



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2006

No. 79

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.

June 19, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM PRICE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for 5 minutes.

### THE IRAQ RESOLUTION

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday and Friday, the House conducted a very important debate on the global war on terror. The resolution in question, H. Res. 861, honored the sacrifice of our soldiers and reaffirmed our commitment to victory in that global war on terror. I am very heartened that the House Republicans were joined by nearly a quarter of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, 42, to be exact, voting in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it was a spirited 10-hour debate, and over the course of it I

heard some criticisms that I believe deserve a response. Many in the minority objected to the resolution and the forum for its consideration. They contended that the resolution was hollow, and it did not allow for a meaningful debate on the war.

With such antipathy for the process and the resolution, one would have expected the Democratic leadership to ask for a vote on the previous question on the rule so that they could, in fact, amend it. In fact, they didn't. Or they might have offered a specific official substitute resolution which I, on several occasions over a 2-day period, said we would have considered making in order.

But, Mr. Speaker, they did neither. In fact, as I said, for over 2 days, I asked the Democratic leadership for an alternative. I was told that nothing would be forthcoming. While individual Members such as Mr. ABERCROMBIE did offer their own alternatives, the minority on the Rules Committee chose not to submit any of them as the official Democratic substitute.

Unfortunately, many Members chose to make this a debate about process, rather than the real issue at hand. After listening to the debate, I know why. The minority party has no clear position on how to win the global war on terror and prevail in Iraq. When it comes to the biggest challenge of our generation, they are not of one mind. Some agree with House Republicans that it is absolutely essential to stay in Iraq until we achieve victory. Unfortunately, the majority of Democrats favor retreat in one form or another, whether it is the vague policy of redeployment or outright and immediate withdrawal, as the Out of Iraq Caucus has called it.

This is a dangerous approach, Mr. Speaker. While perhaps intended to comfort our country in the midst of a truly devastating and trying struggle, it would serve chiefly to comfort the

enemy. We know that two decades of tepid responses to attacks on our citizens and our interests in Lebanon, Somalia, New York City, Saudi Arabia, Tanzania, Kenya and Yemen only emboldened terrorists. We will not make the same mistake again.

Mr. Speaker, the Iraqi people, its security forces and its government are not naive. Nor are we. Despite recent progress such as the killing of al Zarqawi and the completion of the Iraqi government's cabinet, calm is not just around the corner. The terrorists are unyielding. After all, their stated aim is to drive coalition forces out of the country and establish a territory-hungry, terrorist-friendly extremist state.

They have openly declared that the United States does not have the will to see the fight through. They understand the significance of this battle, and so must we. We must accept nothing but total engagement and commitment as we help Iraq stabilize herself and become an ally in the war on terror. We cannot fulfill our mission, honor the sacrifice of our troops and move forward in the war on terror by backing away from its central battlefield. In a region where democracy has the potential to become more than a hope, we cannot abandon its best hope.

Mr. Speaker, if we leave prematurely, and Iraq is allowed to become a lawless territory, sympathetic to terrorists, and brutal to its own people, the safety of the world and the security of the United States of America would be directly threatened.

On September 11, 2001, we saw exactly what could happen when such conditions were allowed to exist in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that some criticized the forum for our debate. As one Member described it, the 10 hours would be like a glorified special order.

But make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, our words matter. For proof, look no

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4191

further than Zarqawi's bombed-out safe house. In the rubble, a copy of Arabic Newsweek was found. Our enemies, the enemies of peace and freedom, are listening, they are reading, and they are waiting for signs of weakness and timidity in the face of their brutality.

With a vote in support of H. Res. 861, we gave them no such thing, and their kidnapping of our men and women will only strengthen our resolve. While there are significant differences between the majority and the minority on how to win the global war on terror, I am proud of both the process followed for conducting this debate and the overwhelming bipartisan vote to support our troops and complete the mission in Iraq.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: God our Father, Your care and wisdom are shown to us by the way You extend Your kingdom into our world down to the present day. Your word reveals every aspect of Your saving plan. You accomplish Your designed purpose in and through the hearts of the faithful who respond to You.

Today, convert our minds and hearts that we may become the great Nation You hope us to be. Help us to seek Your presence in the midst of a busy life, then animated by Your spirit help us to perform marvelous deeds and come to know peace, Your gift to the world, now and forever. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

#### FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, there are two strikingly different philosophies at work here in Washington. On one side are fiscally conservative Republicans who want to cut government spending and rein in the Federal deficit. On the other side are Democrats who believe that raising taxes and spending tax dollars solves all problems. But we all know better than that.

Republicans are the party of fiscal discipline, reform, and accountability. We have been working very hard to exercise fiscal restraint and keep taxes low, and our economy is thriving as a result.

Last week, The Wall Street Journal reported that surging individual and corporate tax receipts in May have helped to reduce the Federal budget deficit down 16.6 percent from the same period a year earlier.

Mr. Speaker, fiscal restraint and tax relief are stimulating the economy and increasing tax revenues. The Treasury Department predicts that if these Republican policies continue, we will cut the Federal deficit in half well before President Bush's goal of 2009.

#### TIMES PICTURE REVEALS WAR TRUTHS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a former journalist, I am saddened that much of the American media continues to play politics with the global war on terrorism, blame America, unfairly criticize our military, and bash President Bush.

By accident, the driveby the New York Times on Saturday published a front-page picture of a mosque bombing which reveals details that the newspaper frequently fails to explain. Troops are identified as Iraqi commandos, verifying Iraqis are capable and equipped. The shoe bomber was a coward, mass-murdering innocent Iraqi worshipers, and not promoting a just insurgency. The homicide bomber attacked an easy target of convenience, prevented by Iraqi and coalition troops from murdering in the streets of America.

From this picture, we can learn we must face the evil enemy overseas with our Iraqi allies, or American families will be more at risk at home. The only path to peace is victory in Iraq as the central front in the global war on terrorism.

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

#### HEALTH CARE COSTS FOR ILLEGALS

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, news from the front: The battle for the border continues. The cost to Americans for the government's failure to prevent the invasion onto our shores increases. Last year in my hometown of Houston, citizens spent \$125 million on treating 57,000 illegals in local hospitals, a 77 percent increase from the previous year.

This nonsense that illegals are not a drain on the American taxpayer is a myth perpetrated by the admiral of the fleet of invaders, Vicente Fox. America cannot continue to be the lifeboat for the sinking ships of states south of the border. What happens when our lifeboat overflows because of America's compassion? In fact, Americans are paying for hospital costs for illegals and cannot afford to pay for their own health care. So until our shores are secure, and since we choose not to deny illegals health care, every time an illegal is treated at our hospital, deduct an equal amount of foreign aid from those ships of state who send their citizens here. Make Admiral Fox pay instead of the American citizens. And that's just the way it is.

#### FORT CAMPBELL

(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, I want to ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the members of the 101st Airborne at Fort Campbell, which is there in my district. These are the men and women who were there when we eliminated Saddam's sons. They were on the ground when we eliminated Zarqawi. They have always been there for America. And today, my colleagues, we need to be there for them.

Our missing soldiers are members of the 1st Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade, 101st Airborne.

The past few days have been tough in Clarksville and Montgomery County where Fort Campbell is located. And to those families, we want them to know we are there with them, and I want everyone there to know that America mourns the loss of their colleague David, and we pray for the safe return of Kristian and Thomas.

America needs the 101st. We depend on the fighting men and women for our freedom, and their sacrifices and their losses pain this Nation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May God bless our troops.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 5 p.m. today.

**SERGEANT JACOB DAN DONES  
POST OFFICE**

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5540) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 217 Southeast 2nd Street in Dimmitt, Texas, as the "Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5540

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

**SECTION 1. SERGEANT JACOB DAN DONES POST OFFICE.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 217 Southeast 2nd Street in Dimmitt, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5540 offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) would designate the post office building at 217 Southeast 2nd Street in Dimmitt, Texas, as the Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office Building. All members of the Texas delegation have cosponsored this legislation.

Sergeant Dones was born in Dimmitt, Texas, in 1984. He was educated in the local school district, and graduated from Dimmitt High School in 2002. Upon graduation, Dones enlisted in the United States Army and served his country valiantly with the armed services from 2002 to 2005 in both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was a member of the 2nd Squadron, 11th Cavalry Regiment based out of Fort Irwin, California.

While serving in Iraq, Sergeant Dones, an expert infantry rifleman, was awarded the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, and a service ribbon for his efforts in battle. He was also awarded the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the National Defense Service Medal.

Sergeant Dones was killed in the line of duty on October 25, 2005, while defending his fellow soldiers from an oncoming attack on their base in Iraq. I urge all Members to pay homage to a great patriot and a dedicated member of the community by passing H.R. 5540.

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

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

As a member of the Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 5540, a measure sponsored by Representative RANDY NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 5540 names the postal facility in Dimmitt, Texas, after Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones. Sergeant Dones was killed in Iraq on October 20, 2005. This measure has the support and cosponsorship of the entire Texas delegation, and was unanimously reported by the Government Reform Committee on June 8, 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests at this time, and yield back the balance of my time asking for support of this bill.

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

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 5540, to designate the post office in Dimmitt, Texas, as the Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office. I would like to give a special thanks to the distinguished chairman of the Government Reform Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the distinguished ranking member of that committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for their prompt assistance in marking up this legislation and sending it to the floor so quickly.

As we have learned about Sergeant Dones is that he was a leader, he was a hero, he served his country with great distinction, and he gave the ultimate gift that any American can give our country: He gave his life.

As I read about Sergeant Dones, it was interesting to hear what his commanders and the people that worked with him said. One of the quotes was, "I wish we had more men like Sergeant Dones to serve this country." He was awarded many medals for his service, including the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the National Defense Serv-

ice Medal. He also was classified as an expert infantry rifleman. Unfortunately, on October 20, 2005, he was killed in the line of duty.

One of the interesting things is just a few days before his life was taken, he served as an election support team for the referendum of the Iraqi Constitution, something that he was fighting alongside the Iraqis to bring a new government, a free government to this country. According to the people that served alongside him, he was happy, and he shouted out to the Iraqi people, and I am probably mispronouncing this, but "Abebe, Abebe." He was saying to them, "I love you. I love you." He was known as a great ambassador for our country, and the Iraqi people loved him. Whenever there was a call for a volunteer, Jacob was always the first to volunteer.

He leaves behind a large extended family, including his parents Danny and Rosa Dones, his daughter Alyssa. And I would like to thank his cousin Joe Alvarez, who has been extremely helpful in making this idea of renaming the post office a reality.

□ 1415

He was a greatly loved family man, a community leader; and he will be sorely missed. I cannot think of a better way to show a small token of our appreciation than to rename this post office after a brave American.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote for the passage of H.R. 5540, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5540.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

**LARRY WINN, JR. POST OFFICE  
BUILDING**

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5504) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6029 Broadmoor Street in Mission, Kansas, as the "Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5504

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

**SECTION 1. LARRY WINN, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6029

Broadmoor Street in Mission, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the "Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5504, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), would designate the post office building at 6029 Broadmoor Street in Mission, Kansas, as the Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building.

Larry Winn was born in Kansas City, Missouri, on August 22, 1919. He attended the public schools in Kansas City and in 1941 graduated with a bachelor's degree from the University of Kansas.

Before becoming a Member of Congress, Winn spent 2 years as a private home builder and 14 years as director of the National Association of Home Builders.

He was elected as a Republican to the 90th Congress and to the eight succeeding Congresses. Winn served 18 years on the Space Science and Applications Subcommittee, 4 years on the District of Columbia Committee and 14 years on the Foreign Relations Committee.

After his retirement from Congress in 1985, Winn continued to serve Prairie Village, Kansas, as one of the elected members of the board of directors of the Kansas City Life Insurance Company.

I urge all Members to come together to honor a man who truly promoted excellence in community and government by passing H.R. 5504.

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

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

I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 5504, a measure sponsored by Representative DENNIS MOORE. H.R. 5504 names a postal facility in Mission, Kansas, after Larry Winn, Jr. A native of Kansas City, Missouri, Mr. Winn was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and served from 1967 to 1985. He is currently a resident of Prairie Village, Kansas.

This measure has the support and sponsorship of the entire Kansas delegation and was unanimously reported by the Government Reform Committee on June 8, 2006. I urge Members to support this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, joined by my Kansas delegation colleagues—Representatives TIAHRT, RYUN and MORAN—I recently introduced legislation to designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 6029 Broadmoor Street in Mission, Kansas, as the "Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building." I am pleased that the House is considering it today and I thank House Government Reform Committee Chairman TOM DAVIS and Ranking Democratic Member HENRY WAXMAN and their staffs for moving this measure so rapidly through their committee.

Edward Lawrence "Larry" Winn, Jr., represented Kansas' Third Congressional District in the U.S. House from 1967 to 1985. Born in Kansas City, Missouri, in 1919, he was an Eagle Scout who attended public schools and received a B.A. from the University of Kansas in 1941. Becoming an announcer for WHB radio, he later served as public relations director for the local branch of the American Red Cross. Returning to Kansas, he established and became vice president of Winn-Rau Corporation, a private home builder. For 14 years, he served as National Director of the National Association of Home Builders, and also served as President of the Home Builders Association of Kansas City.

In 1962, the incumbent U.S. Representative in the Third District, Robert Ellsworth, asked Winn, who had served as Republican Party chairman in that district, to be his campaign manager; he fulfilled that role in the 1962 and 1964 campaigns. In 1966, when Ellsworth unsuccessfully challenged incumbent U.S. Senator Jim Pearson in the Republican primary, Winn won election as his successor, defeating Overland Park Mayor Marvin Rainey. In later contests, among eight successful re-elections, Winn would defeat Lieutenant Governor James DeCoursey and Dan Watkins, the former chief of staff to Governor John Carlin.

Initially appointed to the House Committees on Space and Aeronautics (later renamed Science and Technology) and the District of Columbia, Winn later was appointed to the Select Committee on Crime, the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and the International Relations Committee, which was later renamed the Foreign Affairs Committee. Described by Congressional Quarterly's Politics in America, 1982 as a "quiet, unassuming man," Winn eventually rose to the ranking Republican seat on the Science and Technology Committee, where he was an active supporter of America's space exploration program. As Politics in America, 1982 noted, he also advocated research into alternative energy sources such as gasohol and solar and wind power, and tax credits for energy efficiency and conservation.

Winn was appointed by President Carter and confirmed by the Senate to serve as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations in 1979. He also was a member of the Canadian Interparliamentary Group and was ranking Republican member of the U.S.-European Interparliamentary Group. Domestically, Winn was a leading advocate of "value engineering," a cost-saving government management system that was implemented in the early 1970s. He also was a leading advocate

of a successful proposal maintaining 10 regional Federal office centers in the United States, which preserved Kansas City as a Federal regional office center, rather than transferring those functions to Denver.

Winn also is remembered for his advocacy of a proposed Tallgrass National Prairie Park in Kansas; as a result of his initial efforts, the Kansas Flint Hills are now home to the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, a unit of the National Park System managed in partnership with the private National Park Trust dedicated to the rich natural and cultural history of the tallgrass prairie ecosystem.

In their 1972 analysis of Winn's career, the Ralph Nader Congress Project's Citizens Look at Congress review of Winn's activities concluded that: "Legislatively, Winn shows a good feel for Third District needs and interests. . . . Although Winn has had considerable experience in public speaking and writing, his style is more folksy than polished." During his tenure, he taped a weekly radio program on current congressional issues that was distributed to local broadcasters, as well as drafting and circulating weekly newspaper columns and twice-yearly congressional questionnaires that were sent to all in-district postal patrons. He estimated that over 2,000 Third District residents visited his Washington, D.C., office during the first 4 years of his tenure, and bumper stickers proclaiming: "I visited Congressman Larry Winn in Washington" were seen frequently across the Kansas City area.

Upon announcing his retirement from the U.S. House in 1984, Representative Winn published a column in the Christian Science Monitor decrying the increase in congressional partisan rancor. Twenty two years later, his words are even more relevant: "It is important now for both Republicans and Democrats in the House of Representatives to recognize that a continuation of this rancor will undercut the legislative process. Most Americans are neither Republicans nor Democrats but are independents. This expresses a desire for pragmatism over ideology. Members of the House, without abandoning their individual philosophical approaches, should also approach problems pragmatically."

Mr. Speaker, Larry Winn, Jr., served the Third District of Kansas as its Representative with diligence and decency for eighteen years. It is fitting that we now name a major postal facility in the Third District after him, and I hope the House and the Senate will move swiftly to approve this measure.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5504, which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6029 Broadmoor Street in Mission, KS, as the "Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building."

Edward Lawrence "Larry" Winn, Jr. represented Kansas's Third Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1967 to 1985. He was born in Kansas City, MO, on August 22, 1919. He was an Eagle Scout who attended public schools and graduated with a B.A. from the University of Kansas in 1941.

Before his election to Congress, Winn spent 2 years with a radio station in Kansas City, 2 years with North American Aviation, and 2 years as a private home builder. From 1950 to 1966 he served as vice president of Winn-Rau Corp. Winn also spent 14 years as national director of the National Association of Home

Builders and is a past president of the Home Builder's Association of Kansas City. Winn was elected as a Republican to the 90th and to the eight succeeding Congresses (January 3, 1967–January 3, 1985) and did not seek reelection to the 99th Congress.

In Congress, Winn served 18 years on the Space Science and Applications Subcommittee and served on the Technology Assessment Board of the Office of Technology Assessment. He also spent 4 years on the District of Columbia Committee and 14 years on the Foreign Relations Committee. Winn served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations in 1979 and served as ranking Republican on the European and Middle East Subcommittee.

Winn also served as a member of Canadian Interparliamentary Group and as a member of U.S.-European Interparliamentary Group. He was the first congressional spokesman for Value Analysis Engineering and a strong supporter of Peace Corps and Agency for International Development. Winn received the Treasury Department's "Bulldog Award" for fiscal responsibility all 18 years.

Winn was the original sponsor of the legislation for the Tallgrass Prairie National Park in Kansas and after his retirement, the bill was managed by Senator Nancy Landon Kassebaum and Representatives PAT ROBERTS and Dan Glickman. The bill was passed, and today the park is a reality. He also is a recipient of the Paul Harris Fellowship Award for Rotary International.

After retirement from Congress, Winn was elected to the Board of Directors of Kansas City Life Insurance Company. He married Joan Elliott in 1942 and has five children.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Larry Winn and his 18 years of service to the Third Congressional District of Kansas by voting for H.R. 5104.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5104.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### MORRIS W. MILTON POST OFFICE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5104) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1750 16th Street South in St. Petersburg, Florida, as the "Morris W. Milton Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5104

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

#### SECTION 1. MORRIS W. MILTON POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1750 16th Street South in St. Petersburg, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Morris W. Milton Post Office".

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5104, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), would designate the post office building at 1750 16th Street South in St. Petersburg, Florida, as the Morris W. Milton Post Office.

Morris Milton was one of the most dedicated and courageous attorneys in St. Petersburg, Florida. He fought tirelessly for the rights of the disadvantaged and was responsible for the hiring of more minority teachers and the promotion of more African Americans to prominent administrative jobs at the Pinellas County School Board. He also represented the NAACP in a court battle against Pinellas County voter registration practices and was outspoken against police brutality.

Along with his impressive legal career, Mr. Morris also found time to establish the Democratic Black Caucus of Florida and to serve as president of the St. Petersburg branch of the NAACP for 10 years. His gracious community involvement also included serving on the board of directors of the Pinellas United Way, participating in the Pinellas Opportunity Council, the Pinellas County Urban League and the Bethune-Cookman Alumni Association.

I urge all Members to come together to honor a dedicated community member and true civil rights pioneer by passing H.R. 5104.

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

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

I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 5104, a measure sponsored by Representative JIM

DAVIS. H.R. 5104 names a postal facility in St. Petersburg, Florida, after Morris W. Milton. Mr. Milton was known as a creative and courageous attorney who fought for the rights of the disenfranchised and disadvantaged in his St. Petersburg community.

The measure has the support and co-sponsorship of the entire Florida delegation and was unanimously reported by the Committee on Government Reform on May 4, 2006.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank Chairman DAVIS and Ranking Member WAXMAN for bringing this bill to the floor. Today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5104, naming the Morris W. Milton Post Office in St. Petersburg, FL.

From the moment he became a lawyer until his untimely death in 1986, at the age of 42, Morris Wilbert Milton, Sr. was one of the most courageous and creative attorneys who fought for the rights of the disenfranchised and disadvantaged in Florida and particularly in the St. Petersburg area.

Mr. Milton grew up in Welaka, Florida in Putnam County. He received his bachelor of arts degree from Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach and a doctor of jurisprudence from Howard University School of Law in Washington, DC.

