Square in Cranston, Rhode Island, shall be known and designated as the ''Holly A. Charette Post Office''.

March 6, 2006:

S. 1777. An Act to provide relief for the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

March 9, 2006:

S. 2271. An Act to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge nondisclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, and for other purposes.

March 13, 2006:

S. 449. An Act to facilitate shareholder consideration of proposals to make Settlement Common Stock under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act available to missed enrollees, eligible elders, and eligible persons born after December 18, 1971, and for other purposes.

March 20, 2006:

S. 1578. An Act to reauthorize the Upper Colorado and San Juan River Basin endangered fish recovery implementation programs.

S. 2089. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1271 North King Street in Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, as the ''Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building''.

S. 2320. An Act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.

March 23, 2006:

S. 2064. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 122 South Bill Street in Francesville, Indiana, as the Malcolm Melville ''Mac'' Lawrence Post Office.

S. 2275. An Act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the national flood insurance program.

March 24, 2006:

S. 1184. An Act to waive the passport fees for a relative of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member or to attend a funeral or memorial service for such member.

S. 2363. An Act to extend the educational flexibility program under section 4 of the Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999.

April 11, 2006:

S. 2116. An Act to transfer jurisdiction of certain real property to the Supreme Court.

S. 2120. An Act to ensure regulatory equity between and among all dairy farmers and handlers for sales of packaged fluid milk in federally regulated milk marketing areas and into certain non-federally regulated milk marketing areas from federally regulated areas, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4:30 p.m. on account of a family emergency.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, May 2.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 1, 2006, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7029. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Emamectin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0212; FRL-7765-4] received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7030. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pyraclostrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2004-0292; FRL-7772-8] received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7031. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Novaluron; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0525; FRL-7756-8] received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7032. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—FD&C Blue No. 1 PEG Derivatives; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0486; FRL-7765-1] received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7033. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Industrial Process Cooling Towers [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0004; FRL-8054-1] (RIN: 2060-AK16) received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7034. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Magnetic Tape Manufacturing Operations [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0161; FRL-8054-2] (RIN: 2060-AK23) received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7035. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendments to Vehicle Inspection Maintenance Program Requirements to Address the 8-Hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ozone [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0095; FRL-8054-3] (RIN: 2060-AM21) received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7036. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Gasoline Distribution Facilities (Bulk Gasoline Terminals and Pipeline Breakout Stations) [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0019; FRL-8054-5] (RIN: 2060-AK10) received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7037. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ethylene Oxide Emissions Standards for Sterilization Facilities [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0197; FRL-8054-6] (RIN: 2060-AK09) received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7038. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Hydrochloric Acid Production [EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0057; FRL-8055-6] (RIN: 2060-AM25) received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7039. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Idaho: Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [FRL-8055-7] received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7040. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—PM2.5 De Minimis Emission Levels for General Conformity Applicability [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0491; FRL-8055-3] (RIN: 2060-AN60) received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7041. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: General Provisions [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0094; FRL-8055-5] (RIN: 2060-AM89) received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7042. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation of the Hazelwood SO2 Nonattainment and the Monongahela River Valley Unclassifiable Area to Attainment and Approval of the Maintenance Plan; Correction [PA209-4302; FRL-8055-8] received April 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7043. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that an executive order has been issued blocking additional persons in connection with the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, concerning actions of the Government of Syria, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1701; (H. Doc. No. 109-100); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

7044. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report to Congress on Arms Control, Nonproliferation and Disarmament Studies completed in 2004, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1113 note; to the Committee on International Relations.

7045. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-348, ''Non-Health Related Occupations and Professions Licensure Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7046. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-354, ''Oak Hill Construction Streamlining Temporary Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7047. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-353, ''Triangle Community Garden Equitable Real Property Tax Exemption and Relief Temporary Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7048. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-347, ''Low-Emissions Motor Vehicle Tax Exemption Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7049. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-352, ''District Department of Transportation DC Circulator Temporary Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7050. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-346, ''Closing of a Portion of a Public Alley in Square 5230, S.O. 04-9922, Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7051. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-351, ''Closing of Public Alleys in Square 743N, S.O. 04-12457, Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7052. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-350, ''Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Fund Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7053. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-345, ''Government Facility Security Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7054. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-349, ''New Columbia Community Land Trust 20th and Channing Streets, N.E. Tax Exemption Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7055. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-344, ''Advisory Commission on Sentencing Amendment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7056. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-342, ''Closing of a Portion of a Public Alley in Square 1030, S.O. 02-2103, Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7057. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting in accordance with the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (FAIR Act), the Year 2005 A-76 Inventory of Commercial Activities for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7058. A letter from the Chief Human Captial Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7059. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-343, ''Financial Institutions Deposit and Investment Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7060. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's annual report for FY 2005, summarizing data and analysis of complaints filed for the past five fiscal years and how the Department is working to fulfill the requirements of the Act, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, section 203 of Title II; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7061. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of

