

THE FAVORITES—STOCKS HELD BY LARGEST NUMBER OF ACCOUNTS AT MERRILL LYNCH

Stock	Close	Change (%)	
		Day	2006
AT&T Inc	26.66	+0.2	+8.9
Avaya	11.31	-1.6	+6.0
BkofAm	48.41	-0.8	+4.9
Chevron	57.59	+0.1	+1.4
Cisco	19.48	-2.5	+13.8
Citigroup	49.33	-0.9	+1.6
Comcast	32.47	-0.6	+25.3
ExxonMob	58.24	-1.0	+3.7
GenElec	33.87	-0.6	-3.4
Home Dep	36.26	-1.9	-10.4
Intel	16.86	-1.7	-32.5
IBM	77.02	-0.8	-6.3
JPMorgCh	41.60	-1.2	+4.8
JohnJn	61.38	*	+2.1
Lucent	2.41	-1.6	-9.4
Microsoft	21.71	-1.0	-17.0
Pfizer	23.29	-1.0	-0.1
ProctGam	54.31	-0.3	-6.2
TimeWarn	17.20	-0.9	-1.4
VerizonCm	31.33	-0.5	+4.0

LIMITING CONSENT DECREES

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, I appreciate joining the majority whip, Mr. BLUNT of Missouri, as well as the chairman of the Constitution Caucus, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. For several weeks now we have tried to come before this body and talk about issues in which the Federal Government in its effort to be helpful has actually caused greater harm than good.

We have talked about the significance of sunset reviews, reviewing administrative decisions, mandates, States that would put on specific pieces of legislation that would help solve some of those problems. Again we come before you today, and I am grateful to be able to talk with these good gentlemen about once again the Federal Government, in an effort to be helpful, not malicious but helpful, tipping the balance of power with the net result that people are harmed, not by design, but that is the way that has happened.

Consent decrees, which shift the horizontal balance of power, have had the net effect of actually harming individuals. It is something that is a phenomenon that every State has experienced. Federal consent decrees are enforced in all 50 States, which end with judges running prisons, schools, welfare agencies, health care systems and on and on, usually on decisions that are based upon the advice of the advocates who brought original lawsuits in the first place.

It has been mentioned there have been a couple of Supreme Court decisions that have talked about these phenomena. The case of Jenkins v. Missouri is one of those great ones in which the Kansas City school district was taken over by a Federal judge. In an effort to try to improve the school system, not only did they use the executive authority to control hires and fires as well as curriculum, they assumed the legislative authority by actually advancing a property tax on the

citizens of Kansas City, Missouri, in an effort to try to improve the education system. At least at that time the Supreme Court said in a 5-4 decision that they had gone too far.

That kind of usurpation of other authorities does not actually produce the better result. In the case that Mr. GARRETT spoke about, Frew v. Hawkins in 2004, the Supreme Court once again said this can lead to the Federal court's oversight programs for long periods of time, even when there is no violation of the law still in effect.

Now what does this do for individuals? Let me give you a couple of examples. In a west coast city, they recently entered into a 5-year consent, actually in 2001 they went to a 5-year consent decree, in which certain practices would be done by the police department of this particular city. They recently conducted an independent review on how they had done in compliance with the consent decree.

The consent decree had said that every time a police officer uses non-lethal force such as perhaps twisting an arm of a suspect to handcuff him, the captain or above has to write a report of the incident within 14 days. There was a 94 percent compliance with that provision, but not enough to satisfy the consent decree.

The police commissioner was supposed to report within 45 days the quarterly discipline report. He actually took 15 days longer than that and was once again out of compliance. The department took 21 days rather than 7 days to send in its audit report to the Inspector General and was therefore out of compliance.

In fact, it would be possible to comply with all the decisions of this consent decree if the police department actually hired more personnel to keep the paperwork going. In fact, that is exactly what they did. They did hire more personnel to do the paperwork that was necessary to fulfill the details of the consent decree.

One article in the National Review talks about how the city's police department and their supervisors would meet to discuss the issues of the police department, and their topics of conversation tend to go almost universally to how to fulfill the provisions of the consent decree.

If I could quote from one article, they said for more than 2½ hours they gathered captains, sergeants lieutenants, and detectives spoke of nothing but processing the paperwork. Not a single word was uttered about reducing crime or otherwise how to improve the quality of life of people in the area in which they serve. The supervisor who attended this meeting simply called the process pathetic.

Oddly enough in the report of how they were doing in fulfilling their consent decree, it also mentioned that what the city needed were more personnel on the street and more supervisor oversight for the officers in the field, which oddly enough, in one of

those ironies of life, they could have done had they not spent their money to hire the personnel to do the paperwork for the consent decree.

In New York City, they have had, since 1974, a consent decree mandating bilingual education in some of the city schools that has now been going on for 30 years, well past the original intent of it, even though the parents do not want to participate in this particular program.

Another west coast city was issued a consent decree in 1991 for their school districts, again claiming there were too few experienced teachers. Again the court stepped in increasing the taxes of these individuals by \$11 million a year, and now, 15 years later, finally, the judge declared herself satisfied and declined to extend this decree for yet another 5 years.

The problem with consent decrees is very simple. Once entered into, those who are subject to those decrees have no recourse. There is no balance, there is no kind of protective area in which to go, in which case in that particular situation it is why the majority whip has asked us to introduce this piece of legislation to put a time limit on consent decrees.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. BILIRAKIS 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 (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY 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 Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Ms. FOX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity once again to come before the House. I want to thank the leadership and the conference for their providing us the opportunity to come and talk this evening for a while and share some views with the Members of the House about a very important topic.

We have coined this on occasion the Official Truth Squad. This is the House Official Truth Squad, the Republican conference Official Truth Squad that grew out of a general frustration on the part of many Members of the freshmen class, 25, 26 strong, who are now about 18 months into our first term in Congress.

And after about 6 months, we met and shared conversation and thoughts about the House of Representatives and where we are going as a Nation. There was some real concern about what we sensed as the politics of division and the politics of deception that seemed to be practiced by many here in this Chamber and across the land, frankly.

So we organized what we called the Official Truth Squad and come to the floor of the House on many occasions, as often as possible, at least try to do it at least once a week. We broadened that participation in the Official Truth Squad, Mr. Speaker, because I think other Members of the conference felt that was an appropriate thing to do, to try to bring some light, shed some light and truth on the issues that we talk about here in the United States House of Representatives, because it is so doggone important to make certain that we have truth and facts when we are talking about issues. Because if you don't have the right facts, the truth of the matter is, it is tough to get to the appropriate solution.

□ 2245

We have adopted a slogan or a quote that we like to call on by the late Sen-

ator Daniel Patrick Moynihan and he had a quote that he used often. He said everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts, and I think that kind of crystallizes the genesis of the Official Truth Squad and why we felt it was so important to come to this floor and talk about various issues.

So, Mr. Speaker, tonight is a topic that is extremely important, and it is a discussion that is important, and it is a topic that demands the truth.

Tonight, we are going to talk a bit about the war on terror, and it is one of those areas where, yes, people can have their own opinions, and it is important but it is also important to make certain that we think and talk about the facts of the war on terror.

I am going to be joined by a number of colleagues this evening, but I wanted to start off by outlining or by citing actions, events that have occurred in the war on terror. And many people have differing opinions as to when the war on terror actually began, when did the terrorism begin to threaten us. I think it probably was in 1979, and we will talk about that a little bit, but I want to just highlight a list of terrorist activities that I think bring real focus to the war on terror and that, Mr. Speaker, are terribly sobering, but I think they are important as we kick off this discussion about the war on terror.

There are literally tens, if not hundreds, of events that one could cite as being associated with the acts of terrorism around the world, but I would like to just highlight a number of them here.

I am going to go in chronological order. I am going to start in 1961 when the first U.S. aircraft was hijacked on May 1, 1961.

A number of events occurred over the next decade, but we all remember the Munich Olympic massacre on September 5, 1972.

The ambassador to the Sudan was assassinated on March 2, 1973, U.S. ambassador to Sudan Cleo Noel. Other diplomats assassinated at the Saudi Arabian embassy in Khartoum.

There was the attack and hijacking at the Rome airport in December, December 17, 1973.

The United States ambassador to Cyprus, Rodger Davies, and his Greek Cypriot secretary were shot and killed on August 19, 1974.

Ambassador to Afghanistan was assassinated on February 14, 1979, and of course, the Iran hostage crisis began in November of 1979 when Iranian radicals seized the U.S. embassy in Tehran and took 66 American diplomats hostage, holding 53 of them for 444 days.

Grand mosque seizure, November 20, 1979, in Mecca.

U.S. installation bombing, August 31, 1981 in Ramstein, West Germany.

Assassination of President Sadat, the Egyptian President, on October 6, 1981.

Murder of missionaries on December 4, 1981 in El Salvador.

The bombing of the U.S. embassy in Beirut, April 18, 1983. Sixty-three people, including the CIA's Middle East director, were killed. Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility.

Naval officer assassinated in El Salvador on May 25, 1983.

Bombing of the marine barracks, Beirut, October 23, 1983. There were simultaneous suicide truck bomb attacks made on American and French compounds in Beirut, killing 242 Americans and 58 French troops killed when a 400-pound device was deployed at a French base. The Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility.

Facts, Mr. Speaker.

Naval officer was assassinated in Greece, November 15, 1983.

Kidnapping of an embassy official and the murder of political officer William Buckley in Beirut, Lebanon, March 16, 1984.

Restaurant bombing in Spain, April 12, 1984. Eighteen U.S. servicemen were killed, 83 people injured.

TWA hijacking June 14, 1985.

Achille Lauro hijacking, October 7, 1985.

Aircraft bombing in Greece, March 30, 1986.

Berlin discotheque bombing, April 5, 1986, two U.S. soldiers killed and 79 American servicemen injured.

Bus attack, April 24, 1987, 16 U.S. servicemen riding in a Greek air force bus near Athens were injured.

Kidnapping of William Higgins on February 17, 1988. He was kidnapped and murdered by Iranian-backed Hezbollah.

Naples USO attack on April 14, 1988.

Attack on U.S. diplomat in Greece, June 28, 1988. Defense attache to the U.S. embassy in Greece was killed when a car bomb was detonated outside his home in Athens.

Pan Am 103 bombing, December 21, 1988. Pan Am 103 was blown up over Lockerbie, Scotland, by a bomb believed to have been placed by Libyan terrorists, 259 people killed.

And then of course, Mr. Speaker, the first World Trade Center bombing, February 26, 1993, when a car bomb, planted by Islamic terrorists, exploded in an underground garage leaving six people dead and 1,000 people injured.

Something we oftentimes forget or very few people talk about, there was an attempted assassination on President Bush by Iraqi agents on April 14, 1993.

Saudi military installation attacked November 13, 1995.

Khobar Towers bombing June 25, 1996, in Dhahran, killing 19 U.S. military personnel, wounding 515 persons including 240 U.S. personnel.

Empire State Building sniper attack in February of 1997.

The murder of a U.S. businessmen in Pakistan, November 12, 1997.

U.S. embassy bombings in east Africa. August 7, 1998, a bomb exploded at the rear entrance of the U.S. embassy in Nairobi, Kenya, killing 12 U.S. citizens and 32 foreign service nationals