One of his greatest contributions to the community came in his commitment to convince the Florida Legislature to adopt a plan for single member legislative districts. In 1982, Florida had one of the smallest numbers of black state legislatures, five, in the South. In 1981, the Florida Legislature had 21 public hearings, and Milton attended many of them. Traveling back and forth to Tallahassee, he was relentless in his appeal. In 1982, the Legislature carved the area into smaller districts to elect one representative each. As a result, the House wound up with seven majority African American House seats and seven majority Hispanic seats.

In addition to this, throughout his impressive legal career, Morris Milton fought for the hiring of more minority teachers and the promotion of more African Americans to prominent administrative jobs at the Pinellas County School Board. He was a counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, in a court battle against voter registration practices in Pinellas County and spoke out against police brutality.

Along with his legal work, Mr. Milton also found time to establish the Democratic Black Caucus of Florida and to be president of the St. Petersburg branch of the NAACP for 10 years.

Mr. Milton's concern for the entire community led him to volunteer his services on the board of directors of the Pinellas United Way, Pinellas Opportunity Council, the Pinellas County Urban League, and the Bethune-Cookman Alumni Association. He was also on the Sixth Circuit Judicial Nominating Committee for judges.

So, it is my pleasure to sponsor this legislation to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1750 16th Street South in St. Petersburg, Florida, as the "Morris W. Milton Post Office," in honor of such a admirable man. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5104.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the passage of H.R. 5104, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5104.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT A NATIONAL YOUTH SPORTS WEEK SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 826) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Youth Sports Week should be established.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 826

Whereas about 42 million children participate in organized sports each year;

Whereas children participating in organized sports tend to perform better in school, develop excellent interpersonal skills, and lead healthier lives;

Whereas organized youth sports help children increase their self-esteem, develop an appreciation of health and fitness, and become leaders within the community;

Whereas organized youth sports provide for regular physical activity and help combat increasing rates of childhood obesity;

Whereas the Congressional Caucus on Youth Sports was created, with great help and support from the Citizenship Through Sports Alliance, Positive Coaching Alliance, and National Recreation and Park Association, to restore the focus in youth sports on the child's experience and character development;

Whereas far too many children quit participating in youth sports at a young age, many telling coaches and parents, "It just wasn't fun anymore";

Whereas the National Recreation and Park Association has designated July as Parks and Recreation Month;

Whereas many youth sports organizations gather at local parks and recreation facilities across the country; and

Whereas designating the second week in July as National Youth Sports Week would raise awareness of the important physical and emotional benefits of participating in youth sports and the need to promote sportsmanship among players, parents, coaches, and officials: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Youth Sports Week should be established to promote awareness of the importance of youth sports and the need to restore the focus in youth sports on the child's experience and character development.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 826, offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), would express the sense of the House that a National Youth Sports Week should be established.

Because children are our country's most valuable resource, it is important that we do all we can to provide them with positive learning experiences, quality role models, and all the enjoyment that comes with participating in organized sports.

Statistics show that approximately 42 million kids play youth sports each year. Children that partake in these activities tend to have better personal skills, lead healthier lives, and are more successful in school. The competitive spirit and character-building camaraderie that sports provide are essential for teaching our children to follow their dreams while working with others to build lasting relationships.

It is important that we all do our part to encourage our children to embrace the experience of teamwork; and for that reason, I urge all Members to come together to support H. Res. 826.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H. Res. 826. Youth sports are much more than just an afterschool activity or a great way for young people to spend their energy and free time. Youth sports can help enrich a child's life; and, Mr. Speaker, they serve a much more important role today when so many youth have become voyeurs of sports and not participants in sports. H. Res. 826 is sponsored by Representative MIKE MCINTYRE.

Youth sporting leagues and activities, when combined with healthy parenting and responsible coaching, help children to grow emotionally, socially, and physically. Teamwork, discipline, and the value of hard work that goes with them are important lessons for children to learn. In addition, there are clear physical and health benefits for children who participate in youth sports.

Mr. Speaker, obesity has become a major problem of young people in the United States. This week I am introducing a bill that would allow the FCC to regulate junk food advertising on TV which is so out of hand that physicians and other health care providers

have focused in on this advertising in particular.

I am pleased that before Representative JON PORTER, former chair of the HHS subcommittee, left, I was a co-sponsor of a bill that has been funded now for the last 5 years with him to establish a program that was extraordinarily successful, as it turns out and according to studies, in getting young people out and active. It was the VERB program. I regret very much that thus far this program has not been funded this year by the committee. I am hoping that it will be funded by Congress before we go home.

No health issue is more pervasive among young people than obesity and being overweight. We appear to be raising a generation that is losing interest in physical activity and, in addition, is consuming nutritionally deficient foods that will guarantee that they have health problems for the rest of their lives.

We have an epidemic of the type II diabetes for the first time in the history of this country. This is not the kind of diabetes people are born with. This is the kind of diabetes people get as a result of lifestyle, and the notion that youngsters now are the fastest growing group of those with type II diabetes should concern all of us and should get us to doing whatever we can to bring this matter to the attention of their parents and their communities. What Representative MIKE MCINTYRE's resolution does in this regard may seem small, but everything we can do we should now be doing.

Children who are not active and maintain poor diets develop health problems that we now know will be with them for their entire lives. The notion that high blood pressure, pediatricians tell us, now starts for many children when they are in elementary school, for example.

□ 1430

Youth sports helps counteract this behavior by encouraging physical activity and healthier diets.

Internationally, many organizations use youth sports to help remove barriers between culturally diverse communities. Basketball and soccer leagues have been successfully used in South America and Northern Ireland to foster reconciliation among troubled youth. Youth sports help train children to become productive citizens and future leaders.

Youth Sports Week, which will be celebrated during the second week of July, will raise awareness of the existence of sports leagues around the country and promote sportsmanship among players, parents, coaches, and officials. I very much urge Members to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I can share many of the concerns and feelings that my colleague from across the aisle has expressed. When we were growing up, we didn't need a lot of organized sports

to keep us busy, it did not seem. There were plenty of activities in the summer to keep us active; and when we were in school during the year, there were activities to keep us active.

But nowadays it seems it is very difficult to keep children active in sports-related activities unless those are around organized activities. As the grandparent of two who are involved in lots of activities themselves, I see very much the benefits to them from being involved in baseball and in basketball and in Kung Fu and other things that teach them skills that will be useful to them all their lives, including team-building skills.

It is very important, I think, that we keep our young people active and that we do all that we can to help them fight against the trends toward obesity that we are seeing in our culture and the trends toward inactivity, with children being drawn to watching television and playing on computers instead of getting outside and being involved in great activities that could help them in all manners of their lives.

So I very much support this resolution, and I urge all Members to support the adoption of H. Res. 826.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 826, legislation to designate the second week of July as "National Youth Sports Week."

Many thanks to the cochair of the Youth Sports Caucus, Congressman KENNY HULSHOF, and all of the Members of the Youth Sports Caucus for their work on this bill.

Additionally, I would also like to thank the Government Reform Committee, particularly Chairman DAVIS and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their swift support in bringing this bill to the House floor.

Having coached youth sports for 7 years as a volunteer coach in my hometown of Lumberton, NC, I recently created the Congressional Caucus on Youth Sports in response to the release of the first-ever Report Card on Youth Sports in America.

The report card, compiled by the Citizenship Through Sports Alliance, revealed alarming deficiencies in child-centered philosophy, coaching, health and safety, officiating and parental behavior and involvement in youth sports in America.

Youth sports are the largest youth organization in the United States. In fact, more than 42 million children play sports each year with tens of thousands of volunteers, parents, coaches, and officials joining in to help.

Therefore, we must ensure that our Nation's children have a positive experience playing youth sports, and we must restore the focus of youth sports on character development.

The benefits of children's involvement in youth sports go far beyond the playing field. Children who participate in organized sports tend to achieve better results in school, develop excellent interpersonal skills and increased self-esteem.

During my years as a youth sports coach with my sons, Joshua and Stephen, I saw the positive impact of sports on our youth and in our community, as well as in other communities. I know first-hand the positive impact youth sports have had on my life growing up and not only on my sons' lives but also on the

lives of countless other young people—both boys and girls—across America.

H. Res. 826 raises awareness about the important and long-term physical and emotion benefits of participating in youth sports and the need to promote sportsmanship among players, parents, coaches and officials.

This bill is supported by the Citizenship Through Sports Alliance, Positive Coaching Alliance, and the National Recreation and Park Association. The month of July has been designated by the National Recreation and Park Association as Parks and Recreation month, and the second week of July to celebrate youth sports would complement this celebration.

Please join me in passing this legislation and helping to ensure that our Nation's children reap the positive affects of involvement in youth sports, and that this crucial part of children's lives remains a source of enjoyment and character-building.

JUNE 19, 2006.

Re National Youth Sports Week Resolution (H. Res. 826)

Hon. MIKE MCINTYRE,

*Rayburn House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

I am writing this letter to offer you the full support and endorsement of the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) as you seek passage of the National Youth Sports Week Resolution.

Public park and recreation agencies are the largest provider and facilitator of community based youth sport opportunities in America. Not only do park and recreation agencies provide instructional programs and coordinate youth sport leagues, they manage an estimated 500,000 facilities that are permitted to independent youth sport organizations to conduct their own programs and leagues. Public park and recreation agencies lead the way in identifying needs and offering solutions to improve youth sports. Our collective influence regarding public policy associated with quality sports, development of practice standards and leadership around improving the quality of youth sports reflect our commitment to the work of the Congressional Youth Sports Caucus.

Since 1998, the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) has engaged national partners and local park and recreation agencies to improve the quality of youth sports nationwide. NRPA partnerships have focused on expanding and improving programming in tennis, basketball, baseball, football as well as many other sports to increase participation among youth and adults.

NRPA was selected by Sports Illustrated in 2002 to celebrate its 50th Anniversary by designating one community in each state as the Sports Illustrated 50th Anniversary Sportstown. This nationwide competition attracted applications from 250 communities in all 50 states. The National Football League Youth Football Fund allowed us to take this project to the next level by engaging thirty-eight communities to demonstrate a new leadership model for improving the quality of youth sports.

At the conclusion of the demonstration project, NRPA launched the Sports Illustrated GOOD SPORTS™ initiative in 2005. Over 1,400 communities joined the initiative to improve youth sports through the following elements:

Teach life skills through sports;  
Empower success among youth through sports;

Promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles through sports; and

Strengthen communities through youth sports.

NRPA brought our expertise in the field and our community perspective to assist in the development of the Citizenship through Sports Alliance's (CTSA) National Youth Sports Report Card. We recently moved this partnership forward by working with CTSA to conduct a Grassroots Report Card of Youth Sports in America in coordination with the Congressional Caucus on Youth Sports. We are currently assisting local community efforts to benchmark their grassroots report card against the national findings.

NRPA looks forward to collaborating with the Congressional Youth Sports Caucus to work in a bi-partisan fashion to promote the values of sportsmanship, civility, respect, health, safety, fun and physical activity among players and leaders, including coaches, parents and officials. We are pleased that the National Youth Sports Week will take place during the second week of July to coincide and compliment National Recreation and Parks month.

The leadership role of parks and recreation in advancing child-centered youth sports is increasingly evident. Convening community stakeholders and engaging partners to improve programs, policies and practices around all of youth sports is imperative. Park and recreation agencies sit at the crossroads of responsibility and opportunity to elevate the practice and to develop new standards for the benefit of all children. NRPA will continue to develop public policy recommendations to support the leadership role of parks and recreation to improve the quality of youth sports nationwide.

We applaud your leadership and dedication and that of the co-sponsors to the improvement of youth sports in America by designating a National Youth Sports Week.

Sincerely,

JOHN THORNER,  
*Executive Director,*

*National Recreation and Park Assoc.,  
Ashburn, VA.*

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 826.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) at 5 p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5631, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-507) on the resolution (H. Res. 877) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5631) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will now resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Postponed votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5540, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5504, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 826, by the yeas and nays.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second vote in the series will be a 5-minute vote.

SERGEANT JACOB DAN DONES POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5540.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5540, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 306, nays 0, not voting 126, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—306

Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Burton (IN)
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Butterfield
Allen	Blackburn	Calvert
Andrews	Blumenauer	Camp (MI)
Bachus	Blunt	Cantor
Baird	Boehmert	Capito
Baker	Boehner	Capuano
Baldwin	Bonilla	Cardin
Barrett (SC)	Bonner	Cardoza
Bartlett (MD)	Bono	Carson
Barton (TX)	Boren	Carter
Bass	Boswell	Case
Bean	Boustany	Castle
Becerra	Boyd	Chabot
Berkley	Bradley (NH)	Chandler
Berry	Brady (PA)	Chocola
Biggert	Brown-Waite,	Clyburn
Bilbray	Ginny	Coble
Bilirakis	Burgess	Cole (OK)

Conaway	Johnson, E. B.	Porter	Gilchrest	McCrery	Regula
Conyers	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)	Gordon	McKinney	Reichert
Cooper	Jones (NC)	Price (NC)	Graves	Mica	Renzi
Costello	Kanjorski	Pryce (OH)	Green (WI)	Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher
Cramer	Kaptur	Putnam	Grijalva	Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Crenshaw	Keller	Radanovich	Gutierrez	Mollohan	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kelly	Rahall	Harris	Moore (KS)	Rush
Cubin	Kennedy (RI)	Rehberg	Hastings (WA)	Moore (WI)	Sanders
Culberson	Kildee	Reyes	Hensarling	Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Cummings	Kind	Reynolds	Herger	Musgrave	Shadegg
Davis (IL)	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Herseth	Myrick	Shays
Davis (KY)	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Hinchee	Nadler	Sherwood
Davis (TN)	Kingston	Rogers (MI)	Hobson	Napolitano	Shimkus
Davis, Jo Ann	Kirk	Ross	Hostettler	Neal (MA)	Smith (WA)
Davis, Tom	Kline	Rothman	Hunter	Nussle	Snyder
Deal (GA)	Knollenberg	Roybal-Allard	Inglis (SC)	Ortiz	Souder
DeFazio	Kolbe	Royce	Israel	Osborne	Stark
Delahunt	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Istook	Otter	Strickland
DeLauro	LaHood	Ryan (WI)	Jefferson	Pascrell	Tancredro
Dent	Langevin	Ryun (KS)	Jenkins	Paul	Tanner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lantos	Sabo	Jindal	Payne	Taylor (NC)
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Salazar	Jones (OH)	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Kennedy (MN)	Pence	Towns
Doggett	Latham	T.	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson (PA)	Turner
Drake	LaTourette	Sanchez, Loretta	Kucinich	Pickering	Udall (CO)
Dreier	Leach	Saxton	Lee	Platts	Visclosky
Duncan	Levin	Schakowsky	Maloney	Pombo	Waters
Edwards	Lewis (CA)	Schiff	Manzullo	Pomeroy	Waxman
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)	Schmidt	Marchant	Weinrad	Weiner
Emanuel	Lewis (KY)	Schwartz (PA)	Marshall	Rangel	Wynn
Emerson	Linder	Schwarz (MI)			
Engel	Lipinski	Scott (GA)			
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)			
Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano			
Everett	Lowey	Sessions			
Farr	Lucas	Shaw			
Fattah	Lungren, Daniel	Sherman			
Feeney	E.	Shuster			
Ferguson	Lynch	Simmons			
Filner	Mack	Simpson			
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Markey	Skelton			
Flake	Matheson	Slaughter			
Foley	Matsui	Smith (NJ)			
Forbes	McCarthy	Smith (TX)			
Fortenberry	McCaul (TX)	Sodrel			
Fossella	McCollum (MN)	Solis			
Fox	McCotter	Spratt			
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Stearns			
Frelinghuysen	McGovern	Stupak			
Garrett (NJ)	McHenry	Sullivan			
Gerlach	McHugh	Sweeney			
Gillmor	McIntyre	Tauscher			
Gingrey	McKeon	Taylor (MS)			
Gohmert	McMorris	Terry			
Gonzalez	McNulty	Thomas			
Goode	Meehan	Thompson (MS)			
Goodlatte	Meeke (FL)	Thornberry			
Granger	Meeks (NY)	Tiahrt			
Green, Al	Melancon	Tiberi			
Green, Gene	Michaud	Tierney			
Gutknecht	Millender-	Udall (NM)			
Hall	McDonald	Upton			
Harman	Miller (NC)	Van Hollen			
Hart	Miller, Gary	Velazquez			
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Walden (OR)			
Hayes	Moran (VA)	Walsh			
Hayworth	Murphy	Wamp			
Hefley	Murtha	Wasserman			
Higgins	Neugebauer	Schultz			
Hinojosa	Ney	Watson			
Hoekstra	Northup	Watt			
Holden	Norwood	Weldon (FL)			
Holt	Nunes	Weldon (PA)			
Honda	Oberstar	Weller			
Hooley	Obey	Westmoreland			
Hoyer	Olver	Wexler			
Hulshof	Owens	Whitfield			
Hyde	Oxley	Wicker			
Inlee	Pallone	Wilson (NM)			
Issa	Pastor	Wilson (SC)			
Jackson (IL)	Pearce	Wolf			
Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)	Woolsey			
(TX)	Petri	Wu			
Johnson (CT)	Pitts	Young (AK)			
Johnson (IL)	Poe	Young (FL)			

NOT VOTING—126

Abercrombie	Brown (SC)	Davis (CA)
Akin	Brown, Corrine	Davis (FL)
Alexander	Buyer	DeGette
Baca	Campbell (CA)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Barrow	Cannon	Doolittle
Beauprez	Capps	Doyle
Berman	Carnahan	English (PA)
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Evans
Boozman	Cleaver	Ford
Boucher	Costa	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Gallegly
Brown (OH)	Davis (AL)	Gibbons

McKinney	Regula
Mica	Reichert
Miller (FL)	Renzi
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher
Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen
Moore (KS)	Ruppersberger
Moore (WI)	Rush
Moran (KS)	Sanders
Musgrave	Sensenbrenner
Myrick	Shadegg
Nadler	Shays
Napolitano	Sherwood
Neal (MA)	Shimkus
Nussle	Smith (WA)
Ortiz	Snyder
Osborne	Souder
Otter	Stark
Pascrell	Strickland
Paul	Tancredro
Payne	Tanner
Pelosi	Taylor (NC)
Pence	Thompson (CA)
Peterson (PA)	Towns
Pickering	Turner
Platts	Udall (CO)
Pombo	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Waters
Weinrad	Waxman
Rangel	Weiner
	Wynn

□ 1730

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 19, 2006, I was absent due to a family commitment.

Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 289, final passage of H.R. 5540—Sergeant Jacob Dan Donos Post Office Designation Act.