the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Department's report entitled, ''Report to Congress on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2005 Competitive Sourcing Efforts''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7062. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting a copy of the Board's No Fear Act Report for FY 2005, pursuant to Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7063. A letter from the Director, Office of Management, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's 2005 Annual Report on the Use of Category Ratings to fill positions, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3319; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7064. A letter from the General Counsel, Government Accoutability Office, transmitting the information required pursuant to the annual reporting requirement set forth in Section 203 of the ''Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002'' (NoFear), Pub. L. 107-174, for Fiscal Year 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7065. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting in accordance with Section 645 of Division F, Title VI, of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Commission's report covering fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7066. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report entitled, ''Designing an Effective Pay for Performance Compensation System,'' pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7067. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270) and OMB Circular A-76, Performance of Commercial Activities, the Administration's FY 2005 inventory of commercial activities performed by federal employees and inventory of inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7068. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting a report on a proposed archival depository for the Presidential records and other historical materials of the Nixon administration, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2112; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7069. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting the Office's FY 2006 through FY 2012 Strategic Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7070. A letter from the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Letter Report: Advisory Neighborhood Commission 7D Unauthorized Check Activity''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7071. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report about the Commission's activities in FY 2005 to ensure accountability for anti-discrimination and whistleblower laws related to employment, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, section 203 of Title II; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7072. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a copy of the Administration's Fiscal Year 2005 Notification and Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act Annual Report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, section 203; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7073. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's report entitled, ''Report on Acquisitions Made from Foreign Manufacturers for Fiscal Year 2005'' in accordance with Section 641 of Division H of the Fiscal Year 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Pub. L. 108-447; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7074. A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Authority's Annual Performance Report for FY 2005, in accordance with the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7075. A letter from the Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for Calendar Year 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7076. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile Marker 179.2 to Mile Marker 180.0, St. Louis, MO [COTP St. Louis-05-019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7077. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Illinois River Mile Marker 162.3 to Mile Marker 162.7, Peoria, IL [COTP St. Louis-05-017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7078. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Missouri River Mile Marker 422.0 to Mile Marker 423.5, Atchison, KS [COTP St. Louis-05-020] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7079. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile Marker 840.0 to Mile Marker 840.4, ST. Paul, MN [COTP St. Louis-05-021] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7080. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the report on the results of a demonstration project involving the implementation of the Crew Endurance Management System (CEMS) on towing vessels, pursuant to Public Law 108-293, section 409; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7081. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Missouri River, Mile 732.0 to Mile 732.6, Sioux City, IA [COTP St. Louis-05-022] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7082. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 335.5 to Mile 336.5, La Grange, MO [COTP St. Louis-05-023] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7083. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile Marker 791.2 to Mile Marker 791.7, Red Wing, MN [COTP St. Louis-05-024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7084. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile Marker 790.7 to Mile Marker 791.3, Red Wing, MN [COTP St. Louis-05-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7085. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Tampa Bay, FL [COTP Tampa 05-099] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7086. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Tampa Bay, FL [COTP Tampa 05-100] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 16, 206, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7087. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Communications, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a copy of the Authority's statistical summary for Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 831h(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7088. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that the Department has created the Critical Infrastructure Partnership Advisory Council (CIPAC); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

7089. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report to Congress on a plan for the development of fusion energy, in compliance with Sections 972(a) and (b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science.

7090. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the threat from act of terrorism to U.S. ports and vessels operating from those ports, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1802; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Homeland Security.

7091. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification of the change in the title of the office and position of the Under Secretary of Emergency and Preparedness and Response with the title, ''Under Secretary for Federal Emergency Management,'' pursuant to Public Law 107-296, section 872; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Homeland Security.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3418. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Central Texas

Water Recycling and Reuse Project, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4013. A bill to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for conjunctive use of surface and groundwater in Juab County, Utah (Rept. 109–443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4686. A bill to reauthorize various fisheries management laws, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 5112. A bill to provide for reform in the operations of the executive branch (Rept. 109–445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 724. Resolution honoring Leonidas Ralph Mecham, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and Secretary of the Judicial Conference of the United States (Rept. 109–446). 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. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 5216. A bill to require the establishment of a national database in the National Archives to preserve records of servitude, emancipation, and post-Civil War reconstruction and to provide grants to State and local entities to establish similar local databases; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY (for herself, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 5217. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to award competitive grants to units of local government for innovative programs that address expenses incurred in responding to the needs of undocumented immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services, 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. MCDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 5218. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that oil and gas companies will not be eligible for the effective rate reductions enacted in 2004 for domestic manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 5219. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the detection and prevention of inappropriate conduct in the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 5220. A bill to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Certification, Credentialing, and Licensure; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire (for himself and Mr. BASS):