LARRY WINN, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5504.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5504, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 0, not voting 127, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—305

Abercrombie	Bishop (GA)	Burton (IN)
Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Allen	Blackburn	Camp (MI)
Andrews	Blumenauer	Cantor
Bachus	Blunt	Capito
Baird	Boehmert	Capuano
Baker	Boehner	Cardin
Baldwin	Bonilla	Cardoza
Barrett (SC)	Bonner	Carson
Bartlett (MD)	Bono	Carter
Barton (TX)	Boren	Case
Bass	Boswell	Castle
Bean	Boustany	Chabot
Becerra	Boyd	Chandler
Berkley	Bradley (NH)	Chocola
Berry	Brady (PA)	Clyburn
Biggert	Brown-Waite,	Coble
Bilbray	Ginny	Cole (OK)
Bilirakis	Burgess	Conaway

Conyers Jones (NC) Pryce (OH) Green (WI) Miller (FL) Reichert  
 Cooper Kanjorski Putnam Grijalva Miller (MI) Renzi  
 Costello Kaptur Radanovich Gutierrez Mollohan Senhouser  
 Cramer Keller Rahall Harris Moore (KS) Rohrabacher  
 Crenshaw Kelly Rehberg Hastings (WA) Moore (WI) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Crowley Kennedy (RI) Reyes Hensarling Moran (KS) Ruppertsberger  
 Cubin Kildee Reynolds Herger Murtha Rush  
 Culberson Kind Rogers (AL) Herseth Musgrave Sanders  
 Cummings King (IA) Rogers (KY) Hinchey Myrick Sensenbrenner  
 Davis (IL) King (NY) Rogers (MI) Hobson Myrick Shadegg  
 Davis (KY) Kingston Ross Hostettler Nadler Shays  
 Davis (TN) Kirk Rothman Hunter Neapolitano Shimkus  
 Davis, Jo Ann Kline Roybal-Allard Inglish (SC) Neugebauer Smith (WA)  
 Davis, Tom Knollenberg Royce Israel Snyder  
 Deal (GA) Kolbe Ryan (OH) Istook Ortiz Souder  
 DeFazio Kuhl (NY) Ryan (WI) Jefferson Osborne Stark  
 Delahunt LaHood Ryun (KS) Jenkins Otter Strickland  
 DeLauro Langevin Sabo Jindal Pascrell Tancred  
 Dent Lantos Salazar Jones (OH) Paul Tanner  
 Diaz-Balart, M. Larsen (WA) Kennedy (MN) Payne Taylor (NC)  
 Dicks Larson (CT) Kilpatrick (MI) Pelosi Thompson (CA)  
 Dingell Latham Sanchez, Loretta Kucinich Pence Towns  
 Doggett LaTourette Saxton Lee Peterson (PA) Turner  
 Drake Leach Schakowsky Schiff Pickering Udall (CO)  
 Dreier Levin Schiff Marchant Platts Visclosky  
 Duncan Lewis (CA) Schmidt Marchant Pombo Waters  
 Edwards Lewis (GA) Schwartz (PA) Marshall Pomeroy Waxman  
 Emanuel Lewis (KY) Schwarz (MI) McCreery Ramstad Weiner  
 Emerson Linder Scott (GA) McKinney Rangel Wynn  
 Engel Lipinski Scott (VA) Serrano  
 Eshoo LoBiondo Sessions  
 Etheridge Lofgren, Zoe Shaw  
 Everett Lowey Sherman  
 Farr Lucas Sherwood  
 Fattah Lungren, Daniel Shuster  
 Feeney E. Simmons  
 Ferguson Lynch Simpson  
 Filner Mack Skelton  
 Fitzpatrick (PA) Markey Slaughter  
 Flake Matheson Smith (NJ)  
 Foley Matsui Smith (TX)  
 Forbes McCarthy Sodrel  
 Fortenberry McCaul (TX) Solis  
 Fossella McCollum (MN) Spratt  
 Foxx McCotter Stearns  
 Frank (MA) McDermott Stupak  
 Frelinghuysen McGovern Sullivan  
 Garrett (NJ) McHenry Sweeney  
 Gerlach McHugh Tauscher  
 Gillmor McIntyre Taylor (MS)  
 Gingrey McKeon Terry  
 Gonzalez McMorris Thomas  
 Goode McNulty Thompson (MS)  
 Goodlatte Meehan Thornberry  
 Granger Meek (FL) Tiahrt  
 Green, Al Meeks (NY) Tiberi  
 Green, Gene Melancon Tierney  
 Gutknecht Michaud Udall (NM)  
 Hall Millender Upton  
 Harman McDonald Van Hollen  
 Hart Miller (NC) Velázquez  
 Hastings (FL) Miller, Gary Walden (OR)  
 Hayes Miller, George Walsh  
 Hayworth Moran (VA) Wamp  
 Hefley Murphy Wasserman  
 Higgins Ney Schultz  
 Hinojosa Northup Watson  
 Hoekstra Norwood Watt  
 Holden Nunes Weldon (FL)  
 Holt Oberstar Weldon (PA)  
 Honda Obey Weller  
 Hooley Oliver Westmoreland  
 Hoyer Owens Wexler  
 Hulshof Oxley Whitfield  
 Hyde Pallone Wicker  
 Inslee Pastor Wilson (NM)  
 Issa Pearce Wilson (SC)  
 Jackson (IL) Peterson (MN) Wolf  
 Jackson-Lee (TX) Petri Woolsey  
 Johnson (CT) Pitts Wu  
 Johnson (IL) Porter Young (AK)  
 Johnson, E. B. Price (GA) Young (FL)  
 Johnson, Sam Price (NC)

Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Senhouser  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Sanders  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Shadegg  
 Shays  
 Shimkus  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Souder  
 Stark  
 Strickland  
 Tancred  
 Tanner  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Visclosky  
 Waters  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Wynn

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT A NATIONAL YOUTH SPORTS WEEK SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 826.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 826, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 311, nays 0, answered “present” 1, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]  
 YEAS—311

Abercrombie	Cummings	Hoyer
Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Hulshof
Aderholt	Davis (KY)	Hyde
Allen	Davis (TN)	Inslee
Andrews	Davis, Jo Ann	Issa
Bachus	Davis, Tom	Jackson (IL)
Baird	Deal (GA)	Jackson-Lee
Baker	DeFazio	(TX)
Baldwin	Delahunt	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (SC)	DeLauro	Johnson (IL)
Bartlett (MD)	Dent	Johnson, E. B.
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson, Sam
Bass	Dicks	Jones (NC)
Bean	Dingell	Kanjorski
Becerra	Doggett	Kaptur
Berkley	Doolittle	Keller
Berry	Drake	Kelly
Biggert	Dreier	Kennedy (MN)
Bilbray	Duncan	Kennedy (RI)
Billirakis	Edwards	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	Ehlers	Kind
Bishop (NY)	Emanuel	King (IA)
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	King (NY)
Blackburn	Engel	Kingston
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Kirk
Blunt	Etheridge	Kline
Boehler	Everett	Knollenberg
Boehner	Farr	Kolbe
Bonilla	Fattah	Kuhl (NY)
Bonner	Feeney	LaHood
Bono	Ferguson	Langevin
Boren	Filner	Lantos
Boswell	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Larsen (WA)
Boustany	Flake	Larson (CT)
Boyd	Foley	Latham
Bradley (NH)	Forbes	LaTourette
Brady (PA)	Fortenberry	Leach
Brown-Waite,	Fossella	Levin
Ginny	Foxx	Lewis (CA)
Burgess	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Burton (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)
Butterfield	Garrett (NJ)	Linder
Calvert	Gerlach	Lipinski
Camp (MI)	Gibbons	LoBiondo
Capito	Gillmor	Lofgren, Zoe
Capuano	Gingrey	Lowey
Cardin	Gonzalez	Lucas
Cardoza	Goode	Lungren, Daniel
Carson	Goodlatte	E.
Carter	Granger	Lynch
Case	Green, Al	Mack
Castle	Green, Gene	Markey
Chabot	Gutknecht	Matheson
Chandler	Hall	Matsui
Chocola	Harman	McCarthy
Clyburn	Hart	McCaul (TX)
Coble	Hastings (FL)	McCollum (MN)
Cole (OK)	Hayes	McCotter
Conaway	Hayworth	McDermott
Conyers	Hefley	McGovern
Cooper	Higgins	McHenry
Costello	Hinojosa	McHugh
Cramer	Hoekstra	McIntyre
Crenshaw	Holden	McKeon
Crowley	Holt	McMorris
Cubin	Honda	McNulty
Culberson	Hooley	Meehan

□ 1737

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 19, 2006, I was absent due to a family commitment. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 290, final passage of H.R. 5504—Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building Designation Act.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 290 I was involved in a meeting and did not return to the floor in time for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain how I would have voted on June 19, 2006 during rollcall votes Nos. 289 and 290 during the second section of the 109th Congress. My flight into Washington was delayed because of weather.

Rollcall vote No. 289 was on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5540.

Rollcall vote No. 290 was on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5504.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on both of these rollcall votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes Nos. 289 and 290, I was unable to cast votes due to the delay of my Northwest Airlines flight as a result of a thunderstorm over National Airport. There were six of us House Members on this flight.

I would have voted “yea” on the Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office Designation Act—H.R. 5540, and also “yea” on the Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building Designation Act—H.R. 5504.

NOT VOTING—127

Akin	Campbell (CA)	Doolittle
Alexander	Cannon	Doyle
Baca	Capps	Ehlers
Barrow	Carnahan	English (PA)
Beauprez	Clay	Evans
Berman	Cleaver	Ford
Boozman	Costa	Franks (AZ)
Boucher	Cuellar	Galleghy
Brady (TX)	Gibbons	Gibbons
Brown (OH)	Davis (CA)	Gilchrist
Brown (SC)	Davis (FL)	Gohmert
Brown, Corrine	DeGette	Gordon
Buyer	Diaz-Balart, L.	Graves

Meek (FL)	Renzi	Solis
Meeks (NY)	Reyes	Spratt
Melancon	Reynolds	Stearns
Michaud	Rogers (AL)	Stupak
Millender-	Rogers (KY)	Sullivan
McDonald	Rogers (MI)	Sweeney
Miller (NC)	Ross	Tauscher
Miller, Gary	Rothman	Taylor (MS)
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Terry
Moran (VA)	Royce	Thomas
Ney	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Northup	Ryan (WI)	Thornberry
Norwood	Ryun (KS)	Tiahrt
Nunes	Salazar	Tiberi
Oberstar	Sánchez, Linda	Tierney
Oliver	T.	Udall (NM)
Osborne	Sanchez, Loretta	Upton
Otter	Saxton	Van Hollen
Owens	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Oxley	Schiff	Walden (OR)
Pallone	Schmidt	Walsh
Pastor	Schwartz (PA)	Wamp
Pearce	Schwarz (MI)	Wasserman
Peterson (MN)	Scott (GA)	Schultz
Petri	Scott (VA)	Watson
Pitts	Serrano	Watt
Platts	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Poe	Shadegg	Weller
Pomeroy	Shaw	Westmoreland
Porter	Sherman	Wexler
Price (GA)	Sherwood	Whitfield
Price (NC)	Shuster	Wicker
Pryce (OH)	Simmons	Wilson (NM)
Putnam	Simpson	Wolf
Radanovich	Skelton	Woolsey
Rahall	Slaughter	Wu
Ramstad	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Reichert	Sodrel	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—120

Akin	Harris	Nussle
Alexander	Hastings (WA)	Ortiz
Baca	Hensarling	Pascarell
Barrow	Herger	Paul
Beauprez	Herse	Payne
Berman	Hinchey	Pelosi
Boozman	Hobson	Pence
Boucher	Hostettler	Peterson (PA)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Pickering
Brown (OH)	Inglis (SC)	Pombo
Brown (SC)	Israel	Rangel
Brown, Corrine	Istook	Regula
Buyer	Jefferson	Rohrabacher
Campbell (CA)	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Cannon	Jindal	Ruppersberger
Cantor	Jones (OH)	Rush
Capps	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sabo
Carnahan	Kucinich	Sanders
Clay	Lee	Sensenbrenner
Cleaver	Maloney	Shays
Costa	Manzullo	Shimkus
Cuellar	Marchant	Smith (WA)
Davis (AL)	Marshall	Snyder
Davis (CA)	McCrery	Souder
Davis (FL)	McKinney	Stark
DeGette	Mica	Strickland
Diaz-Balart, L.	Miller (FL)	Tancredo
Doyle	Miller (MI)	Tanner
English (PA)	Mollohan	Taylor (NC)
Evans	Moore (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Ford	Moore (WI)	Towns
Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)	Turner
Gallely	Murphy	Udall (CO)
Gilchrest	Murtha	Visclosky
Gohmert	Musgrave	Waters
Gordon	Myrick	Waxman
Graves	Nadler	Weiner
Green (WI)	Napolitano	Weldon (FL)
Grijalva	Neal (MA)	Wilson (SC)
Gutierrez	Neugebauer	Wynn

□ 1814

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 19, 2006, I was absent due to a family commitment.

Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 291, final passage of H. Res. 826—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Youth Sports Week should be established.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, flight delays prevented my attendance for legislative business scheduled for today, Monday, June 19, 2006. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 5540, the Sgt. Jacob Dan Dones Post Office Designation Act (rollcall No. 289); "yea" on H.R. 5504, the Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building Designation Act (rollcall No. 290); and "yea" on H. Res. 826, expressing the sense of Congress that a National Youth Sports Week should be established (rollcall No. 291).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber on June 16, 2006, and today, June 19, 2006. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 288 and "yea" on rollcall votes 289, 290, 291.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from Washington on Monday, June 19, 2006. As a result, I was not recorded for rollcall votes No. 289, No. 290 and No. 291. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 289, No. 290 and No. 291.

Rollcall No. 289—H.R. 5540—Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office Designation Act; rollcall No. 290—H.R. 5504—Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building Designation Act; and rollcall No. 291—H. Res. 826—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Youth Sports Week should be established.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 2006, I was in Connecticut and, therefore, missed three recorded votes.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on recorded vote No. 289, "yea" on recorded vote No. 290 and "yea" on recorded vote No. 291.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was away earlier this evening and thus unable to cast a vote on a number of measures before the House. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: rollcall 289 (on Passage of H.R. 5540)—"yea"; rollcall 290 (on Passage of H.R. 5504)—"yea"; and rollcall 291 (on Passage of H. Res. 826)—"yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes. Had

I been present I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 289—"yea"; rollcall No. 290—"yea"; and rollcall No. 291—"yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Rollcall No. 289: "yea"; rollcall No. 290: "yea"; and rollcall No. 291: "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of June 19, 2006, I was unavoidably detained and missed the rollcall votes for the following measures: H.R. 5540, the Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office Designation Act, H.R. 5504, the Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building Designation Act and H. Res. 826, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Youth Sports Week should be established.

My flight from Cleveland was rerouted to Dulles Airport due to thunderstorms in the Washington area. Had I been present for those votes I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 5540, "yea" on H.R. 5504, and "yea" on H. Res. 826.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, today, June 19, 2006, I was unavoidably detained in my district by flight delays caused by inclement weather.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 289 on H.R. 5540, the Sgt. Jacob Dan Dones Post Office Designation, I would have voted "yea"; had I been present for rollcall vote 290 on H.R. 5504, the Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Designation, I would have voted "yea"; and had I been present for H. Res. 826, Expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives that a National Youth Sports Week be Established, I would have voted "yea".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, due to mechanical problems and weather delays relating to US Air flights No. 232 and No. 1022, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to vote on rollcalls 289, 290, and 291. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each of these measures.

TRANSITIONING SECURITY AND LEADERSHIP TO IRAQ GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on June 16 in Baghdad, Iraq, three soldiers who were at a checkpoint that they were manning came under enemy fire. All three soldiers were assigned to this checkpoint. Unfortunately, one soldier lost his life and two soldiers have been abducted. One of them happens to be from Texas.

In the backdrop of the Iraq debate that we held last week, let me restate a plea that I have made on behalf of these soldiers and on behalf of the United States military. It is imperative that this sovereign government of Iraq clarify and make very clear that anyone who kidnaps or abducts an American soldier will be held liable. The prime minister needs to make a very pronounced statement about seeking information on the whereabouts of these soldiers, and then he must make it additionally clear that he will not hold to anyone receiving amnesty for killing an American soldier.

It is time to transition both security and leadership to the Iraqi Government now.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). 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 North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### NEWS FROM THE FRONT

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, news from the front: the battle for the border continues. The news is disturbing. The enemy is among us. There are invaders here from other nations that were smuggled here, and they live in the shadow of crime. They prey on our families. Some are thieves; some are killers. According to the Government Accountability Office, 25 homicides a day are committed in this country by people that are illegally here. That is 10 times more Americans killed in Iraq since 2003. Americans pay for the prison cost to lock these outlaws up. Then when our government tries to deport them, eight nations refuse to take back their own people. So since we cannot detain these individuals indefinitely, our government lets them go, lets them go into the heartland of America, thereby letting these illegals free to roam our streets with a permanent get-out-of-jail-free card, and a permanent stay-in-America-forever card.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. Eight countries turn a blind eye, a deaf ear on their illegals in America. Many of them are criminals. They have committed crimes and gone to our prisons, and these countries will not even take

their own people back, even though they have lawfully been deported.

How many people are we talking about? In 1 year alone, these eight countries left more than 130,000 people ordered to be deported back to their homeland, and they refused to take these individuals. Many of these people were thieves and bandits, and they are left on our soil.

The detention cost to Americans was \$33 million.

Mr. Speaker, Americans pay. They always pay for illegal entry. That is \$10 million more than the people in my district got after their lives were ripped apart by Hurricane Rita. And despite all that money spent, we are forced to turn these immigrant inmates out on our streets, many to prey on our families, many to strike again, many to steal again.

We foot the bill for their prison stay, then their countries won't take them back. This isn't a matter of illegals ignoring a deportation order and disappearing into the night. It is about eight countries who ignore their obligations. Some of these countries accept foreign aid from the United States.

Who are these eight countries? They include China, Iran, India, Jamaica, Vietnam, Ethiopia. These countries put up immigration obstacles impossible for our government to hurdle, but these same nations gladly take our foreign aid. They gladly take that free American money, but won't take back their own people.

Also, America allows 123,000 legal visas each year to be issued to these nations. So, Mr. Speaker, these nations cannot have it both ways. Take our money and take your illegals back, or no more American money. We should deny foreign aid to nations that refuse to accept their lawfully deported illegals. We should deny American visas to those nations who refuse to take back their lawfully deported citizens. America cannot allow this nonsense to continue.

Mr. Speaker, the war for the border continues, but we will not let ourselves become bogged down by the demands and expectations of the leaders of these obstinate eight, these nations who expect money from our pockets, but won't take back their criminals who have picked our pockets. That's just the way it is.

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

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

#### RETIREMENT SECURITY

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak out of turn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk for a little while about retirement security. More and more when I am home on the weekends, I am having more of my seniors coming up to me and talking about their nervousness about the talk about changing Social Security next year in 2007. They are also concerned about Medicare because a lot of them are starting to reach that doughnut hole that is in the Medicare part D part.

A lot of people are concerned. They have worked hard all of their lives, and they are basically saying why are you guys down in Congress doing this. We have worked hard, we have put our money into Social Security and Medicare. And I try to reassure them.

Last year, Democrats from across the country, the congressional Democrats, came out to the districts and talked to people about why they needed to get out and have their voices heard.

We believe in Social Security. I know certainly some of my friends who are on Social Security now, they need that money every single month. A lot of them are widowed, and the pension that they thought they were getting is not there any more. So Social Security is giving them that little safety issue.

I think we have to bring back again why we have Social Security. It was basically to make sure that people would not go into poverty. It was not meant to be a retirement fund. It was never to be a retirement fund. It was supposed to be insurance to give you a little bump to make sure that you could pay the rent and heating.

I can say we as Democrats are going to fight to make sure that we do protect Social Security. I think it is important that people remember people with disabilities also get Social Security. Or those who, unfortunately, have lost their husbands at an early age and have children, they will be getting Social Security and their children will be getting Social Security.

I know that going back just about 13 years ago when my husband died, I couldn't imagine how was I going to make it. Well, we did make it and I was lucky that my son was able to recover and that we didn't have to ask for Social Security. But I know a lot of my friends had to because they had young children. This is what it is, a safety net. It is a safety net for all Americans.

So I can say that I certainly pledge for all Democrats that we will protect Social Security. I think people have to understand the scare about taking away Social Security. We are good for Social Security for many, many years down the road. And we are probably going to have to tinker with it as time goes by to make sure that the next generation and the generation after that has Social Security.

There are many that say let's have savings accounts. I am all for savings accounts. I think Americans don't save enough. Those that are old enough and

have parents coming through the Depression learned at an early age, even if you put \$1 a week away, or \$2, it is something you have for the future.

I happen to believe in saving. Even here in Congress, I try to put away money so when I retire one day, I will have the comfort of knowing I will be able to pay my monthly bills, and I think that is what most senior citizens want to know.

But when we talk about and when you look at the stock market, certainly in the last couple of weeks, it has been up and down like a roller coaster. We all remember in early 2000 when people lost 35 percent of their holdings in the stock market, and many are just starting to recover now. We can't take that kind of chance with Social Security. Social Security is supposed to be something that is safe that the government is going to back. That is something that is extremely important for many of us.

Certainly I know my mom and dad when they retired, and this is going back even 15 years ago, they needed that Social Security. That was the only thing they had to live on. Certainly their children helped them out, but it gave them dignity to be able to pay their own bills, and there are many parents that feel that way. They don't want to be a burden on their children.

I have pledged that in 2007 when we all come back and this debate on Social Security starts again, I pledge that the Democrats will be fighting to save Social Security.

But also pensions. We have seen so many of our people around this country losing their pensions. I know that some corporations say they can't afford it any more. They want to go into a 401(k). Well, I think a 401(k) is fine, but what is happening to us as Americans? What happened to the companies that basically backed us? If you were loyal to your company, you had benefits.

I am going to continue talking about this in the next couple of weeks because I think it is important that Americans know about it.

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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### IRAQ WAR STATUS

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last week we had a big debate about Iraq, and our battles over there continue. There were a lot of accusations about which party cut and run, yielded by those on the other side who said Democrats wanted to cut and run.

It is ironic because this is the first war in American history that a party and a President has chosen to divide Americans on the war rather than unite them.

But let's take the concept of cutting and running. In the spring of 2002, American forces had Osama bin Laden on the run in Tora Bora and Afghanistan, but the administration decided to cut and run from that fight taking resources appropriated for Afghanistan and moving them onto the field of Iraq and cutting and running from Afghanistan and its responsibilities of isolating and getting Osama bin Laden.

Then Donald Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense, led the charge into Iraq with a cut-and-run mentality, touting what he called the 10-30-30 strategy, to bug out of Iraq as soon as we finished invading: 10 days of war, 30 days of occupation, and 30 days of transition.

His prediction was by May of 2003 we would have less than 30,000 American troops in Iraq.

□ 1830

So I ask, how are we doing on Don Rumsfeld 10-30-30? His entire mentality was to get out of Iraq as quickly as possible. And we have been bogged down in Iraq because of his cut-and-run mentality, because he had too few troops, not a plan for the occupation for Iraq at all.

And when you go back and think about it, they promised a quick war, and we got a long war. When the Republican Congress cut and run from its responsibility oversight, how did that war change?

They said we were going to find weapons of mass destruction, and all we got was sand. But the Republican Congress cut and run from its responsibility of oversight.

They said we were going to have a conventional war, and we ended up with an insurgency. And the Republican Congress and Don Rumsfeld cut and run from their responsibility of oversight and changing the strategy.

They said we were going to be treated as liberators, and we became occupiers. And they cut and run from the responsibility of oversight, and Don Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense, cut and run from understanding the type of conflict we had.

They said we needed no more than 130,000 troops, and it has become self-evident that we needed more troops than even in the first Gulf War, and that Bremer, the then President's ambassador, and others had asked for more troops, and the administration

and, most importantly, the Secretary of Defense cut and run from his responsibility to provide those troops.

And that doesn't even count the Kevlar vests, the Humvees, and the other types of equipment that the troops needed at every step of the way. The Republican Congress and Secretary of Defense Don Rumsfeld cut and run from their responsibility, and that reality that they met with in Iraq cut right into their ideology of cutting and running from their responsibilities.

And need I remind the Secretary of Defense of the words of Winston Churchill. "Never, never, never believe any war will be smooth and easy. The statesman who yields to war fever must realize that once the signal is given, he is no longer the master of the policy, but the slave of unforeseeable and uncontrollable events."

Or as Don Rumsfeld himself likes to say, "Stuff happens, and it's untidy." Perhaps it turned out untidy because from day 1 the administration had a cut-and-run attitude towards the results of the war.

Don Rumsfeld convinced the President to cut and run on the safety of our troops when it came to Kevlar vests and Humvees. Over objections of GEN Eric Shinseki and Secretary of State Colin Powell, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld produced a plan to invade a nation of 25 million with only 130-some-odd-thousand troops.

GEN Anthony Zinni, Commander of the U.S. forces in the Middle East, said, "We are paying the price for the lack of credible planning or the lack of a plan. Ten years of planning were thrown away."

LTG Greg Newbold, top operations officer for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, put it more succinctly and clearly. "My sincere view is that the commitment of our forces to this fight was done with a casualness and a swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions or bury the results."

Secretary Rumsfeld's spokesman Larry DiRita visited Kuwait in 2003 and said, "We don't owe the people of Iraq anything. We're giving them their freedom, and that's enough."

So when it comes to the accusation of cutting and running, let's look at the record. And the record is quite clear that although the slogan is easy to throw around, that it is the mentality of the Secretary of Defense.

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

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

#### LEAKED CABLE FROM U.S. EMBASSY IN IRAQ

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week in his surprise visit to Baghdad, President Bush was full of happy talk. "The progress here in Iraq has been remarkable when you really think about it," he said.

But as usual, with this administration, there is a side of the story you don't hear until it leaks out.

Over the weekend, the Washington Post reported on a memo under the name of U.S. Ambassador of Iraq Zalmay Khalizad, which describes the treacherous living conditions faced by Iraqi nationals who work for the U.S. Embassy.

The cable cites harassment from militia groups, hostility from security forces, the ones we have trained, sporadic utilities in 115-degree heat, scarce and expensive fuel, women forced to cover their faces in public, kidnappings of family members, fear of recrimination if it is discovered that they are employed by the embassy and are thus aiding the occupation. Some of these men and women haven't even told their families where they work.

Mr. Speaker, is this the freedom that the President says is transforming the Middle East?

The dispatch describes the central government, the one we have heard the Bush administration pump up to no end, as ineffective and "not relevant." Embassy staff report that it is actually local militia and neighborhood governments that control the streets.

After 2,500 American deaths, more than a quarter of a trillion dollars spent, and our global reputation lying in tatters, we still don't have a grip on basic security in Iraq. It is absolutely scandalous.

Mr. Speaker, if the men and women who work for the U.S. Government feel threatened, how can we possibly hope to maintain peace, rule of law and basic services for millions of ordinary Iraqis living outside of the bubble of the Green Zone?

It couldn't be clearer. We are not trusted, respected or beloved in Iraq. Our military presence is not providing relief from an atmosphere of resentment, danger and paranoia in Iraq; we are contributing to it. In fact, we are exacerbating it.

There is only one answer, Mr. Speaker. It is time, in fact, it is long past time, for our troops to come home. We can help Iraqis build a more promising future. We can help them rebuild their country and do our best to help them resolve sectarian strife. But we can do it only as a partner, not as an occupier. We can do it only if we end this disastrous war, only if we return Iraq to the Iraqis and return our troops to their families.

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 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.)

#### EXTENSIONS OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong support for extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The importance and necessity of the Voting Rights Act cannot be over-emphasized. We have learned through experience what a difference the vote makes. In 1964, the year before President Johnson signed the act into law, there were only 300 African American elected officials in the entire country. Today there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 Members of Congress.

The most fundamental right of our democratic system of government is the right of citizens to participate in the political process. The 15th amendment ensures the right of every citizen, regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, to vote and participate in the electoral process. However, as we have seen in previous elections, some local governments have actively and, in some instances, have aggressively attempted to disenfranchise African American and other minority voters.

This year, all who care about social justice and equal opportunity in America can share one overriding goal, and that is Congress needs to review the provisions of the Voting Rights Act which will ensure that our Nation's government has the opportunity to reflect the views, the values and, most importantly, the votes of the people it serves.

Of all the civil rights legislation that the Nation has enacted over the past four decades, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is arguably the most important. Yes, every major piece of civil rights legislation has helped to eliminate injustices such as discrimination in education, employment and housing, but it is the Voting Rights Act that empowers Americans to take action against injustices by electing those who pledge to eliminate it and removing those who perpetuate it.

African Americans in the South were prevented from voting by a battery of tactics, poll taxes, literacy tests that

were for blacks only, and the crudest forms of intimidation. From the Southwest to some urban areas in the Northeast and Midwest, Latinos were discouraged from voting in more subtle but just as effective techniques that exploited the vulnerabilities of low-income newcomers for whom English was a second language. Both groups were also the targets of districting designed to dilute the ability to elect officials of their own choosing, a fundamental freedom that all too many Americans take for granted.

And this is why it is so important that Congress renew all three provisions that are set to expire: section 5, which requires Federal approval for all proposed changes in voting or election procedures in areas with a history of discrimination; section 203, which requires some jurisdictions to provide assistance in other languages to voters who are not literate or fluent in English; and the portions of section 6-9 of the act which authorizes the Federal Government to send Federal election examiners and observers to certain jurisdictions covered by section 5 where there is evidence of attempts to intimidate minority voters at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, this act is scheduled to come before us in the next few days, and I am gratified to note that it has generated tremendous support on both sides of the aisle. And I am certain that American people all over the country look forward to its passage. I simply urge strong support.

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.)

#### MORALITY TALE ON AIDS

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to really tell a morality tale that the American people may well not know anything about. Many things go on in the world, and we learn nothing in our press. But if you read widely, as I do, and read something called the Asia Times, which is one of many newspapers around the world, you find out very interesting things are going on.

Everyone knows that there is a problem with AIDS worldwide, and the problem with AIDS is that we, today, have the ability to actually treat people with AIDS with the triple therapy drugs that will make their life longer, allow them to continue working, allow them to take care of their children,

create less orphans. There are many, many positive benefits from triple therapy around the world.

The problem is the drugs are made in the Western world where they are very, very expensive. In the Asia Times story, an article entitled World Health, A Lethal Dose of U.S. Politics, that is dated 6/19/2006, that I will enter into the RECORD, this article talks about a veteran World Health Organization professional by the name of William Aldis, who found himself in such conflict with the World Health Organization that he was fired. Now, they called it a promotion. They put him elsewhere. But basically they put him in a position where he would have no power similar to what he had before. He was the representative to Thailand.

Now, Thailand's use of these medications has reduced their level of deaths from AIDS by 79 percent. These drugs are effective, but very expensive. And the problem is that under the World Trading Organization rules, countries are allowed to make their own or to develop generics that are much less expensive.

Now, Thailand comes to the point where they want to develop a bilateral trade relationship with the United States. And the United States, at that point, uses their muscle to say to the Thais, you no longer can have this loose standard of developing drugs. You must abide by United States intellectual property law.

□ 1845

Therefore, you are cut off from an expensive source of the medication that is in use in Thailand today and in many other countries in the world.

Now, this is a question of morality. We have the capacity to treat the millions of people who are living with AIDS and thousands of them, millions dying every year. We have the ability to treat them. But on the other side, we have the pharmaceutical industry that says we want to get the last nickel, we want to get the most money out of this situation that we can get. And the United States Government is helping the pharmaceutical industry squeeze the Third World.

Now, a lot of people say why does the rest of the world dislike America? It is this kind of stuff that goes on under the radar screen of most people in this country who do not understand what is going on who, therefore, do not understand why the rest of the world looks at us as being in it for ourselves and no one else. We can talk all we want to about liberty, and we can talk all we want about the free enterprise system and all these things, but when it comes down to money we put the squeeze on.

Now, you say, well, hasn't the President been generous? Hasn't he put \$15 billion out there to deal with the AIDS epidemic? Yes, in theory he has made that and some of that money has been appropriated out of this House, but it is being used to buy drugs that are much more costly. We could buy many

more drugs if we would buy generics produced in these countries by themselves.

Now, recently there was a Congressional Research Service report, and this is our research service in the Library of Congress, that said that the United States' main purpose for pursuing bilateral FDAs is to advance U.S. intellectual property protection rather than promoting free trade.

This is wrong, and the American people should know about it and insist that their government make available the drugs for the rest of the world's treatment.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

WORLD HEALTH: A LETHAL DOSE OF U.S. POLITICS

(By Dylan C. Williams)

BANGKOK.—When World Health Organization (WHO) director general Lee Jong-wook died of a cerebral hemorrhage last month before the start of the United Nations agency's annual World Health Assembly, the world's most prominent public-health official was arguably of a conflicted mind.

The WHO veteran was caught in the middle of an intensifying global debate over how to reconcile intellectual-property protection with the pressing public-health need to expand and access to expensive life-saving medicines, a hot-button issue that has sharply divided WHO member states along developed- and developing-country lines.

An Asia Times Online investigation reveals that at the time of his death, Lee, a South Korean national, had closely aligned himself with the U.S. government and by association U.S. corporate interests, often to the detriment of the WHO's most vital commitments and positions, including its current drive to promote the production and marketing of affordable generic antiretroviral drugs for millions of poor infected with the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), which can cause AIDS.

According to senior and middle-ranking WHO officials familiar with the situation, Lee blatantly bent to U.S. government pressure in March when he made the controversial decision to recall the WHO country representative to Thailand, William Aldis, who had served less than 16 months in what traditionally has been a four-year or longer posting.

Aldis had made the mistake of penning a critical opinion piece in the Bangkok Post newspaper in February that argued in consonance with WHO positions that Thailand should carefully consider before surrendering its sovereign right to produce or import generic life-saving medicines as allowed by the World Trade Organization (WTO) in exchange for a bilateral free-trade agreement (FTA) with the United States, which is currently under negotiation.

The WHO official also wrote that the stricter intellectual-property protection measures in the proposed U.S.-Thailand FTA would inevitably lead to higher drug prices and thereby jeopardize the lives of "hundreds of thousands" of Thai citizens who now depend on access to locally produced cheap medicines to survive. He noted too that the Thai government's current production of generic treatments had allowed the country to reduce AIDS-related deaths by a whopping 79 percent.

Aldis' arguments directly mirrored stated WHO positions, but significantly were at direct odds with the objectives of current U.S. trade policy, which through the establishment of bilateral FTAs aims to bind signa-

tory countries into extending their national intellectual-property legislation far beyond the parameters of current WTO agreed standards.

A recent U.S. Congressional Research Service report states that the United States main purpose for pursuing bilateral FTAs is to advance U.S. intellectual-property protection rather than promoting more free trade. The Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002, the applicable U.S. legislation for bilateral FTAs, states explicitly that Trade-Related Intellectual Property Standards, or TRIPS, are by law non-negotiable and must reflect a standard of protection similar to that found in U.S. law.

A U.S. ambassador to the U.N. in Geneva paid a private visit to Lee on March 23 to express Washington's displeasure with Aldis' newspaper commentary, according to WHO officials familiar with the meeting. A follow-up letter from the U.S. government addressed to Lee strongly impressed Washington's view of the importance of the WHO to remain "neutral and objective" and requested that Lee personally remind senior WHO officials of those commitments, according to a WHO staff member who reviewed the correspondence.

The next day, Lee informed the regional office in New Delhi of his decision to recall Aldis.

Perhaps strategically, Aldis' removal coincided with the height of Thailand's recent political crisis, and failed to generate any local media attention at the time. Internally, Lee had characterized Aldis' transfer to a research position of considerable less authority in New Delhi as a promotion.

But a Geneva-based WHO official familiar with the situation said the article "was seen as stepping over unseen boundaries which the director general set for himself and his staff when dealing with the U.S. It was a disappointing reaction, a sad reaction, but under Lee's administration not a surprise."

Suwit Wibulpolprasert, senior adviser to the Thai Ministry of Public Health, early this month sent a formal letter to acting WHO director general Anders Nordstrom, requesting an official explanation for Aldis' abrupt removal.

According to a WHO official in Geneva with knowledge of the correspondence, the letter raised questions about possible U.S. influence behind the irregular personnel rotation and said that if the WHO decision was motivated by Aldis' comments on the U.S.-Thai FTA, then the WHO should reconsider the transfer.

Suwit also raised his concerns about the level of transparency and freedom of speech inside the WHO. In e-mail communication with this correspondent, Suwit said WHO officials had already denied that Aldis' recall was related to the opinions stated in the Bangkok Post article. A regional WHO official in New Delhi told a senior Thai public-health official that Aldis' removal was related to "inefficiency" in performing his functions—a characterization that Thai officials who worked alongside him through the 2004 tsunami and ongoing avian-influenza scare have privately contested.

News of Aldis' transfer, which oddly was first leaked by a Bangkok-based U.S. official, quickly spread through the global health organization. The June edition of the highly regarded medical journal *The Lancet*, which otherwise painted a flattering portrait of Lee's tenure, drew on anonymous WHO sources to characterize Lee's decision on Aldis as a "clear signal of U.S. influence on WHO."

A senior WHO official who spoke to Asia Times Online on condition of anonymity believes that Lee's decision and its subsequent leak by the U.S. government was specifically

designed to engender more self-censorship among other WHO country representatives when they comment publicly on the intersection of U.S. trade and WHO public-health policies.

A large number of WHO staff members are employed on renewable 11-month contracts, meaning that their standing inside the organization is on perpetually shaky ground and hence curbs their ability to voice critical opinions.

Aldis, a U.S. national and permanent WHO staffer, was known among his colleagues for privately airing views critical of the Bush administration and its policy toward the WHO, particularly in relation to the U.S. government's alleged tendency to mix its commercial and public-health agendas.

Aldis reportedly chafed at WHO regional headquarters' instructions to receive representatives from U.S. corporations and introduce them to senior Thai government officials to whom the private company representatives hoped to sell big-ticket projects and products.

In recent months, major U.S. companies such as pharmaceutical giant Pfizer and technology company IBM have asked the WHO in Thailand to facilitate access to senior Thai officials. In turn, some senior WHO staff members have expressed their concerns about a possible conflict of interests, as the requested appointments were notably not related to any ongoing WHO technical-assistance program with the Thai government.

It's not the first time that the U.S. has played hardball with the WHO and Thailand. In 1998, when member nations proposed that the WHO be granted more power to monitor international trade agreements and their effects on global public health, particularly in relation to the access to patented medicines in developing countries, the U.S. government threatened to withhold funding to the organization.

Under that financial threat, the WHO has since largely refrained from commenting critically on the drug-patent issue. International and independent non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as Oxfam and Medecins Sans Frontieres have filled the WHO's leadership vacuum on the issue by filling the information gap with highly critical research reports.

From the United States perspective, Aldis, and by association the WHO, had publicly sided with Thailand on the pivotal drug-patent debate during a crucial stage in the FTA negotiations. Washington reportedly hopes that the comprehensive deal it is pursuing with Thailand will serve as a template for other bilateral trade pacts in the region, including soon-to-be-negotiated deals with Malaysia and Indonesia.

Thai civil-society groups, meanwhile, have complained about the lack of transparency surrounding the negotiations, which caretaker Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra has unilaterally conducted without consultations with parliament.

The U.S. and Thailand have in the past sparred over the Thai government's decision to use its WTO-approved compulsory licensing rights to produce certain generic antiretroviral drugs for HIV carriers and AIDS sufferers. In 2001, for example, Washington threatened retaliatory trade sanctions, including curbs on sensitive Thai export products, if the Thai government allowed the production of certain generic antiretroviral drugs.

Thai activists, meanwhile, have given certain U.S. pharmaceutical companies legal fits. In 2001, for instance, they challenged the legality of U.S. pharmaceutical company Bristol Meyer Squibb's patent over the antiretroviral drug didanosine, or DDI, because it was originally developed by a public

U.S. agency, the National Institutes of Health.

In 2002, a Thai court cited international statutes when it ruled that Thai HIV/AIDS patients could be injured by patents and had legal standing to sue if drug makers holding patents restricted the availability of drugs through their pricing policies.

The verdict was upheld in January 2004, and as part of an out-of-court settlement, Bristol Meyer Squibb decided to "dedicate the [DDI] patent to the people of Thailand" of that particular version of the drug by surrendering it to the Thai Department of Intellectual Property.

The dedication, however, did not carry over to third countries. Under the provisions of a U.S.-Thai FTA, future legal challenges to U.S.-held drug patents would be nearly impossible, Thai activists and international NGOs contend.

Lee's unexpected death has already engendered some serious soul-searching inside the WHO. Lee was widely lauded after his death, but his final legacy to the organization he served for 23 years is very much in doubt.

U.S. President George W. Bush said, "Lee provided tremendous leadership to the international community as it confronted the challenges of the 21st century." U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, Microsoft founder Bill Gates and former U.S. President Jimmy Carter all made similar eulogies to Lee's long commitment to improving global public-health standards.

Lee frequently denied allegations that U.S. political pressure influenced his decision-making, most notably perhaps during a recent television interview with the British Broadcasting Corp. However, it is just as likely that Lee will be remembered for the many times he caved to U.S. pressure on crucial public-health issues, frequently in areas where WHO positions and commitments required that he take a stronger stand, some WHO officials contend.

Moreover, the secretive way that Lee sometimes conducted WHO business, apparently in some instances at the United States behest, already has some officials inside the U.N. agency talking about the need for greater transparency and accountability under the next director general. "It will be very rough waters ahead for the new [director general]," said a Geneva-based WHO official, speaking on condition of anonymity.

As the United States strong influence over Lee comes into posthumous light, the selection process for his replacement will almost certainly be politicized along rich- and poor-country lines, and if the U.S. openly pushes its favored candidate, that divide could widen into a full-blown schism inside the traditionally cohesive organization. Those sharp lines are already emerging.

A report by a WHO-mandated independent commission recently recommended that as a general rule governments should avoid bilateral free-trade treaties that reduce access to medicines in developing countries. An annex to that report, signed by mainly Western experts who adhered to positions held by big pharmaceutical companies, highlighted the glaring differences in opinion emerging among WHO member states.

For its part, the U.S. has long advanced the argument that without strong intellectual-property protection, the pharmaceutical industry will not have the commercial incentive to conduct research and development for crucial new medicines.

However, Brazil and Kenya recently claimed that about 90 percent of total global health-related research and development of Western pharmaceutical companies went toward addressing the medical needs of about 10% of the world's population. Those two countries have since called on the WHO to

adopt systems for intellectual-property protection that would increase developing countries' access to health innovations and medicines.

WHO staffers say they resent what they view as the United States political agenda toward vital public-health concerns, ranging from reproductive-health issues to promoting good dietary standards.

At the 2004 World Health Assembly (WHA), the U.S. broke with the meeting's proposed resolution that reproductive and sexual rights should be considered human rights, and strongly protested the meeting's focus on the public-health risks of unsafe abortions. Lee had earlier that year held up a list of essential WHO-recommended medicines drafted by an independent expert committee for more than two months because of U.S. objections about two listed abortifacient drugs that could be used to induce abortions in emergencies.

The U.S. delegation to another recent WHA took issue with a WHO-proposed diet and health resolution, particularly concerning the acceptable level of sugar content in foods, which by the WHO's expert assessment would have cast U.S. fast-food and soft-drink companies in an unfavorable light. Lee famously bent to the U.S. objections and signed off on a significantly watered-down version of the original resolution.

U.S. interference with U.N. personnel and policy decisions, of course, isn't an entirely new phenomenon. The U.S. is the largest donor to the U.N. and by association to the WHO, and in light of the U.S.-inspired events in Bangkok, senior WHO representatives throughout the organization are likely to be more guarded when commenting on public health issues that Washington considers sensitive.

The Bush administration's tactics, often cloaked as reform measures, in reality aim to bring U.N. agencies like the WHO more in line with U.S. commercial and political interests.

At the WHO, at least, that process has come at the expense of the U.N. agency's stated mission, commitments and, perhaps most significant, its global credibility as an impartial and apolitical actor.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Interstate Highway System.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2012. An act to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act for fiscal years 2006 through 2012, and for other purposes.

#### ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your courtesy in giving me a few extra minutes to get here.

What I want to do this evening, and I am a little short on extra Members and we are going to see how that evolves over the next few minutes, but I want to begin the discussion on an issue that I think is really incredibly important to each and every one of us in this country. And certainly as Members of Congress representing so many people, constituents come to us, I think, every day, and they may not say, what are you doing about energy, but they certainly come to us and say, What is going on with the high price of gasoline? We go to the pump. We see the price going up, sometimes more than one time in a day, and we have seen prices well over \$3 a gallon.

And what we know, of course, is that consumers are paying 100 percent more than they were paying 5 years ago. The price at the pump was about \$1.44, \$1.50, the average price of gasoline 5 years ago; and now we are seeing prices certainly well over \$3 a gallon. And this is at the same time, of course, that we are seeing record profits from the oil industry. And certainly my constituents say to me, What is going on? What can we do about this? Why isn't something more happening? And they do understand there are some causes of this, but what I would like to discuss this evening is what is going on and what we have been doing about it and what we have not been doing about it that we should.

I think that is really what I am most concerned about as I see these issues in my district, not only for gasoline. We are not in the right season yet, but we certainly know that home heating oil and home heating fuel has gone up as well. In fact, I commissioned a study in Pennsylvania to see what the price was for home heating oil last winter, and we saw increases on the average in Pennsylvania of over \$700 a year for a family. That is a lot of dollars, particularly for somebody on a fixed income, young families struggling to make ends meet, and, of course, making some of the choices are really very difficult for families. And, in fact, what we are hearing is that families are telling us that it matters, that they have seen a real effect when they see transportation and home heating costs going up an average of 75 percent increase over what they saw even in 2001.

So what are we seeing? What are we doing about this? What do we expect to do? There is certainly discussion on the floor about this issue. And I know, as Democrats, we have stood and really made quite a few suggestions, some very specific as far as what we can do immediately. The one specific one, of course, was what about price gouging? Are we seeing the price of gasoline go up because, in fact, there was some inappropriate, illegal activity? We have some preliminary information about that. Unfortunately, we do not have a Federal definition of price gouging; so it has been really difficult to be able to say specifically whether, in fact, that is really what has been going on.

And what can we do more immediately to help make sure that the oil industry is doing all that it can to get us more affordable gasoline? But there is no question that those are short-term solutions. Those are not long-term solutions. And what many of us feel is that we should be acting on long-term solutions and we should have been doing it already, and why are we not doing it today, because what we do today matters next year, the year after, and for years in the future.

So what are we doing to make sure that there is an adequate supply of energy in this Nation? Are we smart enough to be doing the kind of innovation and research that we know we need to do to be able to do this? Of course the answer, Mr. Speaker, is that we are; that the answer has to be to diversify our energy sources, to look at the different ways, the innovations, that are out there and bringing different kinds of fuel to our vehicles and to our homes. And we have seen that already. We have had numbers of our Members talk about biofuels and the opportunity for ethanol. We have just seen in my region of the country, and we have seen it elsewhere in the country, the fact that we now have mixed gasoline and ethanol. We have 5 percent ethanol coming into our tanks in the Philadelphia area. That switch was just made a couple of months ago.

But we also know that you can have a flexible fuel vehicle, you can fuel your vehicle with 85 percent ethanol. Well, that is made out of corn in this country. Does that mean we reduce our reliance on foreign oil? Absolutely. And should we be doing more of that? How do we actually begin to make the kind of investments that really would matter where we can actually say we are using the kind of research, the kind of smart scientists, the engineers, the innovation that exists in this country to bring new fuel options to our vehicles and to all of us so that we have a diversity, we have more choices as consumers?

And then, in fact, there was an article in the *Inquirer* just this morning that the oil executives themselves are saying this is a question of supply. It is also a question of demand. If there is less demand, that would make a difference in price as well. A report I heard said if we could just reduce demand by 3 percent in this country, we could, in fact, start to see a reduction in prices.

So we have some real opportunities here. And of course long term if we can start to look at biofuels to be able to get them going, be able to get the production up really much faster, then we really have the opportunity to bring down the cost of fuel in this country for our automobiles.

Now, of course, tied to that there is something many of us also believe, and that is that we ought to be calling on the automobile manufacturers to produce more fuel-efficient vehicles, more hybrids, more flexible fuel vehi-

cles, and more gasoline-driven vehicles that are more fuel efficient. And they can do it. They know how to do it. We need to make them do it more quickly and to be able to create that option for us so that we as consumers, all of my constituents, all of my fellow Congressmen's constituents, all Americans, have greater flexibility and can make choices about what are the right kinds of vehicles for them to drive, what is the most fuel-efficient way for us to be handling our own transportation needs.

So I will just say that those are just some of the ideas. In fact, there are so many ideas. This is one of the things that when constituents ask, what can you do, I say we should be investing in serious ways in this country in these new technologies. And then we should be insisting that our automobile manufacturers and our purchasers, as well, start to participate in this. There are so many ideas out there.

I see a colleague of mine has joined us, and I am excited about that because he is someone who is very knowledgeable about this whole area and what we could be doing. But when we see the city of Philadelphia that I represent, that the new city buses they are buying are hybrid buses, that can make a really big difference. All of our cities should be doing that. All of our communities should be doing that. What about school buses? What can we do to make them more fuel efficient? These are things that we really need to be working on.

And I will say two of the things I have only been focusing on, access to the energy we need and to price and the concern that consumers have on that, but there are two other aspects of this that are very critical for us to understand, and that is that of course it has an environmental effect if we continue to burn fossil fuels at the rate we have been doing that, we actually continue the kind of pollution we have. We cannot just have rhetoric about reducing emissions. We need to take it really seriously if we plan to protect this Earth we live in and protect the environment and the consequences that we have seen of some of the changes in the environment, the increasing number of storms.

Hurricane Katrina is, of course, one of the examples that is in all of our minds; and we are just approaching, of course, a new hurricane season.

□ 1900

The third point I was going to make in addition to cost and availability of fuel and the energy we need as well as the environmental effects is, of course, the third area, which is our national security. We all understand, I hope we do increasingly understand, our reliance on foreign oil. Sixty percent of the oil that we use is imported. We need to reduce, if not eliminate, our reliance on foreign oil. It changes the relationships that we have with nations that are not always friendly to us.

So we need to have a much different relationship to foreign oil than we do,

and that is we have to end our reliance on foreign oil. But that is not going to be done unless we start to really seriously invest in alternative fuels and renewable energy sources, both for our vehicles, and, of course for our homes as well.

So I am going to ask my colleague to join us.

I did want to also say that I hope we can in our discussion also get to a little bit of a discussion about what consumers can do. What can individual Americans do that could really change the way we use energy; put more pressure on us, on Congress, to create those alternatives?

Someone asked me, well, where can you buy ethanol-mixed gasoline? Where can you buy E85 in Pennsylvania? Well, the answer is there is one station in Lancaster, and there is one station in Pittsburgh. If you live in Philadelphia, that is a very long to drive to fill up your tank and not acceptable.

So we need to be kick-starting this. We need to not just do a little bit; wouldn't that be nice, let's do that little project over there, let's see how that goes. We need to make a serious investment that changes dramatically the kind of energy options that we have for our automobiles, for our homes, for our daily lives. And only by doing that will we be able to protect the environment for the future, will we be able to end our reliance on foreign oil, will we be able to bring down the cost of energy for our cars and for our homes.

If we don't do it now, we are going to be having this same discussion, only more seriously, in the years to come.

So, as Democrats we have had a number of proposals, but one of the leaders in really putting forward a new energy policy for this country, and it is a wonderful one, it is called the New Apollo Energy Act, I guess we would like to see if it gets to be an act, and I would want to really encourage it, and I am delighted that my colleague Congressman JAY INSLEE has joined us to talk a little bit about what that would do and how it would get us started in a very, very serious way in changing the way we create the energy for ourselves, for our homes and for our businesses.

Mr. INSLEE. Thank you. I am delighted that Ms. SCHWARTZ is leading this energy discussion tonight for two reasons. One, right now outside the Capitol there is a giant lightning storm going on, so talking about energy in the spirit of Ben Franklin is the right time to do it.

But, secondly, and more importantly, many of us here on the Democratic side of the aisle believe that America is ready for a project with the same scope and ambition and vision as we had with John F. Kennedy with the original Apollo project.

I have introduced H.R. 2828, which is called the New Apollo Energy bill, that basically is working on the belief that this Nation has the same gumption, the same technological prowess, the

same vision that we had in the 1960s when we decided, as challenged by John F. Kennedy from that rostrum on May 9, 1961, to say we were going to put a man on the moon in 10 years and bring them back safely.

We have now introduced this New Apollo Energy Project because we believe that the times that we now live in this decade are both as challenging and as promising as the 1960s were in space. We believe that the challenge we have to deal with energy is of the same scope as America had and Kennedy had dealing during the Cold War with the space race. We also believe that our ability to invent, to tinker, to innovate is as good or better as it was in the 1960s, and we need to have that same spirit with the New Apollo Project.

In fact, I was just reading before I came over here, one of my staff handed me the quote from Kennedy's speech, and one of the things that he said was, I think it was kind of interesting, he was talking about the need for America to be a leader in space. We believe America needs to be a leader, it is our destiny to be a leader, and what Kennedy said was, "If this capsule history of our progress teaches us anything, it is that man, in his quest for knowledge and progress, is determined and cannot be deterred. The exploration of space will go ahead, whether we join in it or not. It is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space."

We believe, those of us who are propounding the New Apollo Energy Project believe, that we cannot be a leader of the world unless we decide that we are going to lead the world into a new energy future in this country and later in the world. And to do so, we believe that that is a challenge that is much more than nibbling on the edges.

We got to the moon because we had an aspiration of one giant leap for mankind, not just one little baby step for man. Frankly, this Congress and this administration to date, sadly to say, has been just nibbling on the edges. These tiny little inching forward as a baby would take their first little steps.

We both need and deserve more in this country, which is a very bold and visionary technological leap in energy. So we have introduced the New Apollo Energy Project, which will answer that bugle cry that this country has always answered to really leapfrog the existing technologies.

If I can just briefly describe some of the things we want to do. We want to achieve three ends in the New Apollo Energy Project. Number one, we want to lead the world economically. We want to create good, high-paying jobs in the new technologies of new energy that are right now, unfortunately, going overseas.

Unfortunately, we are losing jobs right now to some of the Japanese

automakers because of auto efficiency. We are losing jobs to some the German solar energy industries. We are losing jobs to Denmark. And I think Denmark is a great country, but to lose jobs to them to create these wind turbines makes no sense. The country that put a man on the moon, to allow other countries to lead in energy makes no sense. So one of the things we need to do is to bring the job growth right here.

The second thing we have to do is truly break our addiction to Middle Eastern oil. Although we laud the President for the first time suggesting after 6 years of urging him, has now suggested that he wants to join us to help to break the addiction to Middle Eastern oil, and that is great, but, unfortunately, the week the President said that, he laid off 150 or 100 researchers in renewable energy at the Boulder Energy Laboratory. So we would like to have some reality rather than rhetoric.

Third, we have to break this tendency to put more carbon dioxide in the air, to deal with global warming. The debate about global warming is over. It was a vigorous and strenuous debate, and it is done. The science of global warming is in, and we need now to really have technologies that will reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

I met the President of the Marshall Islands the other day, and he told me, he was on Bainbridge Island, I live on an island, Bainbridge Island, Washington, he told me that his entire nation may be environmental refugees because their entire nation is threatened by the rising sea levels together with the collapse of coral reefs.

We had a meeting with Stanford professors last week in the basement of this building, who told us in 100 years there may not be any viable healthy coral reefs in the world because the carbon dioxide we are putting in the air out of our tailpipes and coal-powered plants goes into solution in the ocean, it makes the oceans more acidic, and when they become more acidic, coral reefs cannot survive.

So we got to get these three jobs done. We have got a New Apollo Project to do it, and I would like to discuss it in depth.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. I just want to ask you a little more about that. I think sometimes for those of us who are not scientists out there, there is sometimes a feeling when you hear about that, it is what can we do about that? We need to use all of this energy. We need to use these fossil fuels. How am I going to get to my job? I mean, how can we possibly do this? How am I going to worry about the coral reefs? Why should I worry about that? What can we possibly do about it?

I think what you are saying, and I think what we need to really be talking about, is believe in ourselves as a country, to believe in how smart we

are, how capable we are, how innovative we are, and then to use those assets, which are really our people and how smart we can be, to say in fact we can fix it.

Just as you point out, we did create this space program. We did send to a man to the moon. We have actually even sent some women in space now, you know? But the fact is, I was just thinking about this as well, we have taken real problems, and we have solved them. We have solved some of these environmental problems.

So I wanted to ask you about that, because I think one of the things as I read your proposal I was so taken with is that it also understands that there probably isn't one answer. We don't even know exactly what all the solution is going to be, which I think would be great for Americans, because the fact is we like choices. So it may be that a hybrid vehicle works for me, and a more fuel-efficient vehicle that is not a hybrid works for you. Maybe a flexible-fuel vehicles works for you. Maybe I need a big car, or maybe I don't need a big car, depending on where we live, what kind of job we have. But really the question I have, too, as I look at your proposal is you really look at a lot of different ways to solve this problem and really take the science and use it. So talk about that, if you would. I think that is really important to hear.

Mr. INSLEE. I think you have put your finger on a very important principle as we go forward on energy debate. The debate in energy between those of us who believe in the New Apollo Project and those of us who do not is really a debate between the optimists and the pessimists.

The pessimists believe that we are tied to these really now ancient technologies. Fossil fuels is really an ancient technology. It is from the 1800s. It is old. We have been doing it for a long, long time.

Now, pessimists believe that we are stuck burning fossil fuels, and that is about as good as it gets.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. In fact, isn't that the President's solution, just more oil?

Mr. INSLEE. Just more oil. You just drill more holes in the ground. The problem with that is, unfortunately, for reasons that are past our understanding, the dinosaurs went to die under somebody else's sand. That seems so unfair to us. We use 25 percent of the world's oil, but we only have 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. We could drill in Yosemite, we could drill outside on the south lawn of the White House. The problem is, the oil is not there.

We use one-quarter of the world's oil, but we only have 3 percent of the reserves. So we can accelerate some exploration, but, unfortunately, the oil, frankly, is not there. So for one reason, it is just not there. But the pessimists believe that we cannot invent our way out of this pickle.

The optimists believe that we can do the same thing in energy as we did in

space. Just to harken back in history, when Kennedy said we were going to the moon on May 9, 1961, put that in historical perspective. Our rockets were blowing up on the launch pad. We had launched a softball in suborbital flight. Computers were as big as a room. He didn't know how we were going to get to the moon, but he did know a fundamental lesson of American psychology, which is we are the best inventors in human history, literally. Our culture, our society in America is the best inventive society in human history. So he recognized our ability to innovate.

Now, the New Apollo Energy Project that we have propounded delves on that. Let me just give you an example of just a couple things in my neighborhood.

It was in my paper this morning, in the Seattle Times, about a young man who has built a hybrid vehicle that uses an enhanced battery. It is a plug-in hybrid that has a little larger battery that he adds to the trunk. That car now gets 100 miles per gallon, 100 miles per gallon, and it is driving the streets of Seattle, Washington, today. The reason it does, you plug it in, it gets a little larger boost, it uses electricity now much greater than the gasoline. Now, it does use additional electricity, but it is getting 100 miles per gallon driving on the streets today. This technology exists.

Because of his efforts and some of these other groups that are pushing this, they are now pushing the auto industries to move faster to get to this plug-in hybrid technology. It is there.

We have the largest wind farm in North America being built today, 350-foot-tall towers in southeast Washington, that is generating over \$1.5 million over a several-year period for one farmer of a stream of revenue. This is great for farmers as well. It is going to produce enough electricity for 400,000 people.

□ 1915

We have the largest biodiesel plant in North America now is under design in southwestern Washington which will produce environmentally sound fuel for our cars and biodiesel. And biodiesel is great because it reduces the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, because the CO<sub>2</sub> goes into the plant, we make oil out of it, and we don't put any net increase in carbon dioxide.

I just mentioned these three technologies out of hundreds that are now coming on.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. A couple things on what you say. One is that I think we also ought to make clear, and I know in your proposal and you are talking about it is that this isn't about a new big government program, this is about working with the private sector and helping innovation, on whether it is actually giving tax credits or helping to make some investment or helping to kick-start one of those ideas for a private company that

wants to do this and wants to explore doing it. That is who is doing it. But what they need is for us to help make that happen so that it doesn't take them 10 years before they grow just enough to be able to prove it to someone, to be able to take a risk.

And I think some of the proposals that as government we could just ensure that loan, so that, in fact, it helps some private bank be able to make that loan and risk it, because we don't know what is going to work. We know some things are working; we don't know which one is going to really take off. We know, again, even with the biofuels we have been talking about ethanol, but there is some suggestion we could use sugar, we could use switchgrass. There is a whole variety of other ways we can do this, the whole question about electric cars and whether that works and how we can do this. There is some other technologies out there, fuel cell technology that we could actually potentially use in cars.

So, again, what we are saying here is that we want to work with the private sector; we want to work with those scientists and innovators and entrepreneurs who will be able to take their ideas and then be able to keep tweaking them, if you will, to see what works, to see what takes off; and to work with our own automobile manufacturers to say, you want to scale it up not just another few cars, but a lot of cars, and how quickly can you do that? How can you make it? How can we keep making cars here that we want to buy, that we can afford to buy, that will use less fuel?

But it is working with the private sector with that innovation, allowing it to be quite dynamic, because we don't know which ones to choose so much. And that is even happening, as I mentioned this about the old-time fossil fuels. There are now clean-coal technologies. In Pennsylvania we are sort of interested in some of that, could that work? Could it help us get through the hump for the foreseeable future?

But I do think it is so important for us not to be so worried that we actually only think in the very narrowest ways about how we can solve the problem for next year or for the year after. This is really looking at both immediate solutions, but then long term, where are we really going with this, and why shouldn't we in America be the ones in the forefront of this? And that is what you are talking about, and I think that is very exciting.

Mr. INSLEE. And I want to dovetail on this point about this is good old American capitalism as work. We believe in the power of capitalism. You look at the space race, and it was not just governmental activity, it was a public-private partnership with private contractors operating in a profit margin or incentives that did help get us to the moon. And we believe the same type of activity can be part of the solution for energy.

And I have to tell you, one of the huge transitions going on in the U.S. economy right now is happening without necessarily government help, which is a huge influx of investment capital. We just had a startup company involving biofuels that was announced last week at one of the largest infusions of capital for some period of time this decade, and we are seeing that.

And we are also seeing an infusion of intellectual capital. I come from a part of the world that is very active in the Internet and software technologies. The Microsoft campus is in my district. And we are seeing a lot of intellectual capital now from software and Internet move over to the energy side. We have seen investments from some of the Microsoft family into biofuels.

I met an interesting fellow a few months ago who was involved in the commercialization of the MRI machine, the magnetic resonance imaging machine, and he made a bundle of cash on that commercialized product that now they put us in the tubes and diagnose our old knees when you get to be 55 and play basketball like I do. So this guy now is involved in perfecting a solar cell panel that is nonsilicone-based; it is based on an organic molecule that you essentially just spray on, and you can reduce the construction cost because silicone-based solar panels are fairly expensive to make. This could be just a spray-on application and potentially reduces the cost 20 to 30 percent.

So here is a fellow that has done well in one electronic business now making the transition to energy, and we are seeing a lot of that. But what we can do is we can help those businesses get a jump start, and one of the important things we can do on that is to offer loan guarantees to guarantee the loan of some of these new plants. We are now trying to hustle along a loan guarantee for a first cellulosic ethanol plant in the world, actually in the State of Idaho, and we are trying to get that loan guarantee perfected so that company can get up and running.

Those are the kinds of things that are an appropriate public-private partnership, along with the tax incentives. I sponsored a bill with Senator BARACK OBAMA called Health Care for Hybrids, and what it would do is to help the auto industry with some of their legacy health care costs in exchange for producing more fuel-efficient cars. So here is a two-for.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Absolutely. And I think that that says how good this can be for business, both the cost of the new businesses that are created as a result of what we are talking about, but I really also means jobs. Coming from Pennsylvania, and I was in the State senate for 14 years before coming to Congress, and we would often have a debate when we discussed some of these changes that we wanted to in terms of auto emissions and how we would respond to this, and what if we actually put more regulation on

businesses, wouldn't we lose jobs? And how will we be able to protect the environment and not lose jobs? And in Pennsylvania it was a really serious issue. And I remember having those debates on the floor of senate, and yet by not moving ahead, we, in fact, lost some of those jobs anyway and didn't create new ones.

And I think what we are talking about here is let us create those new jobs. If you have an innovative entrepreneur of a company, well, they are going to hire people who then get jobs that potentially will grow into more jobs and more jobs. And these are often skilled jobs, they are decent-paying jobs. And if as a result they end with a product, new energies, new ways for us to both fuel our vehicles and also heat our home, and at the same time reduce some of these really serious carbon emissions and be able to home-grow some of our energy, more of our energy, while we are really doing a lot, and we are at the same time reducing costs, we are reducing costs to our businesses. And now some will say to me, if we could just reduce the cost of our energy, well, then maybe I could hire that additional person that I am trying to do. You hear that all the time, just bringing down the cost of electricity or being able to bring down your home heating or heating for business, that action may produce enough residual money for someone to be able to create a new job or two or maybe many more jobs.

So I think we have to see this as just an extraordinarily potential win-win for all of us. And, again, creating that diversity of options for people and the kind of energy, maybe more choices, meaning that there will be a little more competition, means that prices might come down. That helps all of us. But I think what we have to say is this about creating new businesses, creating new jobs, and at the same time creating new sources of energy that could be both safer for the environment and also be able to be far more available without our having to have those serious kinds of negotiations that might get in the way of some of our more international relationships.

And this isn't about being an isolationist when we talk about other countries. The idea is to share some of these innovations. And we have seen that, too. Talk about the high-tech industry, well, it is actually some of our ideas that are now being produced elsewhere. But it is our ideas, and we need to work and bring all those ideas together, create those jobs, create those opportunities, and help our businesses be able to be competitive, because without reducing energy costs, they simply won't be able to.

Mr. INSLEE. It has been very sad to see technology originally developed in the United States, particularly solar cell technology, now being perfected and commercialized in Germany and other countries. To see that hemorrhaging of jobs is really a pathetic

statement of our inaction to have a national energy policy. And we effectively don't have a national energy policy right now, except to just sort of allow the status quo to stumble along.

There is one thing that is very clear about energy: Somebody is going to create millions of jobs and millions of dollars, and we want that to be Americans. In the 1960s, they had the missile gap. Remember, during the Nixon-Kennedy debate there was a debate about the missile gap. In a way, we have an energy technology gap right now that, frankly, other countries are getting a leg up on us. And the reason is, is that those countries have developed energy policies that have decided to leapfrog technologies and develop technologies there. We can't allow that gap to continue to widen. And that is why this New Apollo Energy Project, H.R. 2828, if you want to take a look at it, is going to answer this challenge.

When Kennedy set us forth in the original space race, it really was not for economic reasons, it was largely not for a job creation program. But if you look at what it did create, can you imagine had he not challenged America to start the original Apollo Project? We would not have a computer industry in this country, we would not have an Internet-based industry, we would not have a satellite-based industry. We would likely probably not have a nanotechnology-based industry. That has been the mainspring of economic development and job creation in this country.

So I think the important thing to realize about energy is we are not just acting to \$3 a gallon gas, we are not acting just to save the planet we live on from the ravages of global warming. We are doing it from a positive economic growth-oriented proposal. And I think you can honestly say that this is probably the best thing the U.S. Congress could do to really grow the U.S. economy right now, because it is the one thing that the world obviously needs. Our market is not just in America. When we develop a clean-coal technology, we want to sell that technology to the Chinese and to India. And assuming we can do that, there is enormous growth potential.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. I was going to bring up another aspect of all of this discussion. I think also that sometimes when people hear these kind of conversations, they think, well, it is not really about me. What can I do that would really affect carbon emissions in this world? You know, how can I actually help save the planet and create more energy sources?

But the fact is, and if we could just talk about this for a minute, there is a lot that people can do. And, again, I am reflecting back. I remember when we first started talking about recycling, and I remember some of my colleagues would say, well, no one is going to want to bother doing that. And now people are doing this all across the country, and it actually makes you

much more aware. It is something you can do. It saves cost at some level.

But when you think about what some individuals can do related to energy, and I thought we could talk about that. Again, if you are a business owner, there is so much you can do in your own plant potentially to be able to reduce your energy consumption so that you could reduce your costs. All of us know about if you can weatherize your home.

Well, I just went to visit a new building in my district that is actually on the campus of a university that they just built a green building. Well, I think I have seen green buildings, you know. They have sort of motion detector electric lights, or they have more efficient plumbing appliances and all that. But this building, actually the roof looked like it had grass on it. It had green plants on the roof. It was new to me. I didn't know that that existed. But they said this isn't new. This is something we are experimenting with, but, in fact, it is not just grass, it is a little more complicated than that. But it is going to reduce their need for heating and cooling that building dramatically. Dramatically. So if you could, I don't know what the number was, cut it in half, cut it 80 percent. They are trying to perfect this, of course.

My guess is that they are going to be able to come up with something as we experiment with these ideas that we can do in our homes, in our businesses, in our public spaces. And we should be leaders in that as public officials, as elected officials. This is something we should be doing because we know how important it is. And we know that we should learn from each other. We always talk about best practices. Well, we should start to scale up on this, as they say. We should start to say: If it is working in this State, why isn't it working somewhere else? And the States are innovative to change. We are interested to hear what you are talking about in terms of the State of Washington. We are proud in Pennsylvania that we have wind farms and they are working, that they are working, as I said, on clean coal, that we are creating incentives for businesses to be able to reduce their costs of energy.

Public transportation obviously is something we are not even getting into here, but some of the newer technologies on that.

But just to comment on what we can do. I know there is a Federal program, I don't think it is known well enough, called Energy Start, where you can buy more efficient appliances. Businesses can get credits, tax credits, for being more energy-efficient.

So as you pointed out, there are little starts here, but if we really want to get serious about this, we have to start talking about it, making it clear that everyone, every business, every family, and certainly our bigger businesses can really start to participate in this in a way that will start to really make the

kind of difference that will see us shifting to these new energy sources and reducing our reliance on foreign oil.

□ 1930

Mr. INSLEE. I would like to compliment you for bringing up the idea of efficiency and not wasting energy. Because one of the things when we talk about energy, it is very easy to just launch into how we are going to generate more energy in an environmentally clean way. Obviously, or maybe not so obviously, the best energy you can create is the energy you do not waste. That is, clean energy is saving dirty energy and not wasting it, and those of us who have studied this believe that 30 or 40 percent of this solution ultimately is using energy in a much more efficient way, as much as inventing new ways to generate it.

That starts at home, with weatherizing your home, as you have indicated, a pretty simple thing, and there are some simple, inexpensive things you can do. There are more expensive things one can do with insulation, green building; and the green building, we just had two young men design the greenest building. They won a national award. We are kind of proud of that. It uses passive solar heating.

They can use solar cell technology now. If you want to build a new home, you can buy shingles that have the solar cells incorporated right in the shingle. There is a home about 20 miles from where we are standing in Virginia that is a net zero user of electricity, and they use massive solar heating. It is a two story, looks like a nice little home you find in any suburban place around Virginia. They use an in-ground heat pump, integrated solar panels on the roof, solar sort of passive heating through the use of the windows and tiles that collect the heat. When they generate more electricity than they use, they feed it back into the grid. That home was built for no more money than an average home. They are using zero electricity off the grid on a net basis. So a family that is committed to this can do it today using even existing technology.

But you said something I thought was very interesting, too, and that is about businesses. We are fortunate to have some visionary business leaders who are already accomplishing what we need to do.

British Petroleum, under the leadership of Sir John Brown, they decided they were going to change their energy use, and this is an oil company. This is an oil company that decided to reduce their carbon dioxide emissions to actually meet the treaty goals of the Kyoto global warming treaty. They were not pessimists. They were not nay-sayers. They just decided to do it; and within 3 years, they met their Kyoto targets of a reduction in their CO<sub>2</sub>, and, importantly to their shareholders, saved something like \$300 million in the process because when you do not waste energy you save yourself money.

General Electric, under the leadership of their CEO, has decided to make an enormous investment not only in the use in their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions but in developing these new high-tech, energy-efficient appliances that all of us are going to use.

So we have some business leadership; and regrettably what we do not have, we do not have leadership here in Congress, at least in the majority, who have not joined us optimists in breaking this addiction to oil and gas. The sad fact is that oil and gas still dominate the situation here in the House of Representatives; and until something changes, we are going to follow the leadership of the business community and people around this country who want to respond to this energy crisis individually that we are seeing.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Just to be a little political here for a moment, because you brought up, I think, how do we take what we are saying and make it happen. I mean, that really is sort of what we are talking about; and again, we are starting to sound sort of hopeful, optimistic, and it sounds like a lot of new terms for a lot of people, but I think we will increasingly get comfortable with some of this discussion. You know we can do that, and I think that is one of the reasons that I am on the floor tonight. It is one of the reasons that Mr. INSLEE joined me.

We want to get more familiar with this terminology. What are the alternative fuels? What are the choices they have? What is the flexible fuel vehicle? What are the kinds of options that I have out there in the future? What should I be asking for? How can I save energy at home? How can I save energy for business? How can we encourage businesses to do that? And what is the role of government in all of this?

I think what is exciting here is that there are so many of these ideas out there that if, in fact, we can encourage businesses to push even harder, to move even faster, push automobile manufacturers to higher fuel efficiency, if we went to 33-miles per gallon rather than 22 or whatever we sit at right now, we would save literally 2.6 million barrels of oil per day by 2025. You say, well, that is a long time from now. If we start now, we will start to do it. We should start to do it. We really have this opportunity to do it, and in fact, we know how to make those vehicles. We can make more fuel-efficient SUVs. So if Americans want to buy the SUVs, we can make them fuel efficient.

The fact is we have brought these ideas, brought them up as amendments and bills, and we want to work together to make this happen. This should not be a fight about do we ever use oil again or do we only go to you get to live in a green building or not. It is about moving all of us forward so that we can use less energy, use it more efficiently, bring down the costs for Americans, be more self-reliant. Knowing that we can do this, our role

is to recognize the innovation out there, to create the incentive, to encourage it to move much, much faster so, in fact, we can make this happen.

Occasionally we have to set some of the rules. I mean, sometimes we cannot bring people along. You do have to set rules out there to help make it happen, and to help make it happen much, much faster; but the fact is that this is very much a part of the Democratic agenda to be able to again use our innovation and to use our smarts to make this happen.

I see the pamphlet that you have, and I will maybe yield over, but I know one of the things we are talking about that we have not brought up today is we do need to encourage our young people to be well-educated in science and engineering and technology. We know that that is so important to our future for all of us that if we do not start making sure that our young people and some of the old people who are maybe going back to school or have some new training and education that we actually encourage this so that we do have the best and the brightest who are putting their minds to this work, and that is what we are hoping to make happen as well.

Mr. INSLEE. As Ms. SCHWARTZ indicated, I just happen to have an Innovation Agenda, which is the Democratic suggestion on how we can seize the power of innovation for the country and how the Innovation Agenda is just part of a larger package that one can read if anyone is interested.

We think energy is a very important part, but it is one part of our Innovation Agenda; and page 3 of that basically is our effort to develop a new generation of innovators, and that is what we need to do. That is why we are committed to placing a highly qualified teacher in every math and science classroom, why we are committed to educate 100,000 new scientists, engineers, and mathematicians in the next 4 years, why we want to make college tuition tax deductible for the students studying math, science and engineering so we can have those minds available.

But if you look at page 8 on our Innovation Agenda, you will see our dedication to energy independence in 10 years. I will just mention two of the bullet points in the Democrats' larger agenda. We would commit to substantially reducing the use of petroleum-based fuels by rapidly expanding production and distribution of synthetic and bio-based fuels, such as ethanol derived from cellulosic sources, and by deploying new engine technologies for fuel-flexible, hybrid, plug-in hybrid and biodiesel vehicles. Now, those are different kinds of vehicles.

Coming back to what Ms. SCHWARTZ said, we want to give consumers choices of what kind of vehicles to buy and to use. This is not a command-and-control suggestion we are making. We think we want to develop an economy so that you can decide what kind of vehicle you want to use. That might be a

flex-fuel vehicle. That is a vehicle that can burn gasoline or biofuels, and Brazil has done this through great genius. Now, when you pull up to a pump in Brazil, if you have a flex-fuel vehicle, you can burn either gasoline or biofuels or ethanol, which makes you in the driver's seat literally, not the oil and gas companies. So you can compare prices and decide what to burn.

Now, the reason they have done that is Brazil basically told the auto industry to start producing these vehicles, give consumers choice, and that is what we stand for in giving consumers choice so that we are not victims of the oil and gas oligopolies in our country. We talked about fuel-flexible, hybrids, plug-in hybrids, and biodiesel.

The second bullet point in our plan will create a DARPA-like initiative within the Department of Energy to provide seed money for fundamental research needed to develop high-risk, high-reward technologies and build markets for the next generation of revolutionary energy.

We do realize that there is some basic research that the government is good at that is very high-risk. It might be hard to get a bank loan on some of these cutting-edge technologies, but we have had very great success in the Defense Department with a group called DARPA, the Defense Advanced Research labs. They have done great work in the Department of Defense. We need to use that same strategy in energy, and that is why Democrats are proposing to have a similar energy advanced research program in the Department of Energy. We are very optimistic about that.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. I think this is something that is so exciting I think for all of us. It is something I have been excited about, too. We see the National Science Foundation being able to do some of this research, and again, some of the funding we give to scientific research is done by scientists who work for the government. So it is also given out in grants that are then either given out all over the country to innovators who are doing this kind of work, but then because we are involved in it, we have scientists sort of talking to each other, being able to give that information back on a national level, being able to share that information, being able to again act more quickly on that shared information to see what is working and what is most effective and cost effective and actually what is fuel effective.

These are, I think, really exciting, exciting options for all of us. It is something we can do, but again, I think we should be clear, we are not doing it now. That is detrimental to all of us, not just because when we go right today to fill up our tank we are paying \$3 or more a gallon and because the vehicles we drive are not as fuel efficient as they could be and the homes we live in are not as efficient either as they could be. It is because we actually have not gotten serious about taking

this next step and we need to. We need to again because of the high cost to our families.

If you look at families that are paying several hundred dollars more, in some cases several thousand dollars more, those are really tough decisions for a lot of our families in this country, what do we do and how do we make ends meet when we have these concerns. I hope they are hearing us. We want you to push us. You should push us. You should push this administration to do more.

Again, you pointed out the oil and gas industry could be a part of this. They should be a part of this because they also have scientists. They could be more fuel efficient. They should be.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield for a moment, this is a point that is absolutely galling to me, and folks need to understand this. This Congress is pathetic, with a capital P, when it comes to energy policy. We are doing nothing significant to really reduce our dependency on oil and gas. This place is awash in oil. It is a slave to oil. It has not broken its addiction even to the political ties that bind it to the oil and gas industry. As a result, it has done nothing significant to move forward on energy.

When we have all these new technologies coming on, solar cell technology which costs 80 percent less than it did 10 years ago, those prices are coming down spectacularly, wind energy that is coming down, has come down 20 percent so that it is competitive right now today in the State of Washington with other sources, has come down 20 percent. Instead of making investment in those technologies, you know what this Congress did? It stood up and gave another multi-million dollar tax break to the oil and gas industry of your tax money, and that is boneheaded.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. They did the same thing they have been doing.

Mr. INSLEE. They did the same thing they have been doing since the 1800s. The way I described this is this Congress last year passed a great energy policy for 1890. It was visionary for 1890. It is Neanderthal in the year 2006.

When you look at when this country has made great advances, we have done it in two major challenges that our country had in the last several decades, the Manhattan Project which developed nuclear power, and it was a major investment by the United States of America because of a major challenge. The second was the original project in the space race, and we responded and were successful. The third now needs to be an energy revolution in this country.

But the fact of the matter is under this Congress and in this management of Congress, we are investing less than 15 percent of the equivalent of what we would have done in either one of those projects; and as a result, we are getting

teeny, tiny little baby steps that we are encouraging when we should have these great leaps for mankind.

□ 1945

You know, if this Congress was running the space race, the quote would have been, "Another little step up the cabin of a DC-3," because that is about all we would have invented. Kennedy got us to the moon; this energy policy won't get us to Cleveland.

We believe we need a very significant ramp-up both in Federal research and development, basic R&D, tax credits to manufacturers, to help them manufacture fuel-efficient vehicles; tax credits to consumers to allow you to decide how to buy both a fuel-efficient car and build a fuel-efficient home; and use of the procurement policy.

We haven't talked about this tonight at all, but one of the great tools we have in our toolbox in energy policy is the Federal Government procurement power. The Federal Government is kind of the 800-pound gorilla when it comes to buying things in this economy. The Federal Government needs to start buying fuel-efficient cars, fuel-efficient air-conditioning units, and building green buildings. There is much more that we can do.

We are taking little baby steps there. The Pentagon is looking at a fuel-efficient battery. One of the competitors trying to develop this is in my district. It is called Neopower. They are building a fuel-celled battery that will actually power computers and radio devices using fuel cells. So as we ramp that up, hopefully we will have much more efficient batteries that can last much longer and not burn gasoline-generated electricity. But we are just starting.

I don't know how to categorize it other than to say that we need a revolution, and what we are getting is not even an evolution. It is almost a devolution, going back the wrong way.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. It is not using our imagination and our skills to move forward. And, also, I will just second the point you made. I do feel very strongly that the public buildings, for example, and our public procurement, that is what we buy, we should be setting an example. We should be practicing what we preach. We should be doing as best we can.

Again, it is not so easy for us to change our patterns, you know, what we are used to doing. Someone said, when gasoline prices were so high, one of the suggestions we were trying to make to people is if you are going to run your errands, try to be more efficient in the way you drive and do that. You could save yourself a few gallons of gasoline every week, several a month. That could make a difference. Think about carpooling.

It is hard to change our own patterns, and I think that is true in government, too. We should be setting an example that when we actually build a new building, that it is more energy-efficient; when we change light bulbs,

and I think there were just some changes made in some of the hallways and some of the office buildings, but are we encouraged to turn the lights off? We keep a lot of lights on every night. What would that save if, in fact, we had these all on timers or motion detectors?

We should be thinking about this in a way, because if each of us reduced our energy consumption by 10 percent, maybe some of us could even do better, we could have a dramatic impact on the amount of energy and fuel we would need.

So, again, this isn't picking and choosing. This isn't saying, I am going to blame individuals for not doing all they can. We are not blaming anyone. The idea is for us to really use all of our power, if I can use that word, all of our power to make it clear that we want less costly, more efficient fuel for all of our needs.

And we are going to have these needs. We are going to need this energy for our needs. They are not going to get fewer. There are more of us, more people, more densely populated, and we need to figure this out and do so in a way that doesn't just say let us just give a little more subsidy to the oil industry. If we just took the subsidies, \$8 billion, \$9 billion from the oil industry, maybe collected those royalties for offshore drilling from the oil industry, and said let us take that money and invest it in these new technologies and invest it in renewables, use the incentives so people will build buildings that will be more fuel-efficient and energy-efficient, what would that do for us?

In fact, what we know is that that is really significant. The amount of reduction in energy needs would be really significant and would have an impact. And at the same time, we would be learning better what, in fact, works best for us so we would be able to move ahead.

I just want to say one more thing, and then I want to reflect on some of this, too. I think we also have to say to people that we have done this. I think you are right to use the example of the man on the moon, but we have even done smaller things; for instance, when we found out that lead in paint was extremely harmful to kids in this country. We didn't always know that. There was lead in paint, and we all painted with that, used that paint, but, in fact, those paint chips actually caused brain damage for our kids. Well, we did something about it. It didn't happen immediately. People finally had to get outraged by it. Members of Congress finally had to stand up and say, you know what we are going to do, we are going to take lead out of paint.

Now, originally people said, I don't think we can do that. I don't think we have the technology to do that; how do we do that? Well, some smart people got together and figured out how to do it, and they did. We don't allow lead to be put in our paint anymore. We don't have chlorofluorocarbons anymore, be-

cause we realized it was causing a big hole in the ozone layer. It took a while for us to agree to do something about that, and some people said, oh, it is not really a problem, but it turns out it was a problem, and the fact is we could fix it, and we did.

So I just want to reflect on that because people sometimes think this is just too big. I can't do it, you can't do it, how are we going to do it? But the fact is we can if we get serious about it. If we understand the different roles of the private and public sector, we can actually do something really dramatic about creating less expensive, more home-based energy.

Mr. INSLEE. I just want to point out the history of our own country is that we will succeed on this because we have succeeded.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, because of what Congress did, and President Carter, we increased our fuel efficiency at least 50 percent. And if we had simply continued on that path, we would be free of Persian Gulf oil today. We could have solved this problem if we had simply continued with that success.

But I want to close by thanking you for your leadership on this and by saying that the Democrats are optimistic on energy, Democrats believe in innovation, and Democrats believe in paying for it and not having a deficit. And we are going to do that by closing some of these giveaways to the oil and gas industry.

Thank you for your leadership.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. And I'll just also end by saying thank you very much, Mr. INSLEE, for joining me and for helping, I hope, being able to talk about what is such an important issue for every American, and that is how to create less expensive, more available, more home-grown energy.

So thank you very much for joining me this evening, and I look forward to getting this done with you.

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here to open up for another discussion with the 30-something Working Group. We will be joined later by our friends from Florida who have been rooting on the Miami Heat in the last few days and are very excited about some key victories. So Mr. MEEK and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ will be here soon.

The issue tonight, Mr. Speaker, for all of us as Americans, I believe, is one of the most pressing issues our country has faced in a long time, and that is the issue of our national debt and our annual deficits that we are running here in the United States of America. We have always prided ourselves in the United States of being able to balance

our budgets and pay our bills, and making sure that we were like the average family in the United States that had to deal with paying bills, making sure at the end of the month we at least broke even, maybe even had a little bit to save.

Throughout the course of the 1990s, under the leadership of President Clinton, and in 1993 with a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate, we passed a budget resolution, as Democrats, that balanced the budget and led to one of the greatest economic expansions in the history of the world, which lifted up millions of people, created 20 million new jobs, and led to prosperity for everybody in the country.

We put in place PAYGO rules, which said that you can't spend any money that you don't either raise taxes to spend it or you cut spending somewhere, but what you don't do is you don't go out and borrow it. You don't go to China or Japan or OPEC and borrow the money. You make sure we have the money that we generated ourselves, and we pay our bills and meet our obligations: Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits, education, Pell Grants, health care, children's health care, or whatever the priorities may be, we would have the money to pay for it.

So the discussion tonight, Mr. Speaker, is of an issue that is pressing not only to the 30-something generation, because we are going to be around to pay the bills for the reckless spending, and our kids and our grandkids, the next couple of generations coming, but you can't get something for nothing. And right now the Republican House and Senate and President Bush are basically living on a credit card at the expense of the next generation of Americans who are going to be forced to pay the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know you have seen this chart before, but it is indicative of the situation we are in in the United States of America. In 224 years, from 1776 to the year 2000, all of the Presidents and all of the Congresses borrowed a total of \$1.01 trillion from foreign sources, foreign interests, in 224 years. The current President and the current Republican House and the current Republican Senate have managed, from 2001 to 2005, to borrow more money from foreign interests than all the previous Presidents in the previous 224 years. This is staggering.

And you may ask, Mr. Speaker, well, what are the 30-somethings talking about this for? We are supposed to talk about issues, Mr. Speaker, that affect kids and 20-somethings and 30-somethings, and young families. This is the most pressing issue for the next generation of Americans because we are going to be the ones left footing the bill.

When tax rates go up for the 30-somethings or the 20-somethings, or the kids that are in college or in grade school now, because of this reckless borrowing, it is irresponsible. It is not

in the public interest. It is not in the interest of the next generation, Mr. Speaker. And, therefore, it is an issue for the 30-something Democratic Working Group to talk about.

So it may be \$1 trillion. Where are we getting it from, Mr. Speaker? Look at this picture of America, and it shows exactly where we are getting it: \$682 billion from Japan; \$249 billion from China, the U.K., the Caribbean, Taiwan, Germany, Korea, Canada; and \$67.8 billion we have borrowed from OPEC countries. OPEC countries.

Can you imagine, in this day and age, with the cost of gas and with the price of a barrel of oil, that the United States has been so reckless and so irresponsible that we would go out and put ourselves in the position where we have to borrow money from OPEC and borrow money from China? This has a lot of different effects. This is just like when you get a loan for your house. You look at your house, and your house costs \$110,000, and then when you take out a loan, you look at what you are going to end up paying to actually get your \$110,000 house, and it is thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars more.

This is what we are doing here. We may borrow \$682 billion from Japan, we may borrow \$250 billion from China, but how much more do we have to pay on interest, Mr. Speaker? That money is not going to be going to other priorities here in the United States of America. So China, who has been wiping out the middle class of the United States of America, especially in Ohio and Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin, Indiana and Connecticut, and a lot of the other areas of the country, China is loaning us money. We pay them the interest on it, they take the interest, make some money off the Americans, and invest that back into their state-owned companies that will compete directly with American manufacturers here in the United States of America.

Now, I know we are in a global economy, and nobody wants to say that we are not going to trade. We all know that is ridiculous. We all know it is going to happen. But to borrow money from a country that is going to take the interest that you pay them on it and invest it back in to compete against you makes it even more unfair than the situation already is. You are putting yourself at a competitive disadvantage. It is irresponsible, and it is reckless because we have to pay the interest, but you are also aiding and abetting your competition every day.

Again, here is what we borrowed. The increase in the national debt, \$1.18 trillion; and of that, \$1.16 was borrowed from foreign interests, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and only \$.02 trillion borrowed from domestic interests.

And let me make one more point before the Miami Heat takes the floor again.

This is the kicker, Mr. Speaker. All of that money that we borrow and that

we have to pay interest on, here is what it looks like in the 2007 budget authority. This is billions of dollars. The big red bar on the left is what we have to pay in interest, interest on the money that we are borrowing.

So this money that the American people send down here and we spend it on education and health care and this and that, the biggest portion goes to just paying interest on the debt; and China and these other countries will take that money and reinvest it back into their state-owned, Communist-run facilities.

But look how it compares to what we are spending on education or on homeland security or on veterans. This is really the icing on the cake. This is what makes it so irresponsible. Not only are we putting the burden on our kids, but there are current investments that we cannot make because we are forced to spend all this money on just the interest on the debt.

□ 2000

I yield to the Miami Heat.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I am going to wait on that little celebration until our good friend from Florida joins us and we can do the happy dance together on the Heat's amazing victory last night, and I am sure the Speaker enjoyed that fantastic victory last night as well. So we will regale you with the success of the Heat when the gentleman from Florida joins us.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I could interrupt my friend, it was very reminiscent of the glory days of the Boston Celtics. In the old Boston Garden and in the new Garden they hang, I think, 16 flags representing world championships won by the Boston Celtics, and I hope at some point in time the Miami Heat does as well.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, do the Celtics still have a team?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Of course. They are in the rebuilding mode.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I was a Larry Bird fan from way back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We have begun a proud tradition in south Florida, and we are looking forward to equaling over time the amazing success of the Boston Celtics. Having already experienced the joy of a national championship by the University of Florida Fighting Gators basketball team, basketball is alive and well in Florida. As you can see, we have some pretty good players down our way.

But I want to jump off because Mr. RYAN did refer to the billions in debt, and you went through very eloquently, and I don't think people in America have a real idea, that is why I love that chart of the percentage of debt that each of those countries has of the United States.

And when you graphically depict it across the entire country, it really, really drives the point home. But what I found, and I have a shorter tenure in

Congress than you and Mr. MEEK and Mr. DELAHUNT do, going from the State legislature where we were dealing with millions more often than billions with a “b,” people would tell me it is hard to get their mind around what a billion is. It is such a big number; it is hard to grasp.

So I came up, along with my staff's help, with this chart to graphically illustrate what a billion is. When we are talking about billions in debt and the interest payments are in the billions and they dwarf other priorities like homeland security and funding for our veterans and education, how much is a billion?

A billion hours ago, for example, humans were making their first tools in the Stone Age. A billion seconds ago it was 1975, and the last American troops had pulled out of Vietnam.

A billion minutes ago, it was 104 A.D. and the Chinese had first invented paper.

If you take the definitions that the Republicans use when it comes to a billion, a billion dollars ago under the Republican leadership was only 3 hours and 32 minutes ago at the rate our government is currently spending money.

So a billion used to be a really significant number that if you translate it into time was a very long time ago. But translated into time under Republican leadership, it was just a few hours ago.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The issue here, and I love that chart because it does put everything into perspective, is that this outfit is leaving America worse off than they found it, and that is really upsetting. When you think about long term what we are going to have to deal with, what the 30-somethings and people with kids in college and grade school, what kind of country are you leaving these kids, that is what frustrates me. We have an obligation to make sure that we leave the garden patch a little nicer than we found it. And the debt, the war, you are strapping this next generation for generations. We are going to spend our entire life in public life or our generation's service to the country is going to be fixing the war in Iraq, balancing the budget, and trying to make ourselves competitive in a brutal global economy.

It is frustrating, but it is the overarching theme that the Republican Senate and House and White House are leaving the country worse off than they found it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You are absolutely right, and a little more reality to translate what we are talking about here into everyday economics, if you look at the 2006 tax reconciliation bill and compare it to benefit by income for the benefit that was given or the equivalent of the benefit to the amount of income that an American taxpayer brings in, for example under the 2006 tax cut legislation that passed out of this House overwhelmingly with Republican votes, an aver-

age American taxpayer that makes between \$10,000 and \$20,000 a year would get back enough to buy a Slurpee. But if you make between \$40,000 and \$50,000, you will get from the 2006 Republican tax cut bill about as much money to buy a gallon of gas.

Now, if we are talking real benefits here, the real benefits and who got the most out of the Republican tax cut bill this year, the reality is if you made more than \$1 million, you get the equivalent of a Hummer.

I don't know, if I am talking to the folks in my district, and I know the folks in Youngstown, Ohio, and the people on the Cape and in the Boston area, they probably are not that interested in getting enough money back to buy a Slurpee. Something tells me, and at least when I go home, and I have a district that includes a lot of areas that have people of means, and I can tell you when I go to community events and bring my kids to the soccer game and drive my kids around in our minivan, the people in the wealthiest parts of my district are coming up and saying keep the money because the needs we have in America are overwhelming. They are saying, you know what, I don't need the Slurpee, I can buy my own Hummer. If you are making more than a million dollars, you can buy your own Hummer.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And it is not like we have the money to give the person making a million dollars.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We don't. We have an \$8 trillion deficit.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And where do we get the money to give the money to the millionaire to go buy a Hummer? We have to go borrow it. That makes no sense.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yet the rank and file Republicans and the Republican leadership continue to try to profess that they are the party of fiscal responsibility. It is hilarious. It really is.

In the legislature in Florida, we used to talk about statements like that not being able to pass the straight-face test. It doesn't pass the straight-face test. How do they say it without smirking? How do they say it without crossing their fingers and putting their fingers behind their back? We should check behind the backs of all of the Members when they are speaking on the floor here about how fiscally responsible they are because I am sure they are all like this. They can't cross themselves enough. It is really over the top.

I was taught to tell the truth by my parents. I'm incredulous how some of these Members get away with claiming fiscal responsibility.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me give a very concrete example that was reported Saturday in my hometown newspaper, one of them, the Boston Globe. The headline read: “Cost of college piling debt on Massachusetts families.”

“Massachusetts families fell a total of \$562 million short of being able to

pay for college in the State last year, according to State officials, highlighting the struggle for families to afford higher education in Massachusetts.”

Now that \$562 million represented the portion of college costs a family cannot afford to pay that is not covered by Federal, State or institutional grants or loans. And when aid falls short, many students make up the difference with private loans they have trouble repaying.

Here is a quote from a young student: “My dad had to take money out of his 401(k) twice because during the semester we weren't given enough in grants and student loans to meet the amount we had to pay.”

The article goes on to say that students are covering the funding gap with higher-interest private loans, credit card debt, and too many hours of work outside of school.

Now I sat on the Administrative Law Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary where for 5 or 6 years we reviewed the proposal for the so-called bankruptcy law. I was always struck by the number of solicitations that were going to students to utilize their credit cards. Some would send a check.

I remember in the debate bringing a blown-up posterboard of a check that my daughter received for \$2,500. And as part of the solicitation, there was an opening salutation that said: “Have a good spring break.”

Well, the truth is that those credit card solicitations were putting in the hands of students credit cards that carried with them 18 percent, 22 percent, 26 percent, 30 percent interest rates. So what we are doing is not only creating a culture where credit card debt is an acceptable norm for paying significant loans, but we are graduating our students with average debts of about \$10,000 on which they are paying these exorbitant credit card rates.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. In the Democratic proposal to take the country in a new direction, one of the key components, and I am glad you brought this up, two basic provisions, cutting interest rates in half for the borrowers in most needs on subsidized student loans from a fixed rate of 6.8 percent to a fixed percent rate of 3.4 percent, and cutting rates on parent loans for undergraduate students from a fixed rate of 8.5 percent to a fixed rate of 4.25 percent.

This is about running the government and what are your priorities. Now it amazes me, Mr. DELAHUNT, it amazes me how this Republican-led Congress can go to great lengths to make sure that the oil industry gets their corporate subsidies to the tune of \$13 billion, how the health care industry will get \$20 billion in corporate welfare, and how tax cuts go predominantly to the people who make more than \$1 million a year, as we have seen tonight.

□ 2015

But yet, they refuse to try to enact proposals that the Democrats have

tried to get in place over the past several years, time and time again, in the Education Committee, in the Ways and Means Committee, in the Appropriations Committee, in the Judiciary Committee, whatever it takes to try to get these proposals enacted. And we run up against the stone wall of Republican ideology that is hellbent on making sure the wealthiest people in the world, in the United States, get their corporate welfare at the expense of average citizens.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would suggest that this particular study illustrates exactly what you said. Rather than cap loans that students can take out, or that parents can take out in their behalf, what we are doing is forcing these young people, our future, to go to private sources such as credit cards, and private lenders at rates that would make the Mafia blush. They ought not to be called interest rates. They ought to be called the vig. That's what the Mafia charges for a loan.

So what happens? We graduate young people, and for years they are carrying around this debt that is impossible if they are going to go on and get married and have a family of their own. It is like graduating from college and having a mortgage that you are paying off at some ridiculous rate of interest. And forget about owning a home, forget about taking a chance and initiating your own small business if that be your choice.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Welcome to the race of life, and let the Federal Government hook a piano on your back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Look at this. To illustrate what you are talking about here, you have got interest rates that are bad enough in terms of interest people have to pay in order to get on top of their college loans.

But college tuition itself has gone up. This is under the President, since President Bush has taken office. College tuition itself has gone up 40 percent.

Then you take a look at gas prices which have gone up 47 percent. You take a look at health care costs, gone up 55 percent. This is the reality for Americans today. But median household income has dropped by 4 percent. I mean, dropped. So how are Americans supposed to make up this difference? What are they supposed to do when it comes to the income that they are bringing in and the everyday costs that are a part of their life? This is, like, for a mom who has got a bunch of kids, and she is trying to figure out how many of them she is going to be able to actually feed, which one do you let go? Which one is not important? Higher education? Putting gas in your car? How are you going to get to work? How are you going to get to the grocery store? How are you going to help your family day to day?

How about health care? What happens, we all know, because everyone's heard the story. I have constituents who don't even think about this stuff

every day who can tell me, you know, most of the people that they know who don't have health insurance have to wait 'til they are so sick that they have to take their family member or themselves to the emergency room so that they can get primary health care. I mean, which one do you eliminate? Which one is not important if your income is plummeting?

Now, let's take a couple of other things that have happened under the Bush administration. You have got the typical family paying \$1,200 more a year for health insurance. You have housing that is the least affordable that it has been in 14 years. I mean, just to give you an example, in the community that I live in, I represent south Florida, the average price of a house in the two counties that I represent is over \$300,000. That is not affordable. I mean, that just puts home ownership completely out of bounds for, never mind the average person, even somebody making a decent living.

Mr. DELAHUNT. One can only imagine that young person graduating from college with this debt.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. But this is the 30-something Working Group, Mr. DELAHUNT. We identify, we are not, well, some of us are not, that far from having been through exactly the situation.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But being 30-something, things were better.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Of course.

Mr. DELAHUNT. For you when you were 20-something than your 30-something.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, let me just tell you. When my husband and I got married, we got married in 1991. And I was 24 and my husband was 26. Within several months of getting married, we were able to buy our first home. We both had health insurance. We were not worried about how to put gas in our car, and neither one of us had college tuition debt.

Fast forward to 15 years later, because I just celebrated my 15th wedding anniversary, and someone starting out just like we did can't afford a house in the community that I live in and represent. Literally they are driving their car around and have to pay more than \$50 every single time. We couldn't have afforded that on the incomes that we made. We could back in 1991, but not, back in 1991 we could afford gas prices because they were in the \$1 range, a little over a dollar. How are they supposed to do it? It is unfathomable.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But the point that you are speaking to, I think everybody understands, is that the country is heading in the wrong direction. In the space of 15 years, people that were in your situation, as you just described it with your husband, newly married, in a short period of time being able to afford a down payment, no tuition debt, and prospects for a bright future. That is not happening today. And a lot of

our friends can understand it because they continue to talk about, well, the economy is growing. I guess the question is who is it growing for? It is not growing for the middle class. It certainly isn't. It isn't growing for low income. In fact, it is not even growing for those who are affluent. It is growing for the superwealthy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What plan have you heard of from the other side of the aisle, from our good friends on the other side? Where is their economic plan? Where is their plan to fix it? What bills have they passed that reduce the deficit, that help Americans struggling to pay for gas, that help them pay for higher education? I mean, is it all you are on your own? It is all about you, and we are from the Government, and we are not here to help.

We have a plan. We have a new direction for America which is laid out right there. I hear a lot of the Republicans on the other side of the aisle accusing us of not having a plan. We have got one. Where is theirs? Because if we keep going in this direction, we are headed for more deficit and more of our citizens twisting in the wind.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Their plan, Mr. Speaker, has been implemented. We are now experiencing the results of their plan, cause and effect. They issued, they administered, they proposed, they passed year after year after year. Democrats, we couldn't stop anything if we wanted to. Went through the House, went through the Senate, the President had the signing ceremony, brought everybody behind him, had 50 pens and was passing them out to all the leadership. And the end result is that chart that you just had up: higher gas prices, higher college tuition costs, higher health care costs, lower median income, \$9 billion lost in Iraq, nobody knows where it is. We are building roads and hospitals and schools in Iraq while we are cutting funding here. Katrina, we are paying people's divorce lawyer bills. I mean, come on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are paying for funerals for people who didn't die as a result of the hurricane.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And yet we have not begun to even address the real issues of rebuilding the Gulf States, of taking care of the people in Mississippi and Louisiana, and allowing the insurance companies in those States to tell people that, sorry, you are not covered, despite the fact that they were told early on. Thankfully, we have leaders, and I am particularly proud of someone like a GENE TAYLOR and others from the Gulf States that stand up and speak to these issues, and Members on the other side of the aisle, for that matter. I was listening to Senator LOTT just recently speaking about this issue.

But the truth is, you are right. The consequences of the plan of the Bush administration and the Bush Congress has resulted in \$3 per gallon of gas, a deficit that is a Hall of Fame record, a dependence on China and Japan and

the United Kingdom and OPEC countries to finance our debt, a decline of the median income for a middle-class family in this country, and housing that is not affordable today for most Americans, and as you suggested, TIM, a health care system that is, to call it a system is hyperbole. It just is not a system. And this is what we have.

We finally have seen the plan, and the plan is being rejected by most Americans because it is clear that it is taking this country in the wrong direction, and if it continues in this way, we will become a second-tier Nation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, you are absolutely right. The contrast here is that when it comes to actually improving the economy and beginning to go in a new direction, the Republicans have no plan at all. More of the same. More deficits, more tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, more people who are going to go uninsured, more of the same; as opposed to the Democrats' new direction for America, Mr. RYAN, that you have on the easel next to you.

And I think it would be useful to take, Mr. Speaker, the Members through what the Democrats' plan is if we take the majority back of this institution and the things that we would implement if we were able to actually implement an agenda.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is a comprehensive agenda, and what I love most about what the Democrats are going to do when they get in charge, our agenda is integrated into creating a government that works in the 21st century. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side are like dinosaurs. They keep trying to work and run the government like it is 1950. It is 2006. We have new technologies, new communications, a new ability to administer government, and the Republicans are caught in the stone age like dinosaurs, unable to run the government.

Look at Katrina. Look at the war. Look at all the issues that we have talked about. It is their inability to run.

So what I like about what the Democrats are doing is we are taking a very new, cutting-edge, progressive approach to administering government. And it starts with making health care more affordable. We are going to use the ability, buying power to make sure we eliminate the major influence of drug companies and HMOs, corporate welfare, basically, that the Republicans gave to the health care industry; get lower drug costs, encourage competition, and make sure that we invest in the stem cell and other medical research. We have cutting-edge technologies that we are that close to getting to, and the Republicans are cutting the budget for research.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And, Mr. RYAN, don't forget. We have a plan that would allow small businesses to pool their resources and pool their risk that, if we were allowed to implement

it, and if we were in the majority in this institution, we would pass legislation that would do that without totally eliminating the benefits that are part of these health insurance packages.

In the Republicans' legislation that they crammed through the Congress with a rubber-stamp vote that they typically do, their solution was to pass bare-bones insurance legislation that basically provides coverage for almost nothing. And you would basically dumb down any insurance policy. Some people might say, well, some insurance is better than none. But when you have the second leading cause of death for women in this country, being breast cancer, and in most States mammograms are a mandated insurance benefit, their plan would allow the elimination of that required coverage. If you implement it and their plan became law, we would ensure that fewer women would be able to get mammograms, and the incidences of breast cancer would go up.

□ 2030

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right. And what I really love is what JOHN TANNER's bill is doing, and JOHN TANNER is a Democrat from Tennessee, a Blue Dog Democrat, and this is just good stuff. We are going to audit the government. When we get back in charge, we are going to throw everything on the table, and we are going to audit everything. We are just going to start over, figure out why we are wasting so much money. And Mr. TANNER and I had a great conversation, Mr. Speaker, last week. And we are going to have Mr. TANNER down here because he needs to participate in the 30-something group to explain to the House of Representatives just exactly what his bill does. But in a thumbnail sketch, it audits all of the branches of government. It audits all of the agencies of government. And we can squeeze wasteful spending out of the government right now and invest that money into things that matter.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And let us remember, Mr. Speaker, who is running the government. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that this administration for the past 6 years has been run by a Republican President, a Republican Vice President. All of the Cabinet members, with one exception, are Republican. The House has been run by the majority party, which is the Republican Party. On the Senate side, Mr. Speaker, the majority party has been Republican. So what we are seeing and what we are getting is Republicanism, but not really the traditional mainstream Republican Party that has made significant contributions to this great country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Teddy Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to know where all the Members from 1994 went when they were saying we have got to run government like a business, we need a balanced budget amendment, we cannot afford all this wasteful spending. Democrats now have a bill that we are going to put

forth before this Congress when we take over of how to run this place like a business. Now, we realize it is not a business; so there are things we are limited to do. But there is no excuse why we cannot audit this government and find the waste and invest it into math, science, education, health. We cannot keep going to the taxpayers and asking them for more and more money.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Can I just digress for one moment?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Please.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We had a 10-hour, I don't want to call it a debate because it was not a debate.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Special Order.

Mr. DELAHUNT. It was a long Special Order about Iraq. And I thought what was particularly striking was, as people spoke even on the other side, the references that were made specifically to Secretary Rumsfeld.

Now, if you had a CEO of a business that was running the business into the ground, that was being exposed by his own subordinates again and again and again, what would happen in the private sector? And just look back at what the administration had to say.

I mean, I always think of what the former Secretary of State, Colin Powell, had to say about the Vice President. He said the Vice President was so obsessed with attacking Iraq, that it was as if he had war fever. Well, you know, the problem with fever is that you become delusional and you see things or hear things that aren't necessarily there no matter how true you want them to be. I mean, it was the Vice President himself who said that we were going to be greeted as liberators. I think that lasted for maybe 1½ days. Rumsfeld himself said that the war wasn't going to last any more than 6 months. Wrong. His Deputy, Paul Wolfowitz, said that Iraq could pay for its own reconstruction from its oil revenue. Wrong. We were told that the administration had a coherent plan for reconstruction and bringing peace to a nation that had experienced the brutality of a Saddam Hussein, a coherent plan. Wrong. It just goes on and on.

The truth is that the administration's incompetence, absolute rank incompetence, has set back our efforts to deal with terrorism all over this planet.

And you don't have to take our words for their incompetence. If our staffer is present, I would like to just put on some of the quotes, not coming from a partisan Member of Congress, but from people who served their country. Here is one coming now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We do not have the military one.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, this is as good, I guess.

The former House Speaker, Newt Gingrich, speaking about this Republican Congress, can you read that for me.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Sure. What former House Speaker, leader of

the Republican revolution on this Republican Congress said, he cited a series of blunders. You referred to our Republican colleagues' incompetence a minute ago, Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, former Speaker Gingrich "cited a series of blunders under Republican rule from failures in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina," which we have been talking about this evening, "to mismanagement of the war in Iraq. He . . . said the government has squandered billions of dollars in Iraq."

And our good friend Mr. TANNER, whom you just talked about, and the audit he wants to accomplish once we are in the majority, he analogized that legislation to a mechanic looking under the hood because that is really what is necessary here. I think I would want to make sure I had some Purell with me after we looked under the hood when the Republicans are put aside and maybe have a mask just so that I wouldn't become infected by some of the mismanagement and gross incompetence that has clearly occurred here under Republican rule.

I mean, a deficit of more than \$8 trillion, a debt that is more in the time that President Bush has been in office than all previous 42 Presidents combined, a war in Iraq that has created a cesspool in a country that was in bad shape to start with, but that literally the situation that they are in now in Iraq with the terrorism on the rise that exists there was created by this President and the Republicans' war.

Mr. DELAHUNT. To go back to the point that Mr. RYAN was making relative to if this were a business, if this were a business, which brought me to the point of the incompetence specifically of the Secretary of Defense, and to think despite call after call for his resignation, would this have ever happened in the private sector?

And as I was saying, this is not your words, our words, my words. Here is retired Army Major General Paul Eaton. This is back in March. He is speaking about the Secretary of Defense, and these are, again, his words: "He has shown himself incompetent strategically, operationally, and tactically and is, far more than anyone, responsible for what has happened to our important mission in Iraq . . . Mr. Rumsfeld must step down."

Now, it is okay, I guess, for the President to ignore those words, but if we had a Congress that took its oversight role seriously, I would have expected that once those words appeared in print that the appropriate committee of jurisdiction, possibly the Armed Services Committee, and I know you serve on that, Mr. RYAN, would have immediately issued a request to Major General Paul Eaton to come before it to give his opinion and his views. Did we see that?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, when you look at what happened in the late 1990s with what the Republican committees were willing to investigate going on in the

executive branch, what they were willing to investigate under President Clinton, they spent \$40 million chasing him around, and now you are not even willing to provide some oversight for the war or Katrina or any of these other things? It is not a witch hunt. These guys are saying we are screwing up, let us fix it.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The silence coming from the Congress is just overwhelming. There has not been a single committee in the House of Representatives that invited General Paul Eaton to come before it and testify. Talk about a rubber stamp.

Well, now here is retired Marine Lieutenant General Gregory Newbold. He had these words to say in April: "My sincere view is that the commitment of our forces to this fight was done with the casualness and swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions or bury the results."

Has there been a request from one single committee of this House to Marine Lieutenant General Newbold to come before us to listen to what he has to say about the incompetence of the civilian leadership of Secretary Rumsfeld? Not one invitation that I am aware of.

And here is retired General John Baptiste, again, speaking about the Secretary of Defense. This was reported in *The Washington Post* on April 13: "We went to war with a flawed plan that didn't account for the hard work to build the peace after we took down the regime. We also served under a Secretary of Defense who didn't understand leadership, who was abusive, who was arrogant, who didn't build a strong team."

I know there are more posters. Now, what would have happened in the private sector? Is this a way to do business? Is this competence? I could go on and on and on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman from Ohio would yield, because the contrast to what is going on in the cesspool that has been created by the Republican leadership in Iraq is that if we were in the majority in this Congress, we would implement the real security agenda. We would focus on making sure that there was a plan in Iraq so that we can train the Iraqi troops to take care of the business at hand in Iraq on their own and begin to phase out our involvement there.

□ 2045

Yet there is no plan to do that. There is no timetable. There isn't anything coming from this President that would say when a percentage of Iraqi troops are prepared, that we are going to pull out X percentage of American troops. We have to make sure we start focusing on the terrorism here at home.

What happens instead, in the debate we had the other day, where it should have been a debate, like you said, it was not a debate, but in the basic fil-

buster, single-subject filibuster in which we were afforded no opportunity to present or talk about our alternative, instead you had bobblehead after bobblehead on the other side of the aisle just come up to the podium and shake their head up and down and say exactly what the administration wanted them to say. Then they put their votes up on the board and did exactly what was expected of them, vote to rubber-stamp the exact same stay-the-course policy that Americans clearly have indicated they do not want to continue. I don't know what hometown these people are going home to.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I can, for just a moment, I hear all this foo-for-all about we have to stay the course, and we will stand down when they stand up.

It must have been a shock to President Bush, do you remember when he made that visit, I think it was about a week ago, to Baghdad? Well, on his way home he was discussing the visit with reporters and his conversations with Iraqi leaders and he made this statement that was reported in the *Associated Press*: "There are concerns about our commitment in keeping our troops there. They," meaning the Iraqis, "are worried almost to a person that we will leave before they are capable of defending themselves, and I assured them they didn't have to worry." That is the President.

But apparently when he said "almost to a person," he is not including the president of Iraq and the vice president of Iraq, because the *Associated Press* reported the day after that Iraq's vice president had asked President Bush for a timeline, for a timeline, for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Iraq.

Here is the quote: "Vice President Tarik al-Hashimy, a Sunni, made the request during his meeting with Bush on Tuesday when the U.S. President made a surprise visit to Iraq. President Talabani, in a statement that was released after the meeting, said 'I supported him in this,' meaning the vice president."

So when we hear that we can't give a timeline or a table for when we withdraw, Mr. Speaker, the Iraqis are asking us to do it. They are asking us, Mr. Speaker.

So, please, you know, cut the politics. Run away from the politics. Let's cut and run from the politics and talk about the truth.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. So that way we can get back to talking about what Americans' priorities are here; making sure their kids can afford college, making sure when they are sick they can go to the doctor, but right now they can't because 46 million Americans don't have health insurance; making sure that gas prices aren't over \$3 a gallon, with record profits going to the oil industry, and this Congress, led by the Republicans, passing legislation twice last summer with every single Republican voting yes and them holding the vote open at

least 40 minutes to make sure that they could twist enough arms to give away subsidies to an oil industry that is already making more money than they know what to do with.

I mean, if you were watching Meet the Press on Sunday and you saw the three CEOs of the oil industry just completely not getting that they need to be part of this solution, and no one in this Congress, that is leading this Congress, except for us, who are making every attempt, no one asking the oil industry to step up and invest their revenue from their profits into alternative energy resources. It is just absolutely unbelievable.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We don't mind you making a profit. Profit is not a dirty word. Go out and make money, hire Americans, this is good news. But do it in the national interest.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Exxon-Mobil invested \$10 million, and made \$30 billion; \$10 million in alternative energy last year. That is what they talked about on Meet the Press on Sunday.

I mean, give me a break. Where is the commitment? Where are the priorities?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Who was the one gentleman, Lee Raymond, that got big time money. I don't know how many millions he made last year. I know he got a \$2 million tax break.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. \$400 million.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think he made \$390-some million. So they are paying this guy a \$398 million retirement package, \$2 million tax break, and companies like this are only investing \$10 million, when they can give them a retirement package of \$400 million.

Newt Gingrich said, just to wrap up, our good friend, Mr. Speaker, about the Republican Congress, "They are seen by the country as being in charge of a government that can't function." This is your laundry list that you just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, all of these posters are available on our web site for other Members to access at [www.housedemocrats.gov/30something](http://www.housedemocrats.gov/30something). All these posters are available.

We missed our good friend Mr. MEEK, and we cheer on the Miami Heat.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CARNAHAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CLEAVER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CUELLAR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel problems.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and June 20 on account of family matters.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel problems.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of airline delays due to inclement weather.

Mr. THOMPSON of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of bad weather and travel delays.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for the week of June 19 on account of family obligations.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of flight delays.

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a flight delay due to inclement weather.

#### 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:)

Mr. DEFAZZO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and June 26.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and June 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, June 20 and 21.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today and June 20, 21, and 22.

Ms. HARRIS, for 5 minutes, June 20. (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 20, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., for morning hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8137. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Ohio, West Virginia, and Wisconsin [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0029] received June 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8138. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Transfer of Sugar Program Marketing Allocations (RIN: 0560-AH37) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8139. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments [Docket No. 1998C-0790] (formerly 98C-0790), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8140. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Food Labeling: Health Claims; Dietary Noncariogenic Carbohydrate Sweeteners and Dental Caries [Docket No. 2004P-0294] received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8141. A letter from the Chief, Policy Section, Military Awards Branch, Department of Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Decorations, Medals, Ribbons, & Similar Devices (RIN: 0702-AA41) received June 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8142. A letter from the Legal Counsel, Terrorism Risk Insurance Program, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; TRIA Extension Act Implementation (RIN: 1505-AB66) received May 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8143. A letter from the Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Amendment to the Bank Secrecy Act Regulations — Requirement That Mutual Funds Report Suspicious Transactions (RIN: 1506-AA37) received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8144. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Share Insurance and Appendix (RIN: 3133-AD18) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8145. A letter from the General Counsel, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — AmeriCorps Grant Applications from Professional Corps (RIN: 3045-AA46) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8146. A letter from the Director, OLMS, Office of Policy, Reports & Disclosure, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standards of Conduct for

Federal Sector Labor Organizations (RIN: 1215-AB48) received June 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8147. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Assistance Regulations — (RIN: 1991-AB72) received May 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8148. A letter from the Chairman, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting pursuant to the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act, the Foundation's Form and Content Reports for the second quarter of FY 2006 as prepared by the U.S. General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8149. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Management and Procurement Executive, Department of Commerce, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum M-06-01, the Department's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8150. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of House and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8151. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Government National Mortgage Associations: Excess Yield Securities [Docket No. FR-4958-F-02] (RIN: 2503-AA18) received June 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8152. A letter from the Attorney, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8153. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8154. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8155. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two Semiannual Reports which were prepared separately by Treasury's Office of Inspector General (OIG) and the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA) for the period ended March 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8156. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the Bank's Annual Management Report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2005, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8157. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2005 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the No Fear Act, Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8158. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semi-annual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period from Oc-

tober 1, 2005 through March 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8159. A letter from the Director, Compliance and Evaluation Division, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Federal Fleet Report for Fiscal Year 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8160. A letter from the Director, National Gallery of Art, transmitting a Gallery's Fiscal Year 2005 Commercial Activities Inventory Report, pursuant to Public Law 105-270; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8161. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8162. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8163. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8164. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Chief Human Capital Officers (CHCO) Council's Report to Congress covering FY 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1401 note Public Law 107-296 section 1303(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8165. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's report on agencies' use of extended assignment incentives for the period May 2, 2003 through December 31, 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8166. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's assessment of the effectiveness of the extended assignment incentive authority as a human resources management tool and recommendations for any changes necessary to improve the effectiveness of the incentive authority for the period May 2, 2003 through December 31, 2005, pursuant to Public Law 107-273, section 207(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8167. A letter from the EEO Director, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Office's FY 2005 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the No Fear Act, Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8168. A letter from the Acting Director, Security, Safety, and Law Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Public Conduct on Bureau of Reclamation Facilities, Lands, and Waterbodies (RIN: 1006-AA45) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8169. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 060216044-6044-01; I.D. 030906B] received June 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8170. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No. 051104293 5344 02; I.D. 050906A] received June 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8171. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Safety Standards for Flight Guidance Systems [Docket No.: FAA-2004-18775; Amendment No. 25-119] (RIN: 2120-AI41) received June 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8172. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Under Section 1502; Amendment of Tacking Rule Requirements of Life-Nonlife Consolidated Regulations [TD 9258] (RIN: 1545-BE86) received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8173. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous (Rev. Proc. 2006-26) received May 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8174. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Intercompany Transactions; Manufacturer Incentive Payments [TD 9261] (RIN: 1545-BF32) received May 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8175. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Filing of Applications and Requirements for Widow's and Widower's Benefits (RIN: 0960-AG32) received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### 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. DREIER: Committee on Rules. H.R. 4890. A bill to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority; with an amendment (Rept. 109-505 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5341. A bill to amend section 5313 of title 31, United States Code, to reform certain requirements for reporting cash transactions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-506). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 877. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5631) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-507). 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 Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BAKER, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. BEAN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 5637. A bill to streamline the regulation of nonadmitted insurance and reinsurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. HULSHOF, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 5638. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit against the estate tax to an exclusion equivalent of \$5,000,000 and to repeal the sunset provision for the estate and generation-skipping taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HERSETH:

H.R. 5639. A bill to reauthorize the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project; to the Committee on Resources.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Ms. GRANGER.  
 H.R. 111: Mr. REICHERT.  
 H.R. 500: Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H.R. 503: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FORD, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 920: Mr. ADERHOLT.  
 H.R. 952: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 998: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1125: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. DELAHUNT.  
 H.R. 1298: Mr. MACK.  
 H.R. 1366: Mr. KLINE.  
 H.R. 1554: Mr. BASS.  
 H.R. 1632: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 1688: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 1898: Mr. KIRK.  
 H.R. 2533: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
 H.R. 2567: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 2568: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 2669: Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 2730: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. WATSON.  
 H.R. 2737: Mr. BOSWELL.  
 H.R. 2861: Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 2945: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 3022: Mr. FILNER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. CLYBURN.  
 H.R. 3034: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 3427: Mr. PITTS.  
 H.R. 3459: Mr. PLATTS.  
 H.R. 3760: Mrs. TAUSCHER.  
 H.R. 3795: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. MURPHY.  
 H.R. 3883: Mr. PEARCE.  
 H.R. 4047: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 4215: Mr. BOSWELL.  
 H.R. 4341: Mr. WELLER.  
 H.R. 4381: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.R. 4494: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 4672: Mr. BEAUPREZ.  
 H.R. 4760: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. CLYBURN.  
 H.R. 4777: Miss McMORRIS.  
 H.R. 4890: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Miss McMORRIS.  
 H.R. 4924: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 4941: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. SHAYS.  
 H.R. 4942: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. SHAYS.  
 H.R. 4974: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 4993: Mr. ROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 5005: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SWEENEY.  
 H.R. 5150: Mr. HOLT.  
 H.R. 5171: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. CHABOT.  
 H.R. 5185: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
 H.R. 5188: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 H.R. 5189: Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H.R. 5190: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 5201: Mr. PETRI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. HULSHOF.  
 H.R. 5211: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.  
 H.R. 5290: Ms. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 5312: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. REHBERG.  
 H.R. 5315: Mr. COOPER, Mr. BOYD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 5316: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. CLYBURN.  
 H.R. 5319: Mr. MURPHY.  
 H.R. 5356: Mr. HALL.  
 H.R. 5358: Mr. HALL.  
 H.R. 5363: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
 H.R. 5367: Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 5396: Mr. STRICKLAND.  
 H.R. 5416: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. PEARCE.  
 H.R. 5444: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. PEARCE.  
 H.R. 5458: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 5470: Mr. SOUDER.  
 H.R. 5478: Mr. AKIN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 5513: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. BOUCHER.  
 H.R. 5515: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5520: Mr. BASS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.R. 5533: Mr. CLYBURN.  
 H.R. 5534: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. CONAWAY.  
 H.R. 5538: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 5542: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 5550: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. DELAHUNT.  
 H.R. 5560: Mr. CLEAVER.  
 H.R. 5579: Mr. LANTOS.  
 H.R. 5588: Mr. BARROW, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mrs. MALONEY.  
 H.R. 5594: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 5611: Mr. WHITFIELD.  
 H. J. Res. 86: Mr. SANDERS.  
 H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. CLYBURN.  
 H. Con. Res. 318: Ms. SOLIS.  
 H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. KLINE and Ms. ESHOO.  
 H. Con. Res. 407: Mr. PEARCE.  
 H. Con. Res. 415: Mr. PEARCE and Ms. ROSELEHTINEN.  
 H. Res. 295: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.  
 H. Res. 518: Mrs. CUBIN.  
 H. Res. 723: Mr. BOYD and Mr. DINGELL.  
 H. Res. 731: Mr. POMBO and Mrs. DRAKE.  
 H. Res. 787: Mr. COSTA and Mr. CUELLAR.  
 H. Res. 800: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. PUTNAM.  
 H. Res. 838: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. CARDOZA.  
 H. Res. 846: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H. Res. 867: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5631

OFFERED BY: Mr. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 1: Strike section 9012 (page 115, lines 1 through 4).

H.R. 5631

OFFERED BY: Mr. DEFazio

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10001. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to initiate military operations except in accordance with Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.