H.R. 5221. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance services provided by Vet Centers operated by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to clarify and improve the provision of bereavement counseling by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 5222. A bill to amend the Native American Languages Act to provide for the support of Native American language survival schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FARR, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 5223. A bill to establish the National Commission on Surveillance Activities and the Rights of Americans; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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 Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 5224. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 350 Uinta Drive in Green River, Wyoming, as the ''Curt Gowdy Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REYES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 5225. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prevent and cure diabetes and to promote and improve the care of individuals with diabetes for the reduction of health disparities within racial and ethnic minority groups, including the African-American, Hispanic American, Asian American and Pacific Islander, and American Indian and Alaskan Native communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 5226. A bill to repeal certain tax provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 5227. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with any of the management partners of the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida:

H.R. 5228. A bill to require representatives of governments designated as State Sponsors of Terrorism to disclose to the Attorney General lobbying contacts with legislative branch officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, 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. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SABO, and Ms. HART):

H.R. 5229. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained legally; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. SHADEGG):

H.R. 5230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified elementary and secondary education tuition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 5231. A bill to limit Federal court jurisdiction over certain suits pertaining to the application of a price threshold in determining the volume for which suspension of royalties applies to certain offshore oil and gas leases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 5232. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate and complete an evaluation of lands and waters located in Northeastern Pennsylvania for their potential acquisition and inclusion in a future Cherry Valley National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan:

H.R. 5233. A bill to make funding for the housing choice voucher program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development more reliable and predictable at the local level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 5234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain tax incentives for oil companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 5235. A bill to direct the President to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate certain Federal rules and regulations for potentially harmful impacts on public health, air quality, water quality, plant and animal wildlife, global climate, or the environment; and to direct Federal departments and agencies to create plans to reverse those impacts that are determined to be harmful by the National Academy of Sciences; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Resources, and Agriculture, 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. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 5236. A bill to establish an Unsolved Crimes Section in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, and an Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office in the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 5237. A bill to seek the inclusion of certain requirements of the International Health Regulations of the World Health Organization as obligations under the World Trade Organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 5238. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate adjustments in Medicare payments for imaging services made by section 5102 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005; 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. MCHUGH:

H.R. 5239. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for certain alternative motor vehicles assembled in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 5240. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend the excise tax on highway motor fuels when average United States retail gasoline prices exceed $2.75 per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 5241. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 to allow the Secretary of the Army to extend the period during which the Secretary may provide beach nourishment for a water resources development project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 5242. A bill to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. NORTON:

H.R. 5243. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a dental education loan repayment program to encourage dentists to serve at facilities with a critical shortage of dentists in areas with a high incidence of HIV/AIDS; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 5244. A bill to revitalize the Los Angeles River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 5245. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Marble Street in Fair Haven, Vermont, as the ''Matthew Lyon Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 5246. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore financial stability to Medicare anesthesiology teaching programs for resident physicians; 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 5247. A bill to provide assistance for the Museum of the History of Polish Jews in Warsaw, Poland; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 5248. A bill to regulate over-the-counter trading of energy derivatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 5249. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require recipients of United States foreign assistance to certify that the assistance will not be used to intentionally traffic in goods or services that contain counterfeit marks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KUHL of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WYNN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5250. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act regarding early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of hearing loss; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 5251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the use of alternative fuel vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. FEENEY):

H.J. Res. 84. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the power of Federal courts to force a State or local government to levy or increase taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY (for herself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FARR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. LEE):

H. Con. Res. 395. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideas of a National Child Care Worthy Wage Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. PASTOR):

H. Con. Res. 396. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should address the ongoing problem of untouchability in India; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Government Reform, and 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 Mrs. MCCARTHY (for herself, Mr. OSBORNE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 784. A resolution commending and supporting Radio Al Mahaba, Iraq's first and only radio station for women; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H. Res. 785. A resolution honoring the lives and achievements of Christopher and Dana Reeve; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. FOLEY):

H. Res. 786. A resolution condemning the recent election of the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations to the position of Vice-chair of the United Nations Disarmament Commission; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. SOLIS:

H. Res. 787. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all workers deserve fair treatment and safe working conditions, and honoring Dolores Huerta for her commitment to the improvement of working conditions for farm worker families and the rights of women and children; 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. 34: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 65: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 161: Mr. REYES and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 226: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 503: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 550: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 691: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 699: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 709: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 759: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 765: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 857: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 865: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 892: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 944: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 964: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 974: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 1237: Mr. MURPHY and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1498: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1522: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1561: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1697: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1709: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1798: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1861: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 1994: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2070: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2177: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2178: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 2350: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 2410: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PAUL, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 2421: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 2498: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2683: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 2727: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2828: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2943: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 2962: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 3096: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 3173: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 3278: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 3326: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 3358: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 3385: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 3401: Mr. JENKINS and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 3478: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3544: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3559: Mr. CARTER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 3579: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3628: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 3762: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 3779: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 3791: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 3917: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 3936: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LEE, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 3949: Mr. KLINE and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 3964: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CASE, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4005: Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 4033: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4082: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 4121: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 4156: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 4157: Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4197: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 4217: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 4236: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4298: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4315: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 4341: Mr. BOYD, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 4357: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 4366: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 4371: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 4465: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4479: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OBEY, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 4542: Mr. ROSS and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4547: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 4562: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 4574: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 4597: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4622: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4623: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 4666: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 4681: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TANNER, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 4726: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 4727: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 4737: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4755: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4761: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 4774: Mr. SHERWOOD.

H.R. 4775: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 4794: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4859: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4894: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 4922: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 4923: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4946: Mr. GINGREY and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 4954: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4956: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4961: Mr. MURPHY and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 4962: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 4967: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 4976: Mr. OTTER and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 4980: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 5015: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5022: Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5037: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 5056: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 5058: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 5072: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5099: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 5100: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 5104: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOYD, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MACK, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 5106: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 5113: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5114: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 5115: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 5120: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 5129: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5131: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 5134: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 5136: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 5139: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5140: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5141: Mr. EMANUEL and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5142: Mr. EMANUEL and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5150: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 5159: Mr. MACK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 5166: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MICA, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 5170: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. HART, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 5182: Mr. WALSH, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 5201: Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 5206: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 5208: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5212: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. SOLIS.

H. J. Res. 73: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. FATTAH.

H. Con. Res. 172: Mr. ISSA.

H. Con. Res. 318: Mr. SIMMONS.

H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Con. Res. 346: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KING of New York.

H. Con. Res. 348: Mr. COBLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BACA, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 363: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 367: Ms. GRANGER.

H. Con. Res. 368: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 380: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 383: Mr. GERLACH.

H. Con. Res. 392: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Res. 116: Mr. DICKS, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 149: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 316: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 635: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. FATTAH.

H. Res. 638: Mr. ISSA.

H. Res. 666: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 729: Mr. ISSA and Ms. HARRIS.

H. Res. 730: Mr. HALL.

H. Res. 773: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H. Res. 780: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 781: Mr. HAYWORTH.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 12, April 26, 2006, by Mr. EDWARD J. MARKEY on the bill H.R. 4263 was signed by the following Members: Edward J. Markey, Peter A DeFazio, James L. Oberstar, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Robert A. Brady, James P. Moran, Grace F. Napolitano, and Jerrold Nadler.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 6 by Mr. ABERCROMBIE on House Resolution 543: Timothy H. Bishop, John F. Tierney, Jim McDermott, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Joe Baca, James L. Oberstar, Gary L. Ackerman, Jane Harman, Elito L. Engel, and David R. Obey.

Petition 7 by Ms. HERSETH on House Resolution 568: Benjamin L. Cardin, Barney Frank, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Doris O. Matsui, John T. Salazar, Allyson Y. Schwartz, John W. Olver, Stephen F. Lynch, Rahm Emanuel, Gregory W. Meeks, Lloyd Doggett, Vic Snyder, Artur Davis, Jim Davis, Adam Smith, Jerry F. Costello, Melvin L. Watt, James L. Oberstar, Jim Costa, Chaka Fattah, David Scott, Howard Coble, Ed Case, and Doris O. Matsui.

Petition 10 by Ms. HERSETH on House Resolution 585: Adam Smith.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 109TH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the 1st Session, 109th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

January 5, 2006:

H.R. 3402. An Act to authorize appropriations for the Department of Justice for fiscal years 2006 through 2009, and for other purposes.

January 6, 2006:

H.R. 1815. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year.

January 10, 2006:

H.R. 972. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2017. An Act to amend the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 to authorize appropriations to provide assistance for domestic and foreign programs and centers for the treatment of victims of torture, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3179. An Act to reauthorize and amend the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994.

H.R. 4501. An Act to amend the Passport Act of June 4, 1920, to authorize the Secretary of State to establish and collect a surcharge to cover the costs of meeting the increased demand for passports as a result of actions taken to comply with section 7209(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

H.R. 4637. An Act to make certain technical corrections in amendments made by the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

January 11, 2006:

H.R. 4340. An Act to implement the United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement.