



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2006

No. 117

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable PHIL GINGREY 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 Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for 5 minutes.

IRAQIS MUST ASSUME MORE RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I am very concerned about Iraq. Very concerned. The weather vane of the Iraqi fight has shifted clearly to the Iraqis. It is theirs to win or lose. General John Abizaid stated yesterday, "It's very, very clear that in order to win in Iraq, the Iraqis have to assume more and more responsibility."

Last week, there were two developments in Iraq that I feel need to be

highlighted. First, the Marine Corps' chief of intelligence in Iraq has reportedly described the situation in the Sunni-dominated Anbar province as "politically" lost to al Qaeda. The second is the plan to secure Baghdad from the insurgents by encircling it with, for lack of a better word, a moat. The idea of a moat went out of style in the middle ages. Both of these reports paint a less than rosy picture of how we are faring in this war that has already cost so much in blood and treasure. These two developments indicate that our level of effort is insufficient to maintain control of the country.

On the basis of these and other reports, some analysts determined that the solution to our problems in Baghdad and the Anbar province is to send more troops to Iraq. This might sound like a plausible course of action except for the fundamental problem that there are no more units to send to Iraq. Oh, certainly we can surge units forward into combat, but there is no way we can sustain that increase for any significant period of time. The administration's poor planning and poor strategic choices in Iraq have depleted our military of equipment and manpower. Iraq has become a black hole, sapping our strategic base of resources. The readiness situation has become so bad that our nondeployed combat brigades report that if called today, they may not be fully ready to complete all of their wartime missions.

The fact that our ground force readiness has fallen to such a dangerous level risks emboldening our enemies both in Iraq and elsewhere in the world. We must act now to reverse this decline. Certainly spending more money on Army and Marine Corps readiness will help. The Congress has provided additional funds to reset Army and Marine Corps equipment. But even with that increased funding, it will take some time for our units to get healthy again. I also strongly urge

the administration to submit a budget that realistically reflects the services' needs.

But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, additional money will not be enough. We do not have the luxury of staying the course. The conflict in Iraq has depleted our ground forces and placed this country at strategic risk. We must start making significant progress in Iraq now, and the best way to do it is by transitioning the responsibility for Iraqi security to the Iraqis. I urge the administration to redouble its efforts to train and equip the Iraqi security forces.

COMBATING CORRUPTION REQUIRES EXPANDING FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, according to the State Department, international corruption costs American companies that play by the rules many billions of dollars in lost exports. Corruption impedes government efforts to deliver basic efforts to citizens, weakens confidence in democracy, and is often linked to international criminal activity. It causes rampant economic inefficiency, interferes with capital markets, and obviously contributes to poverty.

Transparency International is a global not-for-profit organization dedicated to the fight against corruption. Transparency puts out annual reports on the state of corruption worldwide, trying to measure whether we are winning or losing that fight.

This fight is a top priority for the U.S. Departments of State, Justice and Commerce. My colleagues, since 1979, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD, has had a convention against corruption

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.

H6661

and continues to see it as a top global priority. All this reflects a growing international consensus that corruption is a problem that we must confront. That much is true. But working on anticorruption campaigns, all these entities treat the symptoms rather than the disease. The disease is oppression and lawlessness. The cure is freedom and the rule of law.

The annual Index of Economic Freedom, compiled by the Heritage Foundation and the Wall Street Journal, provides a simple framework for understanding how open countries are to competition; the degree of state intervention in the economy, whether through taxation, spending or overregulation; and the strength and independence of a country's judiciary to enforce rules and protect private property.

One of the indicators in the index is the size of a nation's "informal," or black market economy, which helps to measure this corruption. Charting the relationship between economic freedom and the size of the informal economy as a percentage of GDP, the Heritage Foundation found a positive correlation between these two factors. They reported, "as economic freedom vanishes, the informal economy takes a larger share of GDP. The size of the informal economy in economically unfree and repressed economies is almost three times the size of the informal economy in free economies, and almost double the size of the informal economy in mostly free economies." The Heritage calculations demonstrate the perverse effect of economic repression on the moral behavior of simple, ordinary people and the continuation of the cycle of poverty that entraps them.

Access to credit in most developed countries is the key to a better standard of living. That access is incumbent upon proving income or property, for which you need a formal job and a legal title to that property.

When it is difficult for people to invest in business, whether a corner grocery store or a major factory, formal jobs are hard to come by. Jobs can be more easily had in the informal economy, where small and medium entrepreneurs can negotiate salaries and benefits, and tie them to performance. In cases like this, the government bureaucracy encumbers legal businesses, encouraging employers and employees to operate in the shadows.

Without a formal job, you can still get credit if you have titled property to offer as collateral. But while Peruvian economist Hernando de Soto has shown that most of the poorest people in the developing world own property, they face innumerable bureaucratic hurdles in order to actually title that property as their own. In Peru, he says, "to obtain legal authorization to build a house on state-owned land took 6 years and 11 months. To obtain a legal title for that piece of land took 728 steps." Other countries are similarly ridicu-

lous. In Egypt, it takes 77 steps in 31 government offices and anywhere from 6 to 14 years. In the Philippines, it takes 168 steps through 53 offices and anywhere from 13 to 25 years to get legal title to this property.

An oppressive government system perpetuates the poverty of its citizens by making it impossible to claim their property rights and pursue legal employment. Equally important, the Heritage Foundation says that the resulting black market economy "creates a culture of contempt for the law and fosters corruption and bribery in the public sector as a necessary means to navigate the bureaucracy."

Mr. Speaker, when those folks, particularly international elites, take on corruption, they see it as just one more corporate scandal to be uncovered and think that will be that and we can fix it. One more capitalistic crime, they call it, that must be prosecuted. That is not it. That is not it at all. In reality, corruption indicates a simple lack of freedom and, more importantly, a consistent rule of law.

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 41 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 (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Most Reverend Anthony Sablan Apuron, Archbishop of Agana, Guam, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, whose goodness fills our hearts with joy and whose love permeates our daily lives, You are blessed for bringing us together to work in harmony, in peace, and in justice. Send Your blessings upon our United States House of Representatives, who generously devote themselves to the work of our Nation and territories in the laws they pass and the resolutions they create.

In times of difficulty, challenge and need, grant them the strength to transcend personal interests and seek only after the common good for all. Strengthen them, Lord, with Your grace and wisdom so that everything that they do may begin with Your inspiration, may continue with Your guidance and, by You, be happily ended.

Grace us with Your saving presence and aid us with Your constant blessing.

All glory and praise be to You, our ever-living God, forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BORDALLO 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.

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 bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5684. An act to implement the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 19, 2006, at 10:25 a.m.:

That the Senate returned the papers to the House pursuant to H. Res. 1011 H.R. 503.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

WELCOMING THE MOST REVEREND ANTHONY SABLAN APURON, O.F.M. CAP., D.D. METROPOLITAN ARCHBISHOP OF AGANA

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, today, it is my privilege and honor to welcome His Excellency, the Most Reverend Anthony Sablan Apuron, the Archbishop of Metropolitan Archdiocese of Agana, Guam, to this House.

Archbishop Apuron is a man of great faith, wisdom and inspiration. He has shepherded the faithful on Guam, the Northern Marianas, Micronesia, Palau, and the Marshall Islands for the past 20 years as our archbishop.

The Catholic Church in the Pacific has blossomed under his leadership,

and our communities have greatly benefited from his ministry. This past weekend, Archbishop Apuron led a pilgrimage from Guam to Washington, DC, for the enshrinement of Our Lady of Camarin, the Patroness of the Marianas, in the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. Many of these pilgrims, Madam Speaker, from Guam are with us today in the gallery.

I thank Archbishop Apuron for his prayer this afternoon and for his guidance and counsel throughout the years. The people of Guam join me in thanking you, Madam Speaker, and our House chaplain, Father Daniel Coughlin, for the invitation to Archbishop Apuron to serve as guest chaplain.

I thank you. Si Yuos Maase. God bless America and God bless Guam.

POLITICIZING THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They continue to pound the drums and politicize the war on terror and unnecessarily criticize the administration. Yet they have no plan or any indication of one for how they would make our Nation more secure.

As the President said last week in his press conference, he wakes up every day to a thorough intelligence briefing that informs of the actions of numerous Islamo-fascists and others whose only goal is to destroy America, our freedoms and our way of life. He must respond to those threats.

The President is not politicizing the war on terror. He is simply carrying out his duty to protect and defend this Nation and constructing plans to ensure that our Nation is safer from potential terrorist attacks, and thus far it has been. As we all know, there has been no attack on American soil since 9/11, but many attempts have been thwarted.

This is not, and should not be, a political issue, and it is time for the Democrats to stop trying to make it one. This is about national security, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to realize what is at stake here.

IN MEMORY OF ESTHER MARTINEZ

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the memory of a very special New Mexican, Esther Martinez.

Esther Martinez is renowned for her work as an educator, author and master story teller.

Last Thursday, Esther was in Washington, DC, where I had the privilege of

helping present her with the Nation's highest honor for folk and traditional artists. At the age of 94, Esther was named as a 2006 National Heritage Fellow by the National Endowment for the Arts. With members of her family in the audience, Esther rose to be honored and received a standing ovation for her life's work preserving her native Tewa language and traditions.

Tragically, while making her way back home from the airport Saturday evening, Esther was killed in a traffic accident.

Our hearts weigh heavy with the news of Esther's tragic passing, but her legacy will forever live in the contributions she made to our Nation as an educator, linguist and master story teller.

Our deepest sympathies are with her family today.

THE POPE AND FREE SPEECH AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, over the last few days, radical Muslims burned the Pope in effigy, destroyed churches in Israel, preached hatred against the Pope and Christians, and cowardly killed a 65-year-old nun, shooting her four times in the back. So much for nonviolence by these radical Muslims.

All this because the Pope quoted a Byzantine emperor from the 1400s who commented on Muhammad's purported command "to spread by the sword the faith he preached." The Pope, of course, was not agreeing with this Byzantine emperor. The Pope was promoting discourse among all religions.

But when the feelings of these radicals get hurt, we overreact, blame ourselves and apologize. That is what the Pope did.

I question whether the Pope should have even apologized. So much for free speech, so much for religious freedom, and so much for nonviolence.

In our world, hypocritical, radical Muslims may preach hate and violence against Christians and Jews, but heaven forbid anybody mention or quote slightly negative comments about radical Muslims, because this extremist sect will react with violence to prove just how nonviolent they are.

And that's just the way it is.

A CRITICAL TIME FOR THE PEOPLE OF DARFUR

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, this week marks a critical time for the people of Darfur and for this administration's role in ending the 3-year genocide in Sudan. Hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians have been murdered by the government-backed Janjaweed, and the African

Union's peacekeeping mission mandate is set to expire within a couple of weeks.

It has been 2 years since the President declared that genocide was taking place in Darfur, but we are still allowing the Government of Sudan to act with impunity and commit crimes against humanity.

Today President Bush addressed the crisis in Darfur before the United Nations and appointed Andrew Natsios as the U.S.' Special Envoy to Sudan. This is a step in the right direction, but it is not enough. The United States must push to keep an international peacekeeping force in Darfur, and this force must be stronger and more robust, with the authority to use force to protect the innocent civilians who are trapped in this nightmare. This has to happen as quickly as possible.

Would we be this complacent if the genocide was not in Africa? Would the administration act any differently if claims of ethnic cleansing were in Europe or the Middle East? What in the world does it take for us to stand tall against the evil of genocide wherever it is taking place?

We have to act before September 30. We have to require that President el-Bashir stop the indiscriminate killing and slaughter of the helpless and the weak in his country.

RECOGNIZING CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Sunday marked the 219th anniversary of the signing of the United States Constitution. To ensure our schoolchildren are educated about our Nation's founding, Congress requires each school to hold an education program observing Constitution Day.

Yesterday, schoolchildren across the country watched as General Colin Powell led the Nationwide recitation of the Preamble. Students at Brookland-Cayce High School in Lexington County's School District 2 hung banners around the school displaying the Bill of Rights. Each senior received a pocket-sized Constitution.

Principal Scott Newman should be commended for his commitment to ensuring students at BC High are well-versed in our Nation's history. He was raised well by his parents, dedicated educators, Tom and Frankie Newman.

As Cicero said, "To remain ignorant of things that happened before you were born is to remain a child." If the goal of Constitution Day is realized, our Nation's schoolchildren will grow into engaged adult citizens.

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

GOLDEN DRAIN AWARDS TO CHERTOFF AND RUMSFELD

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, the Truth Squad on Waste, Fraud and Abuse has been tasked with holding this administration and this Congress accountable for mishandling of taxpayer dollars.

Last week the Truth Squad recognized the first two winners of the Golden Drain Award, Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld.

We created this award to bring attention to the waste, fraud and abuse in government. Otherwise it will never stop.

Overseeing a department that has squandered billions of taxpayer dollars, Michael Chertoff and Donald Rumsfeld are clearly deserving of this inauspicious honor.

In FEMA alone, we have seen billions of dollars go down the golden drain as a result of no-bid contracts and fraud during the aftermath of the Katrina crisis.

The Defense Department has been unable to produce a clean audit, and the Pentagon's track record of waste, fraud and mismanagement in Iraq under Mr. Rumsfeld is disgraceful.

All told, the Truth Squad has identified over \$150 billion that has gone down the golden drain.

Republicans believe that government does not work, and this administration seems to prove it every single day. Enough is enough. It is time for a new direction.

PRETEXTING AND HP

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, it was recently reported that in order to stop boardroom media leaks, investigators hired by Hewlett-Packard used pretexting to obtain the phone records of directors and journalists. This disclosure demonstrates another nasty byproduct of having the availability of Internet-based personal information instantly available.

One of the major reasons for the growing pretexting problem is the lax data security at businesses that hold sensitive consumer information. The Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection Subcommittee which I chair has amassed an extensive record on these issues.

I have introduced H.R. 4127, the Data Accountability and Trust Act, which is designed to improve data security and attack the scourge of privacy-infringing practices, like pretexting, that continue to be exploited on the Internet. The DATA Act will go a long way toward protecting the privacy rights of all Americans, and I urge its consideration by the full House.

MILITARY TRIBUNALS

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on the House and Senate to quickly pass the right kind of military tribunal legislation.

We are in a war for the future of civilization, and military tribunals provide the best way for us to bring brutal terrorists to justice and to prevent future attacks on our citizens.

Military commissions have been successfully used throughout United States history to bring dangerous war criminals to justice. President Roosevelt used them in 1942 to try eight German saboteurs who plotted to attack the United States. In fact, military commissions have been used by President Lincoln and even General George Washington. Now Congress must allow this same power to our modern-day Presidents.

The right kind of military tribunal legislation can help us to disrupt actual terrorist plots right here in America; access critical information on al Qaeda; and prevent handing over Top Secret information to men like Khalid Sheikh Muhammad, one of the masterminds of September 11.

September 11 was one of the darkest days in United States history. We must give our military the power to continue preventing other devastating attacks.

□ 1415

RULE OF LAW AND PRISONERS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. We are having a very important debate in this country on how we deal with terrorist prisoners or so-called terrorist prisoners and the way that we try them and the way that we present evidence.

Many of you will remember that in the Oklahoma City bombing when Timothy McVeigh was captured no one in the United States of America said, We are not going to give him all the rights under our Constitution, we are not going to show him the evidence that we have against him; we are going to deny him all his full rights to a jury trial.

If you think about it, no matter how heinous the crime is, when it occurs here, Americans say we have the rule of law, that is who we are. And no matter how horrible and horrifying it is, each individual has a process.

It seems to me that when we deal with this war on terrorism that we are talking about so much, that we owe it to ourselves as a country that established the rule of law that we make sure that those who are accused get the charges against them and the right to defend themselves.

MILITARY COUP IN THAILAND

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

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, news reports indicate that there may be an ongoing military coup under way in Thailand against the democratically elected government.

As a new member of the National Endowment for Democracy's board, I think we should take all threats to new democracies very seriously and lay out a clear policy for the United States to follow. We should support the democratic Prime Minister of Thailand. And if military forces succeed, it should be the policy of our State Department to terminate all U.S. assistance to Thailand.

It should be the policy of our Treasury Department to undermine the Bot, the Thai currency; it should be the policy of the Department of Defense to cease all military contact with the Thai military; and it should be the policy of our government in general to undermine military rulers in Thailand and return a democratically elected Prime Minister to office.

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 6:30 p.m. today.

WOOL SUIT FABRIC LABELING FAIRNESS AND INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS CONFORMING ACT

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4583) to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to revise the requirements for labeling of certain wool and cashmere products, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4583

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wool Suit Fabric Labeling Fairness and International Standards Conforming Act".

SEC. 2. LABELING OF WOOL AND CASHMERE PRODUCTS TO FACILITATE COMPLIANCE AND PROTECT CONSUMERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(a) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 (15 U.S.C. 68b(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(5) In the case of a wool product stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as—

"(A) 'Super 80's' or '80's', if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 19.75 microns or finer;

"(B) 'Super 90's' or '90's', if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 19.25 microns or finer;

"(C) 'Super 100's' or '100's', if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 18.75 microns or finer;

"(D) 'Super 110's' or '110's', if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 18.25 microns or finer;

“(E) ‘Super 120’s’ or ‘120’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 17.75 microns or finer;

“(F) ‘Super 130’s’ or ‘130’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 17.25 microns or finer;

“(G) ‘Super 140’s’ or ‘140’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 16.75 microns or finer;

“(H) ‘Super 150’s’ or ‘150’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 16.25 microns or finer;

“(I) ‘Super 160’s’ or ‘160’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 15.75 microns or finer;

“(J) ‘Super 170’s’ or ‘170’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 15.25 microns or finer;

“(K) ‘Super 180’s’ or ‘180’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 14.75 microns or finer;

“(L) ‘Super 190’s’ or ‘190’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 14.25 microns or finer;

“(M) ‘Super 200’s’ or ‘200’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 13.75 microns or finer;

“(N) ‘Super 210’s’ or ‘210’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 13.25 microns or finer;

“(O) ‘Super 220’s’ or ‘220’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 12.75 microns or finer;

“(P) ‘Super 230’s’ or ‘230’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 12.25 microns or finer;

“(Q) ‘Super 240’s’ or ‘240’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 11.75 microns or finer; and

“(R) ‘Super 250’s’ or ‘250’s’, if the average diameter of wool fiber of such wool product does not average 11.25 microns or finer.

In each such case, the average fiber diameter of such wool product may be subject to such standards or deviations as adopted by regulation by the Commission.

“(6) In the case of a wool product stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as cashmere, if—

“(A) such wool product is not the fine (dehaired) undercoat fibers produced by a cashmere goat (*capra hircus laniger*);

“(B) the average diameter of the fiber of such wool product exceeds 19 microns; or

“(C) such wool product contains more than 3 percent (by weight) of cashmere fibers with average diameters that exceed 30 microns. The average fiber diameter may be subject to a coefficient of variation around the mean that shall not exceed 24 percent.”

(b) APPLICABILITY DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to wool products manufactured on or after January 1, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4583, the Wool Suit Fabric Labeling Fairness and International Standards Conforming Act, introduced by my colleague, Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee, and co-sponsored by my colleague, the ranking member of our subcommittee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois.

This is a simple bill, my colleagues, which is fundamental and has a fundamental purpose: to give consumers the information they need to make buying decisions about the products they want.

This bill would amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to make specific and standard certain designations of fabric quality for certain wool products.

For years, high-end suits and other expensive wool garments have carried the label “super” and a number like 120 or 130, to designate the fineness of the weave of the wool and thus the quality and cost of producing the fabric. It is about time we make certain that there is a standard, internationally accepted definition of the “super” designation to ensure that unscrupulous garment manufacturers don’t dupe consumers with simple phony labels. We owe that to the American consumer and to the great American textile industry that produces these fine products.

H.R. 4583 makes the “super” designation a standard designation of quality wool products. Likewise, the Wool Suit Fabric Labeling Fairness and International Standards Conforming Act creates a specific and standard definition of cashmere so that the term cashmere actually means a certain thing rather than serving as an nonspecific reference to a quality. The end result is a bill that establishes a legal standard for labeling “super” and cashmere wool products based on internationally accepted standards.

As I said, while these may seem a bit technical, standardizing the designation of a certain level of quality, no matter what the products, allows consumers and the manufacturers alike to be certain that what they are spending their hard-earned dollars on is real and is genuine. That is a laudable goal for any piece of legislation.

I therefore would like to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it on final passage.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4583, the Wool Suit Fabric Labeling Fairness and International Standards Conforming Act; and I want to thank Representative BLACKBURN, the lead sponsor of H.R. 4583. It was a pleasure to work with her and her staff on a bill that would help consumers, American workers, and manufacturers in the wool products industry.

Our bill would update the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to include the internationally recognized standards for wool fiber content of the various

“super” grade fabric, and ensure that any clothing labeled as cashmere actually includes hair from the cashmere goat.

Although quite simple and straightforward, our bill is very important to the U.S. wool products industry. With the increase in imports from China, the domestic apparel manufacturers and textile mills face significant challenges to maintaining employment and production. By requiring clothing to be labeled properly, our bill will help level the playing field. It will ensure that consumers are better informed about the products they are buying, and it will put an end to mislabeled wool and cashmere products in the United States. No longer will imported suits of a lower quality be able to claim they are the same high quality as those bearing the “made in the U.S.A.” label. This bill updates the outdated law that does not recognize the different levels of yarn fineness.

We have a great tradition of wool suit craftsmanship in the United States. By updating the Wool Products Labeling Act, H.R. 4583 will help ensure the health and vitality of the U.S. apparel and textile industry which includes members of my union, UNITE HERE!, and two Chicago-based manufacturers, Hartmarx and Oxxford Clothes.

The passage of our bill will ensure that the U.S. tailored clothing industry can continue to thrive in the international marketplace. H.R. 4583 is supported both by the wool suit manufacturers and the Garment Workers Union, UNITE HERE!, as well as the U.S. textile industry. I urge my colleagues to support it as well, and I look forward to the passage of this bill today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I do rise today in support of this legislation to update our wool labeling laws. I want to thank Chairman BARTON, Ranking Member DINGELL, as well as Chairman STEARNS, for their help in bringing the legislation forward. I also want to thank and commend my friend from Illinois, the ranking member of the Commerce Trade and Consumer Protections Subcommittee, Representative SCHAKOWSKY, for joining me to sponsor the legislation.

The Wool Suit Fabric Labeling Fairness and International Standards Conforming Act will modernize the Wool Labeling Act by using the international definition of “super” as an identifier for the quality of wool products. We have written this legislation to protect consumers and industry participants from the mislabeling of certain suiting fabrics.

In recent years, many wool products at the wholesale and retail level, including worsted wool fabrics and apparel items, are being marketed and labeled as “super 100,” and “super 120s,” and so-called “super” grades. These refer to the fineness of the yarn contained in the product. The finer the average yard is in diameter, the higher the super’s grade.

Higher super grades reflect products that are supposed to have higher yarns and therefore sold at higher prices. The Wool Labeling Act, which regulates the labeling of wool products in the United States, has not been amended to reflect the current marketing practice of using supers as an identifier for quality wool products.

The International Wool Textile Organization is the international body representing the interests of the world’s wool textile industry, which includes the U.S., oversees the implementation of the International Wool Textile Arbitration Agreement. The IWTO has adopted a code of practice regarding the use of the term “super” on wool products, and the exact yarn diameter that each level of “super” must contain. Woolmark, a company that licenses the use of the Woolmark logo, has accepted the identical definition.

Modernization of the Wool Labeling Act has strong support, as my colleague mentioned. It is supported by the National Textile Association, Victor Forstman, UNITE, the Cashmere and Camel Hair Manufacturers Institute, the American Apparel and Footwear Association, Hartmarx, and Hickey Freeman on behalf of the Tailored Clothing Association.

As the domestic tailored clothing industry and wool textile mills continue to face significant challenges, this legislation is timely and it is vital to the continued health of this important manufacturing sector in the U.S. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, let me close by saying this: this is really a jobs bill and a truth-in-labeling bill. It is a win-win-win situation: good for the consumers, good for the manufacturers, good for the garment workers. And I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4583, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

SUPPORTING THE GOAL OF ELIMINATING SUFFERING AND DEATH DUE TO CANCER BY THE YEAR 2015

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 210) supporting the goal of eliminating suffering and death due to cancer by the year 2015, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 210

Whereas this year alone, cancer will claim the lives of more than 570,000 Americans—1,500 per day—and is the cause of one of every four deaths in the United States;

Whereas more than 1,300,000 new cancer cases will be diagnosed in 2005;

Whereas it is estimated that cancer cost the Nation nearly \$190,000,000,000 in 2003, including more than \$69,000,000,000 in direct medical costs;

Whereas the Nation’s investment in cancer research and programs has led to real progress—between 1991 and 2001, cancer death rates declined by more than 9 percent and about 258,000 lives were saved;

Whereas cancer touches almost every family, with over 10,000,000 Americans now living with a history of cancer;

Whereas at least half of all cancer deaths could be prevented by applying existing knowledge;

Whereas the Director of the National Cancer Institute has set a bold goal to eliminate suffering and death due to cancer by 2015; and

Whereas eliminating suffering and death due to cancer will require a commitment by the Congress and the private sector to continue to make the fight against cancer a priority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress supports the goal of eliminating suffering and death due to cancer by 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam 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 H. Con. Res. 210.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 210, a resolution supporting the goal of eliminating suffering and death due to cancer by the year 2015.

To many people, the goal of eliminating suffering and death due to cancer in under a decade may seem impossible or at least highly unlikely. But when we take a step back and look at the amazing things we have accomplished in the last three decades, I be-

lieve that with the hard work and concentrated effort of our Nation, this goal is realistic and achievable.

Thirty years ago, just hearing the word “cancer” sent chills down people’s spines. Cancer of any kind was seen as a virtual death sentence. And unfortunately, today cancer is still a death sentence for far too many people from all ages and all walks of life.

But for an increasing number of Americans, cancer is no longer a death sentence as it once was. Rather, it is becoming a preventable, controllable, beatable disease. Today medical science is accomplishing things that were undreamed of 30 years ago. For the first time, we are seeing a decline in the numbers of lives claimed by cancer each year. People are living longer both with the disease and after the disease. Screening is better and more widespread than ever. Treatments are better and safer, and outcomes continue to improve. Based on the strides that we have made, I can honestly say I think we are winning the war on cancer.

I can also say with confidence that the future of cancer research looks bright. With the mapping of the human genome, we will be able to identify each person’s cancer-related genes. Using this information, we can design tailored prevention and treatment options for each individual patient. The availability of these advanced techniques is not a question of if, but when.

While the goal of ending suffering and death from cancer by the year 2015 requires us to set our eyes on the future, we must also focus on what can be done today. The resolution before us encourages Congress to examine how the resources of this great Nation can best be harnessed to reach the ultimate goal to finding a cure. Whether through government-sponsored research, partnerships with the private sector, investors, or philanthropic organizations, we must pursue this enemy of cancer on all fronts.

We must set priorities. We must demand more for our money. We must foster the next generation of cancer scientists and researchers and encourage more young people to enter this high calling. We must ensure that the fruits of research make their way into clinical practice and into public health efforts to reduce the burden of cancer. We must promote policies that encourage proper intellectual property management, the key to scientific innovation. We must make sure that people who qualify have access to clinical trials.

But finally and most importantly, we must not forget the human face of cancer. Outside of this Chamber, thousands of people are gathering on the National Mall as part the American Cancer Society’s Celebration on the Hill. People whose lives have been touched by cancer from every State and every congressional district across the United States have come to celebrate life, to remember those that were

lost, and to have their voices heard. I applaud their courage, faith and perseverance, and I look forward to meeting with many of them during the coming hours and days.

With their help and shining example, along with the continued attention of this great Nation, we can meet the challenge set forth in the resolution, to end suffering and death from cancer by the year 2015.

In closing, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for introducing this important resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I support the goal of ending suffering and death by cancer by the year 2015 as set forth in this resolution. It is certainly a commendable goal; and, of course, I support the resolution.

But what is Congress doing to set up programs and strategic plans to make that goal a reality? For example, the National Cancer Institute has focused the fight against cancer on eight strategic objectives, including: First, understanding the causes and mechanisms of cancer; second, accelerating the progress in cancer prevention; third, improving early detection and diagnosis; fourth, developing effective and efficient treatment; fifth, understanding the factors that influence cancer outcomes; sixth, improving the quality of cancer care; seventh, improving the quality of life for cancer patients, survivors and their families; and, eighth, overcoming cancer health disparities.

That is the National Cancer Institute. That is what they are focusing on. Congress, on the other hand, is doing little to help this fight. A resolution I would say is mere talk and does not actually take action to fight cancer.

I think Congress has choices right now, and instead of passing this resolution, we should, for example, increase funding for NIH's cancer research, fund real stem cell research supported by the scientific community, fund the Department of Defense's breast cancer research program, and probably most important, expand health coverage to the 46 million Americans that do not have it today. Three times as many people have lost health insurance as jobs since the Bush administration has come to power. Without health coverage, early detection and treatment are almost impossible.

There are many cancers that can be cured today, such as cervical, breast and prostate cancer, but without health insurance, access to early detection or follow-up treatment it is almost impossible for the many hard-working people across this country.

This year alone, Madam Speaker, cancer will claim the lives of 570,000

Americans, that is 1,500 per day, almost half of those that gave their lives on September 11. In addition, 1.3 million new cases of cancer were diagnosed in 2005 alone.

Again, the goal of this resolution is good. I support it, but we should be on the floor today supporting legislative action, not a resolution to help everyone suffering from or touched by cancer. As much as I support this resolution, I think that a lot more needs to be done that is not being addressed today by this Republican majority.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of this important bipartisan resolution that I introduced with my fellow cancer survivors and advocates COLLIN PETERSON, DEBORAH PRYCE, LOIS CAPPS, SUE MYRICK and STEVE ISRAEL, all coauthors of the 2015 Cancer Caucus.

This resolution expresses Congress' support for the National Cancer Institute's goal of eliminating the suffering and death due to cancer by the year 2015.

Cancer claims the lives of more than 570,000 Americans each year. That is right, over half a million, but we have yet to declare a full-scale war on cancer. The passage of this resolution today puts us on record as going on the right track. Cancer affects everyone. It is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue, it is an issue for our entire country, and it is an issue that faces the world.

In 1961, President Kennedy established the lofty goal of putting a man on the moon in 10 years. This historic goal was achieved in just 8 years. Just as this goal was established and achieved, so can the goal of 2015.

We are very close to achieving the goal of ending cancer death and suffering. But when you are in a race and you see the finish line, you don't jog, you sprint. Scientists at the National Cancer Institute and other private and public research facilities across the country and world are conducting vital research each and every day that will enable cancer sufferers to be cancer survivors.

We must show our solidarity on these efforts by fully supporting the 2015 goal and providing the Federal resources necessary that to achieve it. Over the last 5 years, we have doubled the research dollars for cancer, but yet that is not enough. I see no better legacy for future generations than ending cancer suffering and cancer death.

Over 10,000 cancer survivors and advocates from across the country are converging on the Capitol this week for the American Cancer Society's Celebration on the Hill. These heroes will be visiting every one of our offices this week. When you visit with them, and I

hope you will visit with them and not push them off to staff, I hope you pledge your strongest support on the war against cancer.

We must work together to provide Federal funding needed for research efforts and pass legislation to support early diagnosis and treatment. Ending the suffering and death due to cancer will be achieved with momentous global proportions, the most important public health achievement of all time. I urge passage of this important resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

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

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I would like to address my remarks to the thousands of cancer advocates in Washington this week and thank them for their service and dedication. They have come to Washington to tell Congress to make concrete commitments to fight cancer, but instead of action, they get this useless resolution.

Cancer patients, survivors and advocates are getting nothing but empty words. It is all hat and no cattle. It is typical of Republicans' approach to serious problems in this country. I am surprised that they didn't try and land on an aircraft carrier and declare that cancer was conquered. I am offended that the Republican do-nothing Congress is bringing forth a do-nothing resolution as its response to fighting cancer.

No cancer advocate in our country should be appeased by this vote. The resolution is empty rhetoric and not action. And action is what is needed for cancer, for AIDS, for Parkinson's disease, and so many other diseases that impact our citizens and people around the world.

The sponsor of this resolution is offering a few platitudes that agree with the laudable goal of eliminating suffering and death due to cancer by the year 2015. I don't know anybody that would not subscribe to that. Maybe move it up to the year 2010, but I can't think of a human being that would object to that.

But how does this resolution achieve that goal? Does it increase the NIH funding for cancer research? No. Do the Republicans oppose that? Yes.

Does it boost support for the Department of Defense breast cancer research program? Not one penny.

Does it extend the expiring tax credit for research and development of life-saving cancer treatments? No. That, by the way, is something that a few Republicans support, but they can't seem to get it to the floor to get a vote. And they control this place. If they can't get it to the floor, who can?

Does it provide for stem cell research as advocated by the scientific community? No. They are pandering to a bunch of religious radicals and avoiding dealing with scientific research

that is needed to cure these diseases. They put their head in the sand and pander to political contributions.

The sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), voted to cut money for the Centers for Disease Control and early detection and prevention of cancer. This resolution doesn't restore that.

Does it expand health coverage to the nearly 47 million Americans who lack health insurance, can't even find out if they have cancer and, therefore, fail to get the preventive care available to them? No, it does not add insurance to one of the 47 million people without health insurance in this country, who, therefore, do not get medical care. It is the Republican way of all talk and no action.

This resolution is an affront to those who have traveled here from across our Nation to advocate better cancer care. Not only does this resolution fail to do anything to help eliminate cancer, but this Congress is taking us in the wrong direction. Led by the Republicans, President Bush and this Congress have aggressively cut funding for NIH. This year, adjusted for inflation, they have cut \$213 million. Over the last 4 years, they have reduced the agency's purchasing power by more than 12 percent.

The cuts aren't just to research. Since President Bush and the Republican leadership have taken office, nearly 7 million people have lost their health insurance, and we all know that is the only way to get proper care. The President used the only veto of his administration to keep in place restrictions on life-saving stem cell research, and the Republican leadership in this Congress didn't have the courage to override that.

I guess I could go on, but I think I have made my point. I wholeheartedly agree we must do much more to eradicate cancer and other dreaded diseases, but I, like the American public, want action, not words. That is why I suspect the American public will join with us in voting for a change in direction in this Congress. We need a new direction. We need people who will put their money where their mouth is and will vote to take action that is so close within our grasp to help these people and not just sit up and preen and say, My goodness, we think cancer is bad. Let's do something about it.

I urge cancer advocates across the country to recognize this resolution for what it is: a pathetic attempt to play lip service to an issue that requires resources, not rhetoric.

□ 1445

You could replace the inheritance tax. That will give you enough money to fund many of these programs, instead of standing up, sticking your thumb in the pie, and saying, "What a good boy am I."

Let's get busy. Let's change the direction of this Congress. Let's change the leadership and get action toward finding a cure for cancer, not empty rhetoric.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just say that, again, while the Democrats support this resolution, we are very concerned over the fact that it is essentially commemorative in nature and it does not do anything in terms of funding or addressing any of the problems that have been outlined by the National Cancer Institute in order to move forward and eliminate cancer by the year 2015. So while we think it is a good resolution and we do support it, we need to point out that the Republican majority is essentially doing nothing to implement a strategy that would actually lead us to the eradication of cancer.

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is apparent that there is more than one cancer that we are fighting around here, and that is the cancer of political rhetoric that would take a resolution designed to say that we have a goal of eliminating cancer within the next 10 years and try to change it into one of political talk.

I would invite the gentleman from California to accompany me and Mr. PALLONE tomorrow to the Energy and Commerce Committee, where we will be voting to once again reauthorize and to change and expand the concept of the National Institutes of Health of which the Cancer Institute is one.

I would remind him that the National Institutes of Health funding has been doubled during the Republican control of this Congress, something that has not happened prior to that time.

Everyone knows that this is a resolution on its face that is designed to say let us all get behind this issue and put aside political rhetoric and try to have an achievable goal. It is regrettable, and I would apologize to those who are here because they are concerned about the issue of doing something about it, that even a resolution of encouragement and establishing a goal has to take on political overtones.

Tomorrow, the Energy and Commerce Committee will reauthorize and change some of the provisions that have hampered research within the National Institutes of Health and in that will be the Institute for Cancer Research, and I think that is a laudable goal, one that we will be bringing to the floor in the not-too-distant future.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, too many people, either personally or through a loved one, have felt the pain of cancer. It strikes 1 out of every 2 men and 1 out of every 3 women and will tragically claim more than 570,000 American lives this year alone.

Cancer is a complex disease that takes many forms. It can attack a single organ or

the whole body. It can be caused by genetic factors, environmental circumstances, or both. Without early detection or treatment, it can lead to debilitating illness and often death.

On behalf of the Federal Government, the National Cancer Institute (NCI) has led the fight against cancer since its inception in 1937. NCI conducts and supports research, training, health information dissemination, and other program with respect to the cause, diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of cancer, rehabilitation from cancer, and the continuing care of cancer patients and their families.

The National Cancer Institute set for itself the goal of ending cancer suffering and death by 2015. Over the last several years, NCI has taken on this challenge by working with expert staff and identified critical paths needed to make the vision a reality. This includes developing a strategic plan and framework for use of funding, infrastructure, tools, and other resources.

Eliminating cancer suffering and death is a true possibility. Americans have already received the benefits of investment in research and other cancer programs—between 1991 and 2001, cancer deaths declined by more than 9 percent. Moreover, doctors are able to help patients defeat a number of cancers if detected early, including cervix, breast, colon, and prostate cancer. And today 3 out of 4 children with cancer are cured.

The resolution that we are discussing today expresses Congress's support of ending suffering and death due to cancer. But we can best push for the continued decline of cancer death and suffering by making it a national priority and making the right budget and policy choices to meet this goal by 2015.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution, which recognizes the goal of eliminating suffering and death due to cancer by the year 2015.

Investments in cancer research and programs continue to be a crucial part of tackling and eliminating this devastating disease. Thanks to prior investments in cancer research and programs, we are making remarkable progress in the fight against cancer.

When Congress and President Nixon joined forces to fight the battle against cancer in 1971, cancer was largely a death sentence. Thirty five years later, our national research investment has yielded substantial gains.

Today, early detection can defeat some of the more common cancers, such as cancer of the cervix, breast, colon and prostate. These represent more than half of all cancers.

In addition, childhood cancer is curable in 3 out of 4 patients. The development of colon cancer screening tests and treatments has led to a 90 percent 5-year survival rate for colon cancers caught in the earliest stages and 64 percent when the cancer has spread only to adjacent organs or lymph nodes.

Though such progress is encouraging, we still have much work to do. Cancer has now surpassed heart disease as the number one killer of Americans under age 85.

Cancer strikes 1 out of every 2 men and 1 out of every 3 women. This year alone, cancer will claim the lives of more than 570,000 Americans—1500 lives per day—and is the cause of 1 out of every 4 deaths in the United States.

It is imperative that we continue to fund and expand medical research to forge the battle

against this deadly enemy. As Americans, we have a strong history, through science and innovation, of detecting, conquering and defeating many illnesses. We must and we will continue to fight cancer until the battle is won.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 210, a resolution to support the National Cancer Institute, NCI, in its goal of eliminating death and suffering due to cancer by 2015. We can and we must make the 2015 goal a priority, but we cannot do that if we continue to cut and underfund the very researchers working to make it a reality.

Thanks to research, great progress has been made against cancer in the last three decades. In 1976, half of all cancer patients survived more than 5 years after diagnosis. Today, closer to two-thirds or 63 percent of adults and 85 percent of children are alive 5 years after they learn they have cancer. Let's build on that progress.

Since cancer is more common among older Americans and the American population is aging, by the year 2050 the number of new cancer cases in America could more than double, with estimates as high as 2.46 million new cases annually. Cancers cost the United States an estimated \$210 billion in 2005. This amount included \$74 billion in direct medical costs and nearly \$136 billion in lost productivity. And advances in biomedical research benefit not only cancer treatment, but provide information on molecular and genetic processes that will aid in a better understanding in the underlying causes of virtually all diseases.

NCI, part of the National Institutes of Health, is the Federal Government's principal agency for cancer research and training. The NCI has a goal of eliminating all suffering and death due to cancer by the year 2015. I believe that eliminating suffering and death due to cancer by the year 2015 should be America's goal.

Madam Speaker, when the House leadership finally schedules a vote on the Labor, Health, and Human Services Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2007, LHHS, I intend to sponsor an amendment that fully funds NCI. The President's proposed 2007 Budget cuts funding to NCI by over \$39.7 million and the LHHS bill as written currently includes the same underfunding. The Higgins Amendment to LHHS will restore \$240 million in funding to NCI, bringing its total to \$5,033,000,000.

Additionally, I will support projects that advance the mission of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute and other local cancer research, treatment, and advocacy projects. Western New York is home to Roswell Park Cancer Institute, a premier cancer research and treatment facility and one of Western New York's top 20 employers. The research done at Roswell has the potential to blow the research field open—and the care provided there to patients cannot be matched.

Finally, I intend to support expanding programs that detect cancer early and help Americans get treatment. These programs significantly reduce the cost to our nation's health-care system by treating people early. There are proven programs like the Breast and Cervical Early Detection Program, which help underserved communities get diagnosed and treated early. Because of underfunding these programs cannot reach all the people who need them.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that we are here today uniting be-

hind this bill and this goal, but we can and we must do much more than pay lip service to meeting the 2015 deadline. Let's take this opportunity to come together and eradicate cancer by fully funding NCI, by supporting local centers, and by reauthorizing and funding the very programs that reach the men, women, and children who need them most and can least afford them.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 210, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SHAW. Madam 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.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL PERIPHERAL ARTERIAL DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 982) supporting the goals and ideals of National Peripheral Arterial Disease Awareness Week.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 982

Whereas peripheral arterial disease is a vascular disease that occurs when narrowed arteries reduce the blood flow to the limbs;

Whereas peripheral arterial disease is a significant vascular disease that can be as serious as a heart attack or stroke;

Whereas peripheral arterial disease affects approximately 8,000,000 to 12,000,000 Americans;

Whereas patients with peripheral arterial disease are at increased risk of heart attack and stroke and are 6 times more likely to die within 10 years than are patients without peripheral arterial disease;

Whereas the survival rate for individuals with peripheral arterial disease is worse than the outcome for many common cancers;

Whereas peripheral arterial disease is a leading cause of lower limb amputation in the United States;

Whereas many patients with peripheral arterial disease have walking impairment that leads to a diminished quality of life and functional capacity;

Whereas a majority of patients with peripheral arterial disease are asymptomatic and less than half of individuals with peripheral arterial disease are aware of their diagnoses;

Whereas African-American ethnicity is a strong and independent risk factor for peripheral arterial disease, and yet this fact is not well known to those at risk;

Whereas effective treatments are available for people with peripheral arterial disease to reduce heart attacks, strokes, and amputations and to improve quality of life;

Whereas many patients with peripheral arterial disease are still untreated with proven therapies;

Whereas there is a need for comprehensive educational efforts designed to increase awareness of peripheral arterial disease among medical professionals and the greater public in order to promote early detection and proper treatment of this disease to improve quality of life, prevent heart attacks and strokes, and save lives and limbs; and

Whereas September 18 through September 22, 2006, would be an appropriate week to observe National Peripheral Arterial Disease Awareness Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Peripheral Arterial Disease Awareness Week;

(2) supports efforts to educate people about peripheral arterial disease;

(3) acknowledges the critical importance of peripheral arterial disease awareness to improve national cardiovascular health;

(4) supports raising awareness of the consequences of undiagnosed and untreated peripheral arterial disease and the need to seek appropriate care as a serious public health issue; and

(5) calls upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 982, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Peripheral Arterial Disease Awareness Week.

While not as well known as many other vascular diseases, peripheral artery disease is a serious illness that affects millions of Americans. It occurs when narrowed arteries reduce blood flow to the limbs. The disease increases the risk of heart attack and stroke and is also a leading cause of lower limb amputation in the United States. But perhaps the most alarming statistic of all is that most people who suffer from peripheral arterial disease have no symptoms and do not know that they have the disease.

This resolution, with the goal of raising awareness of this deadly disease and its warning signs, was authored by my friend and colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Health, Mrs. CAPPS of California. I would like to thank Mrs.

CAPPS and her staff for their leadership and work on this important resolution. I look forward to hearing more about the disease and its impact on our Nation's cardiovascular health.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I support House Resolution 982, sponsored by my colleague Congresswoman CAPPS from California.

Madam Speaker, peripheral arterial disease is a serious ailment that affects millions of Americans. This resolution will help to draw attention to this problem by recognizing September 18 through 22 as Peripheral Arterial Disease Awareness Week, and it is my hope that this recognition, along with educational efforts on the part of the research and medical communities, will help make this a problem we can overcome.

There are more than 8 million people in the U.S., one in 20 adults, that have peripheral arterial disease. This is a vascular disease that results in the narrowing of arteries and decreased blood flow to the limbs. It could lead to leg pain disability and even amputation. And, sadly, the disease often goes unrecognized because the symptoms include common symptoms of old age, such as fatigue, heaviness, pain and cramping in the leg muscles when walking.

In addition, Madam Speaker, this disease increases the risk of heart attack and stroke in people, making it six times more likely they will die within 10 years when compared with those who do not have peripheral arterial disease. Those at most risk for peripheral arterial disease are people over the age of 50, those who smoke, have diabetes, high blood pressure, abnormal cholesterol, or have a history of heart disease or stroke. In addition, African Americans have a greater risk of getting peripheral arterial disease.

Because of the serious consequences of this disease that affects both women and men and can strike adults of any age, it is important for Congress to support public awareness activities on peripheral arterial disease. Recognizing September 18–22 of this year as National Peripheral Arterial Disease Awareness Week will help bring this deadly disease out of the shadows. And, Madam Speaker, as a part of this week of recognition, we need to encourage outreach activities to educate people about peripheral arterial disease. The public must understand that it is a serious public health issue; and given our awareness of these high-risk populations, education and early intervention could greatly benefit and decrease the incidents of peripheral arterial disease and improve the quality of life.

Once again, I would indicate our support of this resolution.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 982, to support the goals and ideals of National Peripheral Arterial Disease Awareness Week. I was proud to introduce this bill with my colleague and fellow co-chair of the Congressional Heart and Stroke Coalition, Representative FOLEY.

More than 8 million Americans, that is 1 in 20 adults, have peripheral arterial disease (PAD).

Yet this condition is largely unrecognized and often goes undiagnosed because most people do not have any recognizable symptoms.

PAD occurs when arteries in the legs become narrowed or clogged, resulting in reduced blood flow to the legs.

A diagnosis of PAD is indication that a patient is likely to have narrowed arteries to the heart and brain as well and is a powerful warning sign of existing cardiovascular disease.

However, without early detection and proper treatment, 1 in 4 people who suffer from PAD will also suffer a heart attack, stroke, amputation or even death within the next 5 years.

It is evident that greater awareness about PAD and better detection capabilities will not only improve the quality of life for those who suffer from it, but can actually save their lives.

During National Peripheral Arterial Disease Awareness Week, efforts are increased to make physicians and the public at-large more cognizant of their risks for PAD, the symptoms, and the importance of early treatment.

During this week, we can assist by highlighting those who have high risk factors for PAD: over age 50, African Americans, smokers and those with high blood pressure, diabetes, abnormal cholesterol, a personal history of heart disease or stroke.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution and encourage them to learn more about Peripheral Arterial Disease and how it may affect them.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 982.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF OBSERVING THE YEAR OF POLIO AWARENESS

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 526) supporting the goals and ideals of observing the Year of Polio Awareness, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 526

Whereas 2005 was the 50th anniversary of the injectable killed polio vaccine;

Whereas the polio vaccines eliminated naturally occurring polio cases in the United

States but have not yet eliminated polio in other parts of the world;

Whereas as few as 57 percent of American children receive all doses of necessary vaccines during childhood, including the polio vaccine;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends that every child in the United States receive all doses of the inactivated polio vaccine;

Whereas the success of the polio vaccines has caused people to forget the 1,630,000 Americans born before the development of the vaccines who had polio during the epidemics in the middle of the 20th century;

Whereas at least 70 percent of paralytic polio survivors and 40 percent of nonparalytic polio survivors are developing post-polio sequelae, which are unexpected and often disabling symptoms that occur about 35 years after the poliovirus attack, including overwhelming fatigue, muscle weakness, muscle and joint pain, sleep disorders, heightened sensitivity to anesthesia, cold pain, and difficulty swallowing and breathing;

Whereas 2006 is the 132nd anniversary of the diagnosis of the first case of post-polio sequelae and is the 21st anniversary of the creation of the International Post-Polio Task Force;

Whereas research and clinical work by members of the International Post-Polio Task Force have discovered that post-polio sequelae can be treated, and even prevented, if polio survivors are taught to conserve energy and use assistive devices to stop damaging and killing the reduced number of overworked, poliovirus-damaged neurons in the spinal cord and brain that survived the polio attack;

Whereas many medical professionals, and polio survivors, do not know of the existence of post-polio sequelae, or of the available treatments;

Whereas the mission of the International Post-Polio Task Force includes educating medical professionals and the world's 20,000,000 polio survivors about post-polio sequelae through the international Post-Polio Letter Campaign, The Post-Polio Institute at New Jersey's Englewood Hospital and Medical Center, the publication of The Polio Paradox, and the television public service announcement provided by the National Broadcasting Company; and

Whereas it would be appropriate to observe the year beginning October 1, 2006, as the Year of Polio Awareness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the need for every child, in America and throughout the world, to be vaccinated against polio;

(2) recognizes the 1,630,000 Americans who survived polio, their new battle with post-polio sequelae, and the need for education and appropriate medical care;

(3) requests that all appropriate Federal departments and agencies take steps to educate—

(A) the people of the United States about the need for polio vaccination; and

(B) polio survivors and medical professionals in the United States about the cause and treatment of post-polio sequelae; and

(4) supports the goals and ideals of observing the Year of Polio Awareness to promote vaccination and post-polio sequelae education and treatment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 526, a resolution authored by Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey that supports the goals and ideals of observing the Year of Polio Awareness. I commend Representative ROTHMAN for introducing this important resolution, which helps to raise awareness about polio and the continued need to vaccinate all children against polio and other infectious diseases.

While many of us in this Chamber are old enough to remember polio as a national tragedy that claimed thousands of lives and left thousands more permanently disabled, younger generations may have only read about polio in history books. But the story of polio, its spread, its dreaded consequences, the millions of lives it touched, and our ultimate triumph over the disease, should forever remain etched in our national memory.

Recently, the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of American History held an exhibit commemorating the 50th anniversary of the injectable, killed polio vaccine, also known as the Salk vaccine. The exhibit detailed the incredible story of polio in the United States, beginning with the 1916 outbreak in New York City that paralyzed 9,000 people and killed 2,400, most of whom were children less than 10 years of age. It went on to tell visitors about the all-consuming race to find a vaccine, from the story of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who may have been paralyzed by polio and went on to found the March of Dimes, the organization that raised hundreds of millions of dollars for polio research and treatment, and for which President Roosevelt's image was etched on the United States dime; to the research efforts led by Jonas Salk, Albert Sabin, and others to come up with a vaccine that was safe and effective; to the mammoth public health effort needed to vaccinate all children in the United States once a workable vaccine had been found; and, finally, to the worldwide effort to eradicate polio in the latter 20th century. The fight against polio is an amazing story that deserves to be remembered and retold.

But like most museum exhibits, the most striking things about the exhibits were the images. On display were several iron lungs, the metal apparatuses that helped to keep children and adults with polio alive. These metal contrap-

tions restricted all movement and were mostly small because they primarily housed children. They were necessary to help polio patients continue to breathe. Photographs depicted huge warehouses that had been converted to makeshift hospital wards, filled with rows of iron lungs and the children inside.

Other pictures showed parents standing on ladders and soap boxes, peering through hospital windows, trying to see their children who had been quarantined. Such pictures are painful reminders of a past that should never be relived.

The resolution before us today reminds all of us that we have all the tools needed to prevent the reemergence of polio in this century. By far the most crucial weapon in the fight against infectious disease is vaccination, the medical advance that has saved more lives than any other. Vaccines continue to serve as the first line of defense against infectious disease. The resolution rightly recognizes the need of every child to be vaccinated against polio. It also recognizes the 1.6 million Americans who survived polio, but still suffer from its effects today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

Madam Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 526, which supports the observation of the Year of Polio Awareness.

I do want to thank the sponsor of the legislation, my colleague from New Jersey Representative STEVE ROTHMAN, for not only sponsoring this bill, but also for all of his efforts to increase awareness of polio. He will be speaking just a few minutes later.

Polio, as you know, is a viral illness that destroys nerve cells. As a result, muscles become paralyzed, and these muscles can atrophy and die. Polio is most common in infants and young children; however, complications occur most often in older persons and often post-polio.

Those complications have the often disabling symptoms of overwhelming fatigue, muscle weakness and pain, sleep disorders and more. It occurs in 75 percent of paralytic and 40 percent of nonparalytic polio survivors about 35 years after the polio virus attacks.

Although polio has plagued humans since ancient times, its extensive outbreak occurred in the first half of the 1900s before the vaccination created by Jonas Salk became widely available in 1955. And I would say, Madam Speaker, that I certainly am old enough to remember when there were many people who were struck by polio. And in the 1950s, when I was growing up, the fact that there was a vaccine available was

just seen as an amazing thing. It was very much on the minds of all of us as we were growing up in the 1950s and the 1960s.

Sadly, despite having a vaccine against polio, this disease has not been eradicated from the world, and outbreaks continue to occur in the U.S. and other countries. As a matter of fact, it seems we are headed in the wrong direction. The World Health Organization announced last year that they would not meet their intended goal of eliminating new cases of polio worldwide by the end of 2005, since many cases remained.

The hope is that this resolution and the new resurgence of focus on polio will promote increased vaccination and education and treatment of post-polio complications. Even today, Madam Speaker, 10 percent of American children under the age 3 do not receive their polio vaccine. This percentage is lower in poor cities. Given new cases being reported in Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Somalia, Afghanistan, Egypt, Niger, Ethiopia and Yemen, an outbreak in the U.S. would not be surprising. And last year four cases of the polio virus were reported in Minnesota.

The eradication of new polio cases is achievable, but only if we reeducate the public about the dangers, effects and availability of a vaccine and treatment. This resolution asks all appropriate Federal agencies to take action to educate the people of the U.S. about the polio vaccine, and to educate polio survivors and medical professionals about the existence of post-polio complications and available treatments.

Therefore, I support this resolution recognizing a Year of Polio Awareness beginning on November 1.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time with the intention of closing.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague STEVE ROTHMAN, who, again, has taken a lead on this and so many other health care issues.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, first let me thank my colleague from New Jersey for giving me this time, and all of your efforts to increase polio awareness.

I would like to thank Chairman DEAL for all of your hard work as the chairman of this subcommittee in bringing this matter to the floor, and for all of your support. I would also like to recognize the role of Ranking Member SHERROD BROWN for his help.

Madam Speaker, I first want to thank the leadership of the Energy and Commerce Committee for bringing Resolution 526 to the floor. I also want to take this opportunity to recognize my constituent, a very tireless worker on behalf of those suffering the aftereffects of polio, Dr. Richard Bruno.

As the director of the Post-Polio Institute and International Center for

Post-Polio Education and Research at Englewood Hospital and Medical Center, and chairperson of the International Post-Polio Task Force, Dr. Bruno is at the forefront of the movement to educate parents about the need to vaccinate their children against this debilitating virus.

This resolution, Madam Chairman, would not be on the floor today without Doctor Bruno's help. I am grateful for his work and commitment to this cause.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, 526, that will bring critical attention in the United States and around the world to the need for children to be vaccinated against polio. It sounds so simple. So many of us thought that polio had been eradicated, but that is far from the truth.

This resolution recognizes the need for every child to be vaccinated against polio and designates the year starting October 1st as the Year of Polio Awareness. It also urges all Federal agencies to educate doctors and parents about polio, and to also educate polio survivors and medical professionals about the cause and treatment of something called post-polio sequelae. More about that later.

It has been 51 years since the introduction of the polio vaccination. By now this virus should have been eradicated. But as has been said earlier by our chairman and Mr. PALLONE, this is not the case. In fact, according to the Centers for Disease Control, 10 percent of the U.S. children under 3 years of age, which is approximately 1 million toddlers in our country, are not vaccinated against polio.

This percentage is even greater in America's poorest cities. Even more of our young people are not vaccinated against polio. In my own home State of New Jersey, only 86 percent of the toddlers living in Newark were vaccinated in 2004. Furthermore, the United States is not protected against a polio outbreak. In October of 2005, five children in an Amish community in Minnesota were diagnosed with polio. Although that outbreak was ultimately brought under control, this was a clear signal that we must do more in our country to prevent the spread of polio.

Polio outbreaks, Madam Speaker, are not only limited to occurring in the United States, but have, for example, as my colleagues have said, been reported in Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Somali, Afghanistan, Egypt, Niger, Ethiopia and Yemen, amongst other countries.

In some way the polio vaccination has become a victim of its own success, one might say, with many Americans believing that polio has been eradicated. They no longer have their children vaccinated against this virus. That is a mistake. With outbreaks occurring all over the world, unvaccinated children everywhere, including in the United States, are susceptible to exposure and to catching

polio. That is why this resolution is so important.

Madam Speaker, parents must be informed when making decisions about vaccinating their children. They have to know that there is still a threat that their child could be exposed to the polio virus. This resolution will help ensure that doctors will provide all of the necessary information to parents about the polio vaccine and the dangers of the virus.

I hope that the passage of this resolution will accomplish our goal of raising awareness of the importance of having every child vaccinated against polio, and will have the effect of allowing doctors to understand this post-polio sequelae syndrome, which is that after someone has lived a whole lifetime with polio, they then suffer a series of additional complications: chronic overwhelming fatigue, joint pain, and chronic pain of a variety of natures.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution, which will educate our own people and all of the people of the world to the continuing threat of polio.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, once again, we support this resolution and thank the sponsor, my colleague from New Jersey, for introducing it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, certainly as we talk about the elimination of polio, it is one of the great success stories, but one in which we must continue to be vigilant, as has been pointed out. As a Rotarian, I am proud that my organization, on an international basis, undertook as a project to eliminate polio worldwide, poured millions of dollars into that effort, and contributed greatly to the success of the elimination of polio in other parts of the world.

But as we talk about the polio vaccine, a disease that has been able to be treated with a vaccine, we are also on the verge of recognizing that we are going to have, as we currently have, a problem with vaccine manufacturers for not only this disease, but many other diseases as well.

Today we only have four United States vaccine manufacturers. That is down from about 50 that we had back in the 1960s. The bipartisan Institute of Medicine has identified three primary factors as the reason we have lost vaccine firms and for the reluctance of firms to get into the manufacturing of vaccines.

One is the economic realities, and certainly those are very real; secondly, the burdensome regulations that they must go through; and third, legal liability. As we deal with other diseases, in addition to this question of polio, we are going to be faced with the fact that we are going to have to encourage manufacturers of vaccines to get in the marketplace, and we must deal with

those three factors as we move forward on this issue of vaccines for other illnesses as well.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 526 supporting the goals and ideals of observing the Year of Polio Awareness.

During the 1940's and 1950's, between 30,000 and 50,000 cases of polio were recorded annually in the United States. This epidemic caused widespread fear and panic because of its devastating effects. Such effects include muscle and nerve damage, as well as the inability to move one's limbs or to breathe without assistance. The polio virus can also lead to a number of severe illnesses.

Fortunately, the injectable polio vaccine eliminated naturally-occurring polio cases in the United States, but unfortunately has not yet eliminated polio in other parts of the world.

The Centers for Disease and Control and Prevention recommends that every child in the United States receive all doses of the inactivated polio vaccine; yet as few as 57 percent of American children receive all doses of necessary vaccines during childhood, including the polio vaccine.

At least 70 percent of paralytic polio survivors, and 40 percent of nonparalytic polio survivors, are developing post-polio sequelae. Post Polio Sequelae are late effects of the disease that can occur 35 years after the polio-virus attack in 75 percent of paralytic and 40 percent of "non-paralytic" polio survivors. Because they present so long after an individual is ill, these effects are unexpected and are often unrecognized: fatigue, muscle weakness, muscle and joint pain, sleep disorders, heightened sensitivity to anesthesia, cold pain, and difficulty swallowing and breathing.

This year marks the 132nd anniversary of the diagnosis of the first case of post-polio sequelae and the 20th anniversary of the creation of the International Post-Polio Task Force. The mission of the International Post-Polio Task Force includes educating medical professionals and the 20,000,000 polio survivors in the world about post-polio sequelae through letter campaigns, public service announcements, and other forms of media.

I cannot understate the importance of the work of the International Post-Polio Task Force. Because many medical professionals and polio survivors do not generally know of the existence of post-polio sequelae or of the available treatments, it is vital that we continue to support efforts by organizations such as the International Polio Task Force to increase the awareness of the debilitating effects of polio.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 526, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING MARY ELIZA MAHONEY,
AMERICA'S FIRST PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED
AFRICAN-AMERICAN NURSE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 386) honoring Mary Eliza Mahoney, America's first professionally trained African-American nurse, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 386

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney was born May 7, 1845, in Dorchester, Massachusetts, to Charles Mahoney and Mary Jane Seward Mahoney;

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney, at the age of 33, was accepted as a student nurse at the hospital-based program of nursing at the New England Hospital for Women and Children;

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney was one of four students, of a class of 40, who completed nursing at the New England Hospital for Women and Children in 1879;

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney devoted her time and efforts unselfishly to the National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses and was installed as the Official Chaplain;

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney's motto was "Work more and better the coming year than the previous year.";

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney delivered the first annual key note speech of the National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses and established the Mary Eliza award, which today continues as the Mary Eliza Mahoney Award bestowed biennially by the American Nurses Association;

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney supported the suffrage movement and was the first African-American professionally trained nurse to receive retirement benefits from a fund left by a Boston physician to care for 60 nurses, who received twenty-five dollars every three months as long as they lived;

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney's gravesite is in Woodlawn Cemetery, Everett, Massachusetts, and the headstone on her grave states, "The First Professional Negro Nurse in the U.S.A.";

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney was inducted into the American Nurses Association Hall of Fame in 1976;

Whereas Mary Eliza Mahoney advanced the nursing profession by fostering high standards of nursing practice and confronting issues affecting professional nurses, such as the shortage of nurses;

Whereas today the shortage of nurses is a crisis, estimated to be 110,000 nurses, and is expected to increase to 2,800,000 by 2020 if this trend continues; and

Whereas nursing is a critical investment to the delivery of high-quality, cost-effective patient care, and the Nation should invest in and value nursing care: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) honors Mary Eliza Mahoney, the first African-American nurse for an outstanding nursing career, dedication to the United States nursing profession, and exemplary contributions to local and national professional nursing organizations;

(2) recognizes Mary Eliza Mahoney as the first professionally trained African-American nurse, and honors other African-American nurses who practice nursing with distinction;

(3) honors and supports the goals and activities of National Nurses Week;

(4) promotes further understanding and public awareness of the history of American

nurses, who practiced nursing with compassion and devotion and transmitted new scientific knowledge using science-based nursing practice; and

(5) advocates for women of color to enter nursing and supports strategies to counteract the shortage of nurses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 386, honoring Mary Eliza Mahoney, as America's first professionally trained African American nurse.

Born in 1845, Mary Eliza Mahoney lived with her parents, Charles Mahoney and Mary Jane Steward Mahoney. For 15 years, Mary Eliza worked alternately as a cook, janitor, washerwoman, and an unofficial nurse's assistant at the New England Hospital for Women and Children in Roxbury, Massachusetts.

In 1878, at the age of 33, she was admitted as a student into the hospital's nursing program. After graduation, 16 months later, Mary Eliza worked primarily as a private-duty nurse. Her nursing career ended as director of an orphanage in Long Island, New York, a position she had held for over a decade.

As the resolution states, Mary Eliza Mahoney's motto was always, "Work more and better the coming year than the previous year." Mahoney also recognized the need of nurses for nurses to work together to improve the status of African Americans in the profession.

In 1908, she was the cofounder of the National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses. Mahoney gave the welcoming address at the first convention of NACGN and served as the association's national chaplain. She became an inspiration to all nurses and helped make it possible for the members of the NACGN to be received at the White House by President Warren G. Harding.

Ms. Mahoney died in 1926. Because of her dedication and untiring will to inspire future generations, she has been an inspiration to thousands who are a part of the nursing profession.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the author of this resolution, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for her leadership in honoring this great American. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, it is not every day that we get to pay tribute to a truly special person that served our country like Mary Eliza Mahoney, America's first professionally trained African American nurse. I want to indicate my support for H. Con. Resolution 386 offered by Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON honoring Mary Eliza Mahoney's outstanding nursing career, her dedication to the U.S. nursing profession, and exemplary contribution to local and national professional nursing organizations.

Ms. Mahoney was born in 1845 and grew up in an era where many similarly situated African Americans did not have the opportunity for an education. Ms. Mahoney, however, enrolled in nursing school. In 1879, at the age of 34, she was one of only a handful of students in her class who graduated, and the only African American in her class.

□ 1515

Ms. Mahoney changed the face of nursing as the first African American woman. Afterwards, black students were accepted at school as long as they met the requirements. Not only did she pave the way for African Americans as nurses, she advocated for them. Moreover, she worked hard to counteract the nationwide shortage of nurses, which, of course, continues today.

In 1896, Ms. Mahoney became one of the original members of a predominantly white nurses association, alumni of the United States and Canada, later known as the American Nurses Association, or ANA. In 1908, she was cofounder of the National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses.

In addition, Madam Speaker, she supported the voting rights amendment and was the first African American nurse to receive retirement benefits for her lifelong hard work and service to others.

The contributions of people like Mary Eliza Mahoney should be remembered. She set an example more than a century ago that I hope many children today will follow: Work hard, follow your convictions and help others.

The U.S. is expected to have a shortage of 2.8 million nurses by the year 2020, and Congress has to do a lot more to recognize the support, the work of America's nurses both through resolutions like these and through greater funding. Ms. Mahoney was a remarkable woman. We should not let what she fought for so long ago be forgotten. That is why I think it is very important that we pass and support this resolution this afternoon.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 386, honoring Mary Eliza Mahoney, America's first professionally trained African-American nurse.

First, I would like to honor my mother, Ivalita Jackson, who served as a vocational nurse

while she raised her children. With her nurturing hand and wise mind, she instilled in me a strong work ethic, a value of education, and a compelling desire toward public service. Her lifetime of hard work, and her commitment to giving and healing remains an inspiration to me.

Mary Eliza Mahoney was born on May 7th, 1845 in Dorchester, Massachusetts. Mary became interested in nursing as a teenager. Though she worked as a maid, washerwoman and cook at the New England Hospital for Women and Children in Roxbury, Massachusetts for fifteen years, her dream was to practice nursing.

The first step to realizing her dream came when, at the age of 33, Ms. Mahoney was accepted into the nursing school at the New England Hospital for Women and Children. One of only four students of a class of forty two to complete the nursing program, Mahoney received her nursing diploma on August 1, 1879.

As such, she became the first African-American graduate nurse. This indeed, was a magnificent accomplishment at a time in this country when the odds were heavily stacked against her as an African-American, and as a woman.

After graduation, Ms. Mahoney became a private duty nurse. Her employers consistently praised her for her calm and quiet efficiency and for her professionalism.

Despite the odds, she proved that African-Americans could successfully enter into the world of professional nursing. She continues to be a source of inspiration to all nurses.

Mahoney was one of the first African-American members of the organization that later became the American Nurses Association (A.N.A.). When the A.N.A. failed to actively admit black nurses, Mahoney strongly supported the establishment of the National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses (N.A.C.G.N.).

Mahoney recognized the inequalities in nursing education and called for a demonstration at the New England Hospital to have more African-American students admitted.

For more than a decade after, Mahoney helped recruit nurses to join the National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses. Today, nursing is the nation's largest health care profession, with more than 2.7 million registered nurses nationwide. In 2003, 9.9 percent of registered nurses were African American.

Ms. Mahoney was strongly concerned with women's equality and was a staunch supporter of the movement to give women the right to vote. At the age of 76, Ms. Mahoney was among the first women in Boston to register to vote after passage of the Nineteenth Amendment.

At a time in our country when there is a nurse-shortage crisis, it is important to acknowledge the service and dedication of an outstanding American nurse. More than one million new and replacement nurses will be needed by 2012. Ms. Mahoney is a prime example of a professional woman who values and advocates for education, civil rights, and giving something of yourself for your community and for your nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution honoring Mary Eliza Mahoney, America's first professionally trained African-American nurse.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 386, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING FILIPINO WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 622) to recognize and honor the Filipino World War II veterans for their defense of democratic ideals and their important contribution to the outcome of World War II, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 622

Whereas in 1898, the Philippines Archipelago was acquired by the United States, became an organized United States territory in 1902, and, in preparation for independence, became a self-governing commonwealth in 1935;

Whereas the people of the Philippines and of the United States developed strong ties throughout the decades-long democratic transition of the island, compelling the United States to assume the responsibilities of defending the archipelago and protecting the people of the Philippines;

Whereas on July 26, 1941, anticipating the aggression of Japanese invasion forces in the Asia Pacific region, as well as the imminent conflict between the United States and Japan, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued a military order, calling the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines into armed service under the command of United States Army officers led by General Douglas MacArthur;

Whereas on December 7, 1941, the Japanese Government began a devastating four-year war with the United States with their stealth bombing attacks of Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and Clark Air Field, Philippines, and led to the loss of tens of thousands of American and Filipino soldiers and countless civilian casualties;

Whereas on February 20, 1946, President Harry Truman stated, "Philippine Army veterans are nationals of the United States and will continue in that status until July 4, 1946. They fought, as American nationals, under the American flag, and under the direction of our military leaders. They fought with gallantry and courage under most difficult conditions. I consider it a moral obligation of the United States to look after the welfare of the Philippine Army veterans.";

Whereas on October 17, 1996, President William J. Clinton issued a proclamation on the anniversary of the 1944 return of United States forces under General MacArthur to liberate the Philippines and said, "I urge all Americans to recall the courage, sacrifice, and loyalty of Filipino Veterans of World War II and honor them for their contribution to our freedom.";

Whereas on July 26, 2001, President George W. Bush, in his greetings to the Filipino

World War II veterans said, "More than 120,000 Filipinos fought with unwavering loyalty and great gallantry under the command of General Douglas MacArthur. The combined United States-Philippine forces distinguished themselves by their valor and heroism in defense of freedom and democracy. Thousands of Filipino soldiers gave their lives in the battles of Bataan and Corregidor. These soldiers won for the United States the precious time needed to disrupt the enemy's plan for conquest in the Pacific. During the three long years following these battles, the Filipino people valiantly resisted a brutal Japanese occupation with an indomitable spirit and steadfast loyalty to America.";

and
Whereas the contributions of the Filipino people, and the sacrifices of their soldiers in World War II, have not been fully recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes and honors Filipino World War II veterans for their important contributions to the victorious outcome of World War II, including their valiant fight for the liberation of their homeland and their defense of democratic ideals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LAN-TOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 622, which recognizes and honors Filipino World War II veterans for their important contributions to the victorious outcome of World War II.

This resolution notes that the prior history of the Philippines as a United States territory, then as a self-governing commonwealth, during which time the Filipino Armed Forces were called into service under the command of General Douglas MacArthur in July 1941. Those servicemen fought with gallantry and courage, and thousands gave their lives resisting Japanese aggression and occupation. House Resolution 622 honors those Filipino veterans for their valiant fight, for the liberation of their homeland, and for their defense of democratic ideals.

I commend the cochair of the Philippine Caucus, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), for introducing this long overdue resolution. It was moved forward with the strong support of the chairman of the House International Relations Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

My colleagues may not be aware that Chairman HYDE was a combat veteran of the Philippine campaign in World War II, and he piloted a landing craft

in the January 1945 landing that marked the beginning of the liberation of Luzon.

Madam Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an article from the September 10, 2006, edition of Philippine Panorama, the leading weekly news magazine in the Philippines.

[From the Philippine Panorama, Sept. 10, 2006]

MEMORIES OF LINGAYEN
(By Beth Day Romulo)

Henry Hyde, chairman of the US House International Relations Committee, led a group of four congressmen, including Melvin Watt of North Carolina, Dana Rohrabacher of California, Jeff Flake of Arizona and Eni Faleomavaega of Samoa, on a visit to the Philippines (August 11th to 15th) to assess security in this country, discuss trade relations and, in the case of the 82-year old chairman, he hoped to visit with fellow veterans of World War Two, and see Lingayen Gulf again.

As a college freshman at Georgetown University, Hyde enlisted in the Navy in 1942. Why the Navy? He had never been to sea but liked the idea of "a nice clean ship" in comparison to life in a trench. "It didn't occur to me that ships sink," he recalled wryly in an interview at the Makati Shangri-la Hotel where the group were staying. After an officers training program at Duke University, he attended a 90-day midshipmen's school at Notre Dame and won his commission as an Ensign in October 1944. Told that he would go to commanders school at Harvard, he bought new blue uniforms as befitted the occasion which he never wore, since his orders were suddenly changed and he was sent to sea in the Pacific theater, as part of the operation to liberate the Philippines.

Having never been at sea before, he became deathly seasick on his first night out of San Francisco, recovered on the third day and was fortunately never seasick again despite the fact that the Liberty ship took 30 days to reach Hollandia, New Guinea, zigzagging to miss Japanese submarines.

Joining the flotilla of supply ships offshore of the Philippines in January 1945, young Ensign Hyde was assigned command of an amphibious Landing Craft Tank (LCT), a flat-bottomed vessel with a ramp that could tow supplies to shore and unload on beaches. He had 12 crew members, all considerably older than he, so "I grew a full beard." The big ships couldn't come ashore, so it was the duty of the LCT to load from the big ships ("at night and we couldn't use lights") everything from trucks (LCT could carry five at a time) weapons, ammunition, supplies, and occasionally personnel. By this time, General MacArthur had made his historic landing at Leyte and by March 1945, the Americans controlled Manila and Subic Bay and the Japanese army had withdrawn to the North.

After two or three days at sea, water washed over the craft and filled the pontoons. The radio man was frantically calling "we are sinking" to the towing vessel and signaling with the blinker. Hyde recalls with wry humor that he was running around with a mattress "trying to hold back the South China Sea." Eventually, the tow ship got the message and cut loose the lines which dragged down the LCT, and they limped into Lingayen.

Sent on a special mission to Aparri on the northern tip of Luzon, they arrived at a beach which had no grading. "It was like a wall." They couldn't move onto shore, so came in as close as they could. The deserted beach suddenly swarmed with people who

came out from the trees and bushes and waded out to unload their cargo. They were guerillas in dire need of supplies.

While not engaging in combat, the LCT was often under fire from enemy aircraft who dropped bombs near them "but we were too busy to notice."

At another time, Hyde's LCT was given a special mission to salvage the supplies from a Liberty Ship which had foundered on rocks and was lying on its side. They were sent, he found later, because a typhoon was coming and military brass didn't want to lose all the cargo. A destroyer escort took the LCT out to the grounded ship, then disappeared. They tied up to the starboard, started loading and the typhoon hit before they were finished. "This taught me what real terror means." The LCT was banging helplessly against the ship. The wind blew off the conning tower and Hyde was convinced he would lose both his craft and his men. They donned their life-jackets, fully expecting to be washed overboard. "I'll never forget it," Hyde recalled. "The sky was green. The sea was green. And our complexions were green."

Eventually, they were able to cut the lines free from the ship, and Ensign Hyde guided his craft through the swelling seas. In the direction he thought he would lead to Subic Bay. He was in luck. After all-night winds and heavy swells, dawn came. The storm was gone. And they could see Subic Bay. They unloaded their cargo. The LCT was repaired, and they headed back to the grounded ship for a second load. Getting out all the supplies and transporting them to Subic Bay took a week in all.

Lighter moments came when the administrative ship in the flotilla distributed mail from home, and when they had shore leave. After Manila was liberated, there was "a great officers club" where we sat around, sipped beer, and told football stories. Sometimes, they played basketball with college students.

Hyde remembers spending his 21st birthday walking alone on the beach at Lingayen, wondering if he would ever see home again. Other young officers, with wives and children awaiting them, were allowed to leave first. He was finally sent home in August 1946. When the ship was nearing San Francisco, he rose at 3 a.m. and went out on deck to wait for the sight of the lights on the bridge of San Francisco loom through the mist. "It was the happiest moment of my life."

When he had first sailed on the Liberty ship for the Philippines, a submarine was just coming in from the South China Sea, and the men coming and going waved at one another. He wondered then what they had experienced. Now, he knew.

Congressman Hyde was able to greet a large number of Philippine veterans at a wreath-laying ceremony at the American Cemetery in Ft. Bonifacio, some of whom had called upon him in his home constancy. He was also awarded the Philippine Liberation Medal by AFP Major General Horacio Tolentino in a ceremony on August 12th in recognition of his service during the Liberation of the Philippines.

Discovering the difficulties of getting to Lingayen by land, he flew over it instead, which inspired these memories.

The article profiles Chairman HYDE's service in the Philippines and describes, among many other things, his interaction with Filipino servicemen who were waging a guerilla campaign against the Imperial Japanese Army at that time.

I am grateful to have this opportunity today to express our appreciation to those veterans, both Filipino

and Americans, who are with us. This resolution is a fitting tribute to their heroism and sacrifice and deserves our unanimous support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I first would like to commend my California colleague DARRELL ISSA for introducing this important measure. I also want to thank the chairman of our committee HENRY HYDE for letting this resolution move to the floor so expeditiously.

Madam Speaker, the measure before the House honors the contributions of Filipino Americans during the Second World War. You might be surprised to learn that I represent the largest concentration of Filipinos outside of Manila. Among my constituents are tens of thousands of Filipino American families, so it is with great pleasure that I cosponsor this legislation and serve as the Democratic manager of this resolution on the floor today.

Filipino Americans have made an enormous contribution to the cultural, political and economic life of my congressional district, particularly in the community of Daly City. Outside of Honolulu, Daly City is the largest city in the United States with a majority Asian population, and most of this population is Filipino American.

Their contributions to our Nation are not a recent phenomenon. More than 120,000 Filipinos fought under the command of General Douglas MacArthur during World War II. Filipino soldiers played a critical role in stopping the Japanese advance throughout the Pacific. During 3 long years of Japanese occupation, Filipinos helped to liberate their homeland and ultimately to defeat the Japanese war-making machine.

That is why I am so pleased that we are moving forward with this resolution honoring the contributions of Filipino World War II veterans, many of whom are still with us.

It is my strong hope that passage of this measure will pave the way for congressional consideration of the long overdue Filipino Veterans Equity Act. This important legislation would allow Filipino veterans to become eligible for a range of United States veterans benefits currently reserved for former Active Duty military personnel.

Given the enormous contributions made by the Filipinos to the war in the Pacific, it is imperative that Filipino veterans finally receive the benefits they deserve.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to a fighter for Filipino veterans rights, my friend and colleague from California (Mr. FILLNER).

Mr. FILNER. I thank Congressman LANTOS for your leadership in the fight for benefits, and your chairman, Mr. HYDE, and the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. ISSA. Along with my colleague from San Diego County, Mr. ISSA, we chair the Congressional U.S.-Philippines Caucus, and Mr. ISSA is the prime sponsor of the equity bill which you talked about, H.R. 4574, to bring real justice to our Filipino American and Filipino veterans.

We all know, or we all should know, the impact of the Filipino soldiers on World War II. They endured the original Japanese advance. They held them up far beyond their calendar, allowed MacArthur and the U.S. Army to have more time. As guerillas, they kept the Japanese busy for the 4 years that they were occupied, and then helped prepare the way for General MacArthur's return and our eventual victory in the Pacific.

We know their great contribution to American history, but we have repaid this great contribution with words. My friend, the doctor from Florida, said this is a long overdue resolution, and it is a fitting tribute.

Well, 10 years ago this body, or 10 years ago, President Clinton said this same thing: I urge all Americans to recall the courage, sacrifice and loyalty of Filipino veterans of World War II and honor them. Five years ago President Bush sent his greetings, which said the same thing: We thank you all for this work.

But nobody since 1946 has done what President Truman tried to say: I consider it a moral obligation of the United States to look after the welfare of the Filipino Army veterans. They were drafted into the American Army. They were promised benefits.

But in 1946, this Congress, only Mr. LANTOS was here, I think, at the time, this Congress passed a Rescissions Act, which cut the benefits and cut the recognition that they were promised by President Roosevelt and President Truman.

□ 1530

This is wrong, my colleagues; and yet Mr. ISSA, as the sponsor of this resolution, also is the sponsor of the real answer to this situation and the real tribute that we could pay to these veterans, all of whom now are in their 80s. They are a rapidly dwindling band of patriots. What they want is honor and dignity, and that is provided by H.R. 4574, the Filipino Veterans Equity Act. I hope that Mr. LANTOS is right, that this resolution will pave the way. I am afraid it will be an excuse for not doing anything more.

Let us pass this resolution. It helps educate us and our constituents about the role of the Filipino veterans in World War II. But let us go further. Let us pass the Filipino Veterans Equity Act, which provides access to health care and access to pensions of those Filipinos who are eligible.

They don't have long to live, Madam Speaker. They want the honor and dig-

nity that was denied them after World War II. So let us give a fitting tribute and let us do a long overdue action of this Congress. Let us pass H.R. 4574, which will be our true tribute to these brave men.

I thank Mr. ISSA for introducing this resolution. Let us approve it, but let us move on beyond this and truly recognize those who contributed so much to this Nation's freedom and independence.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I rise in strong support of this resolution.

On December 7, 1941, the Empire of Japan attacked not only Pearl Harbor, but also Clark Airfield in the Philippines. Tens of thousands of Americans died that day, but also thousands of Filipino soldiers lost their lives. This one act of war united the American and Filipino people in the noble cause of ending tyranny in the Pacific.

In 1946, President Harry Truman cited that during the war the Philippine Army veterans "fought with gallantry and courage under the most difficult conditions." He also declared that it was the "moral obligation of the United States to look after the welfare of the Philippine Army veterans." In fact, it was with that promise that many of the veterans joined our military efforts, many losing their lives, others suffering lifetime injuries.

Our promise, however, remains unfulfilled. We promised to make them eligible for veterans benefits, but, unfortunately, in 1946, Congress withdrew those benefits.

Now, nearly 60 years later, our Filipino veterans are still looking to see our promise fulfilled. We saw some progress in 2003 when we passed the Veterans Benefit Act, which increased VA benefits for U.S. residents who are Filipino veterans and made the new Philippine Scouts living in the United States eligible for burial in VA national cemeteries.

The United States is indebted to the 120,000 Filipino veterans of World War II for their extraordinary sacrifices. While we can never fully repay our veterans for the sacrifices made on our behalf, today we stop to remember those who gave their lives for our freedom and to thank those who are still with us for their courage and dedication to our country.

Although no longer a territory of the United States, the Philippines and the United States are bound by the countless sacrifices the Filipino veterans made during World War II. We are also bound by countless contributions and achievements of Americans of Filipino descent in every field of human endeavor, including the sciences, business, education, medicine, the arts, athletics, and government.

As the only Member of Congress with any Filipino ancestry, I am honored to

come before the House today to honor the Filipino veterans of World War II and urge my colleagues not only to support this resolution, but to also pass legislation to grant the Filipino veterans the equity that they were promised.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor and strong supporter of H. Res. 622, a resolution to recognize and honor the Filipino World War II veterans for their defense of democratic ideals and their important contribution to the outcome of World War II. As a member of the U.S. Philippines Caucus and the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I am pleased that the House of Representatives is considering this important resolution and urge its passage.

Just this past weekend, Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, the President of the Republic of Philippines, visited my home State of Hawaii and unveiled at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific a commemorative marker honoring Filipinos and Americans who served in World War II. President Macapagal-Arroyo's presence underlines the continuing closeness and importance of the relationship between our two countries.

With more Filipino-Americans in my district than any other congressional district in the country, I was pleased that President George W. Bush, at my request, wrote a message on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of Filipino migration to Hawaii. We must also continue to celebrate and thank the early Filipino migrants who came to work in the sugar plantations of Hawaii and those who fought in support of the United States in World War II.

But there is still much more to be done in support of these brave individuals.

I have introduced legislation in both the 108th and 109th Congresses advancing the interests of the families of our Filipino World War II veterans, many of whom are still waiting in the Philippines to be reunited with their loved ones living in the United States. Earlier this Congress, I reintroduced the bill (H.R. 901) that provides for the sons and daughters of our Filipino World War II veterans to receive priority preference in their respective immigration categories.

Because of the grassroots support by many in Hawaii and across the country and in the Philippines, I am proud to say that Congress is on the verge of successfully advancing legislation that will enable the children of our Filipino World War II veterans to join their parents in the United States. The objectives of H.R. 901 were included in the Senate's version of comprehensive immigration reform legislation. I continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to secure this provision in conference or to pass the free-standing bill.

With the waning days of the 109th Congress upon us, we must stay vigilant and continue to urge Congress to make this and all issues affecting Filipino veterans a high priority in our busy Congressional schedule. I urge Congress to pass H. Res. 622 and to also consider H.R. 901 before the adjournment of the 109th Congress.

Madam Speaker, I commend the Gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) for introducing this important measure. I ask all members to not only support this important resolution, but to also continue to support the full federal recognition and accessibility of benefits for Filipino veterans.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 622, to recognize and honor the Filipino World War II veterans for their defense of democratic ideals and their important contribution to the outcome of World War II.

In 1941, 250,000 of Filipino men and women responded to President Roosevelt's call and joined the U.S. Armed Forces in order to help preserve peace and democracy in the Philippines.

In their tumultuous four-year battle to restore their independence, the courageous young men and women of the combined Philippine Islands suffered many hardships, tortures, loss of life and limbs, yet they never wavered. They endured the unendurable. They bore the unbearable.

Four decades after their heroic service under the command of their leaders and General Douglas MacArthur, these men and women of Filipino-American national heritage were denied the benefits and privileges provided to their American compatriots who fought alongside them.

It is past time that the brave and proud soldiers of the Philippines receive well-earned recognition and thanks for their selfless and heroic contributions.

Filipino World War II veterans fought as nationals of the United States and must be given the same recognition and praise as all American veterans. I applaud the service and efforts of all of our veterans and am honored to give such praise to the Filipino World War II veterans.

I urge my colleagues not only to support this resolution—I urge my colleagues to also consider legislation, such as H.R. 170, the Filipino Veterans Fairness Act, that will grant these aging patriots the full benefits they are due.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, during World War II, the War in the Pacific began with attacks on the United States on December 7, 1941, including the bombing of Pearl Harbor, attacks on the Philippine Islands and the invasion of Guam. Within days of these attacks, our nation and our allies mobilized for war. The United States and the Philippines united behind the cause of democracy and we are proud of the support of the Filipinos during that difficult time. This is why I rise today in support of House Resolution 622, to recognize and honor the Filipino World War II veterans for their defense of democratic ideals and their important contribution to the outcome of World War II.

Ultimate victory belonged to the cause of freedom and therefore to the American and Filipino people. Having suffered a brutal occupation, Filipinos and Guamanians alike were liberated in the march to allied victory in World War II.

Filipino soldiers and civilians fought, sacrificed and died side-by-side with members of the U.S. Armed Forces throughout the course of the World War II. Loyal to the American flag and to the ideals which our country represented, Filipinos fought with notable skill, dedication, and heroism. We honor their commitment to freedom and democracy.

Over sixty years later, we pause today to remember the valor and the commitment to freedom displayed by Filipinos who fought the invading forces alongside their American brothers in arms. With this resolution we also proclaim our deep debt of gratitude for their service and share the disappointment that our na-

tion has not fully honored Filipino World War II veterans as have we honored our own. It is important that we recognize the Filipino veterans and express our appreciation for their sacrifices, contributions and accomplishments.

I am a proud sponsor of this legislation. I urge my colleagues to honor Filipino veterans by voting in favor of this resolution to honor the Filipino World War II veterans for their defense of freedom and their important contributions to our nation in World War II.

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, today the House of Representatives is poised to pass House, Resolution 622 honoring and recognizing the service of Filipino World War II veterans in their defense of our society and the freedoms we enjoy today. I am proud to co-sponsor this resolution highlighting the efforts of a community that came together with the United States to triumph over Japanese Imperialism.

In 1946, on a hot July day, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued a military draft calling the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines into armed services under the command of United States Army officers lead by General Douglas MacArthur. Those brave soldiers stood side by side with American military service members courageously fighting to defend America.

These Filipino World War II veterans are part of what is often referred to as the "greatest generation" and with good reason. From Bataan to Corregidor, Filipino soldiers unselfishly fought to preserve and protect the democratic principles we champion, with the hope that those principles could liberate a people enveloped by tyranny. Today, we stand to recognize those heroes who fought so valiantly to help win the peace in the Pacific.

Madam Speaker, in San Diego we have a vibrant and robust Filipino community that includes many military families with a storied line of military service to our nation. Through the sacrifices of these brave veterans, serve as an example for all Americans. The Filipino community in San Diego has a distinct pride that defines them, and for that they enrich San Diego and make it a better place to live.

I thank my colleague from California, Mr. ISSA, for introducing this legislation and I look forward to voting on its passage.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 622, to, provide recognition to the Filipino veterans who fought to defend democracy and freedom during World War II. Their heroic efforts played a vital role in the outcome of the war and helped lead the allied forces to, victory.

It was more than 60 years ago, when Filipino, soldiers answered a call from President Roosevelt asking them to fight alongside American troops. Countless Filipino and American soldiers sacrificed their lives to protect the democratic principles they shared. It was estimated that 10,000 Filipino, soldiers and 1,200 American soldiers died as prisoners of war during the Bataan Death March alone.

Upon taking the pledge to serve, the Filipino, troops were promised the same benefits and pensions as their American brethren. They suffered the same torture and witnessed the same horrors. They shared the same patriotic duty to preserve liberty around the world. But in 1946 Congress passed the Recission Act, which revoked the full eligibility rights of Filipino soldiers and broke the commitment our nation made to, them.

As we stand together today acknowledging the contributions that the Filipino, soldiers sacrificed for our country, we must pledge to continue their fight for full recognition. This resolution is the first step in correcting the past. As Americans, we make a simple yet sacred promise to those who serve our country in uniform: 'You have taken care of us, so we will take care of you.'

Today, fewer than 70,000 Filipino, veterans are still alive. We remember World War II hero Magdaleno Duenas, a brave soldier who moved to my district in San Francisco and continued the fight from the battlefield to the frontlines in effort to ensure equity for Filipino veterans. We cannot forget the sacrifices that these veterans have made. We must dedicate ourselves as a nation to ensure that America fulfills its moral obligation to those who pay the high price for our freedom.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor those brave American and Filipino soldiers who fought side by side during the Pacific battles of World War II. Their heroic actions and courageous fortitude gave the Allied Forces the edge that they needed to emerge victorious in that great war.

American veterans like Donald Patafio of Woodcliff Lakes and Raymond DiPietro of Demarest. Patafio and DiPietro served in the Navy alongside these brave Filipino soldiers in the battle for their homeland. Patafio served honorably as an aviation radioman and DiPietro's unit received a Presidential Citation for their work in the battle.

More than 120,000 Filipino nationals were formed into U.S. divisions for the defense of their homeland and to advance the Allied forces' cause of liberty. Though poorly equipped, they fought valiantly under the American flag and under the direction of American military leaders in the weeks following the invasion of their homeland. Many continued the battle against the Japanese during the years of occupation.

Thousands of American and Filipino troops died during the infamous hundred-mile Bataan Death March. Many were executed along the way for merely asking for water in the scorching sun. While 70,000 forces surrendered, only 54,000 reached the internment camp. The Geneva Convention was no barrier to the mistreatment, torture, and indiscriminate execution inflicted upon these prisoners of war.

Civilian Filipinos suffered for their alliance with our American troops as well. In Manila, for instance, Japanese troops—in an indefensible position and cut off from supplies—took their anger out on an undefended civilian population, massacring more than 100,000.

We are grateful for the service of all the Filipino people—civilian, guerilla, and regular army—in the defense of democracy. And, we are thankful for their continued friendship. To this day, the Filipino people continue to welcome American soldiers, sailors, and airmen to bases that were instrumental in the Cold War and are now important in the War on Terror. As they did in World War II, fighting along side of brave American soldiers like Donald Patafio and Raymond DiPietro, the people of the Philippines continue to work with American forces to spread the cause of liberty.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the sacrifice of the Filipino veterans of WWII.

America owes a great debt of gratitude to these brave veterans, who risked life and limb

fighting off Japanese aggression in the War of the Pacific.

These brave soldiers, who were outmanned and outgunned, helped hold Japanese forces at bay for 2 years, preventing enemy victories in other parts of the Pacific theater.

Following the surrender of Allied forces on the island, Filipino veterans were subjected to some of the harshest treatment in WWII's recorded history.

This is perhaps best symbolized by the Bataan Death March, where over 10,000 veterans—both American and Filipino, side by side—gave the ultimate sacrifice for freedom.

That is why I would like to thank my colleague, Representative DARYL ISSA, for offering H. Res. 622.

This important resolution, "Reaffirms, recognizes, and honors the Filipino World War II veterans for their defense of American democracy and important contribution to the victorious outcome of World War II."

And while I proudly support Mr. ISSA's efforts here today, I must point out that there is much more work left to be accomplished in fully honoring and recognizing the sacrifices of our brave Filipino WWII veterans.

Sadly, Madam Speaker, as many of these veterans enter the sunset of their years, America has yet to fully extend health and survivor benefits to them and to their spouses.

Filipino veterans did not abandon America in her hour of need. Nor should we abandon them in theirs.

Congress must pass legislation to correct this inequity immediately. Several bills that more fully honor the sacrifices of these brave veterans, including, H.R. 302, the Filipino Equity Act, introduced by my colleague and fellow Californian BOB FILNER, are pending before this House.

H.R. 302 would restore all benefits promised to Filipino veterans. I call on the leadership of this House to bring H.R. 302 to the floor for a full vote before we adjourn this fall.

The words of this resolution are well deserved and welcomed by all who honor the sacrifices by Filipino veterans of WWII. But it is time we match our words with action.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I also have no other requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 622, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Madam 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.

CONDEMNING THE REPRESSION OF THE IRANIAN BAHAI COMMUNITY AND CALLING FOR THE EMANCIPATION OF IRANIAN BAHAI'S

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H.Con. Res. 415) condemning the repression of the Iranian Baha'i community and calling for the emancipation of Iranian Baha'is.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 415

Whereas in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, and 2000, Congress, by concurrent resolution, declared that it deplors the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community and holds the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith;

Whereas on March 20, 2006, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief, Ms. Asma Jahangir, revealed the existence of a confidential letter dated October 29, 2005, from the Chairman of the Command Headquarters of Iran's Armed Forces to the Ministry of Information, the Revolutionary Guard, and the Police Force, stating that the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, had instructed the Command Headquarters to identify members of the Baha'i Faith in Iran and monitor their activities;

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur expressed "grave concern and apprehension" about the implications of this letter for the safety of the Baha'i community;

Whereas in 2005 the Iranian Government initiated a new wave of assaults, homes raids, harassment, and detentions against Baha'is, and in December 2005, Mr. Zabihullah Mahrami died after 10 years of imprisonment on charges of apostasy due to his membership in the Baha'i Faith; and

Whereas beginning in October 2005, an anti-Baha'i campaign has been conducted in the state-sponsored Kayhan newspaper and in broadcast media: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) condemns the Government of Iran for the October 29, 2005 letter, calls on the Government of Iran to immediately cease such activities and all activities aimed at the repression of the Iranian Baha'i community, and continues to hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding all the rights of its nationals, including members of the Baha'i community; and

(2) requests the President to—

(A) call for the Government of Iran to emancipate the Baha'i community by granting those rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international covenants on human rights;

(B) emphasize that the United States regards the human rights practices of the Government of Iran, including its treatment of the Baha'i community and other religious minorities, as a significant factor in the foreign policy of the United States Government regarding Iran; and

(C) initiate an active and consistent dialogue with other governments and the European Union in order to persuade the Government of Iran to rectify its human rights practices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 415, introduced by my colleague from Illinois, Mr. KIRK.

H. Con. Res. 415 condemns the repression of the Iranian Baha'i community and calls for their emancipation. This resolution notes the long-standing concern by Congress for the protection and status of religious minorities in Iran.

The resolution requests that the President call for the Government of Iran to emancipate the Baha'i community and guarantee them basic freedoms in accordance with international and human rights standards and obligations. It emphasizes that Iran's treatment of religious minorities and human rights practices are a significant consideration for the U.S. in formulating our policy toward the Iranian regime.

The Baha'i faith originated in Iran during the 19th century, and their community is one of the largest minorities in religion in Iran. The current government recognizes them as not in true keeping with the faith of the Iranian regime. They are not allowed to practice their faith, and they are further undermined by their inability to maintain contact with Baha'is living abroad.

Baha'is are discriminated against in nearly every sector of Iranian society. In October of 2005, the text of a secret Iranian Government document calling for the identity and monitoring of all Baha'is living in Iran became public. According to Human Rights Watch, Madam Speaker, the anti-Baha'i letter came amid a campaign in the state-run press that began 1 year ago.

Madam Speaker, I recommend that all interested parties who want to learn more about the plight of religious minorities in Iran read the recently released "International Religious Freedom Report" published by our Department of State. This report reaffirms the brutal and oppressive nature of the regime in Tehran. The persecution of the Iranian Baha'is is but one grim example in point.

Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of this resolution, I strongly support the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 415, and I ask my colleagues to vote "yes."

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. First, I would like to congratulate my good friend and colleague, Congressman MARK KIRK, for his leadership and strong voice in the defense of Baha'i communities all over the world. I am proud to be the original Democratic cosponsor of this important resolution.

The Baha'is are Iran's largest religious minority, but because the Baha'i faith is not one of the four religions recognized by the Iran Constitution, Baha'i do not have rights under Iranian law. Iranian courts have ruled that people who injure or kill Baha'is are not liable for damages because the Baha'is are "unprotected infidels." The absurdity of the statement that they are "unprotected infidels" says a great deal about this regime.

Congress has long recognized the plight of this suffering community. Since 1982, we have passed eight resolutions condemning the treatment of the Baha'i in Iran. On March 28 of this year, the White House expressed concern for a worsening situation of the Baha'i in Iran and called on the Government of Iran to respect the religious freedom of its minorities.

Madam Speaker, the situation of the Baha'i in Iran has deteriorated dramatically over the past year with an increase in arbitrary arrests, raids on private homes and imprisonments, a defamation campaign in the government-sponsored press and the continued denial of access to higher education to young men and women of the Baha'i faith.

Iran must grant the Baha'i their full human rights, as this resolution makes crystal clear. Our resolution calls on the Government of Iran simply to grant Baha'i the rights guaranteed by international law. Iran, Madam Speaker, is a signatory to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and several other human rights treaties, but it is obvious that Tehran has no more intention of observing the requirements of these agreements than it does the nuclear agreements it has signed.

The international community must not be mocked. It must hold Iran to those standards to which it has voluntarily committed itself. In fact, Iran's contempt for basic human rights standards knows no bounds. Earlier this year, Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei ordered the Ministry of Information, the Revolutionary Guard and the police force to identify Baha'is and collect information on their activities. This is particularly worrisome in light of the Iranian Government's view of the Baha'is as non-persons.

The Anti-Defamation League has called this order "reminiscent of the laws imposed on European Jews in the 1930s by Nazi Germany." Our resolution rightly highlights this order, which was revealed by the U.N. Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Religion or Belief.

Madam Speaker, the U.S. Congress needs to speak out strongly against

these policies. We cannot stand by quietly as another pogrom against the Baha'is is quietly being prepared by the bigoted regime of Iran. We and the international community must put Iran on notice that such action is utterly intolerable.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the sponsor and author of this resolution.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, which condemns the Government of Iran's repression of the Baha'i community. I would like to thank my very good friend, Congressman TOM LANTOS, for joining me as the Democratic cosponsor of this important human rights resolution.

The North American Baha'i Temple is located in Wilmette, Illinois, inside my congressional district. It is a magnificent house of worship, gracing Lake Michigan's shoreline.

The Baha'i faith, founded nearly 150 years ago on principles of peace and tolerance, is one of the fastest growing religions in the world. Yet since the Iranian revolution of 1979, the Government of Iran has intensified a deliberate campaign of discrimination, harassment, detention, arrest and imprisonment against the 300,000 members of the Iranian Baha'i community.

□ 1545

The plight of the Iranian Baha'is has significantly deteriorated during the last year. On March 20 of this year, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief revealed the existence of a confidential letter by the chairman of the Command Headquarters of Iran's armed services to Iran's intelligence services, military and police. In this letter, the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khomeini instructed Command Headquarters to identify all Baha'is and collect any and all information on their activities and addresses.

Our Anti-Defamation League recently compared this secret letter to steps taken against the Jews in Europe in the 1930s, and yet the secret order has not happened in isolation.

Over the past 18 months, Iranian security forces have begun imprisoning Baha'is without charges, and Baha'i youth in Iran have been denied access to university.

Further, since October of 2005, there has been a campaign of vilification against Baha'is in Kayhan, the government-sponsored press.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom recently released in its 2006 annual report citing numerous egregious human rights violations committed by Iranian

Government officials against Baha'is in Iran. The report says that, "In the past year, dozens of Baha'is were arrested, detained, interrogated and subsequently released after, in some cases, weeks or months in detention. Charges typically ranged from 'causing anxiety in the minds of the public and of officials' or 'spreading propaganda against the regime.'"

Clearly detentions based on claims of causing anxiety or spreading propaganda show a growing weakness in the Iranian regime.

That Congress is considering this resolution today is particularly significant. The Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad will address the United Nations General Assembly today to call for all developing countries to join him in confronting the West. It is incumbent on Congress to reveal the real truth about this Iranian leader. We must demonstrate to the international community that while Iran's President has become a ruthless dictator who espouses hatred, discrimination and tyranny, the United States is standing for liberty and toleration and human rights and freedom, especially for Baha'is in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I would like to thank our ranking member Congressman LANTOS for his friendship and support on this measure, a tireless advocate, a Holocaust survivor, a man who knows when the authorities call for the names and addresses of a particular minority what the next step is.

We have seen this before, and I want to particularly thank Chairman HYDE and Chairwoman ROS-LEHTINEN for their strong support, upon whom this resolution would not be coming to the floor on this crucial day in which the Iranian dictator speaks before the United Nations.

Finally, I would also like to thank Kit Bigelow and Aaron Emmel from the National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'is of the United States for their dedication to their afflicted coreligionists inside Iran.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend from Illinois for his most gracious comments, and I am pleased to yield as much time as he might consume to our colleague and my good friend from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. LANTOS for his undying commitment to human rights. It was you and Mrs. Lantos who worked to see a Human Rights Caucus created, and you have kept these issues in front of the Congress, and I salute you for that.

I also salute my colleague Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for her commitment to human rights. I think it is important that we always bring these issues before the House.

But I think it is also important to relate to Members of Congress the context in which this resolution is occurring and to look back over the last 4 years at a similar context.

The Baha'is in Iran certainly deserve to have a full according of their rights. As a matter of fact, this House has passed eight resolutions that condemn Iran for persecuting the Baha'i faith. At the same time, the House has not passed any resolutions condemning any other Nation for the persecution of the Baha'is.

The 2006 U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has identified three nations that persecute the Baha'i faith: Iran, Iraq and Egypt. I have quotes here that I would like to submit for the RECORD that establishes in each case, of Iran, Egypt and Iraq, the objections out of the 2006 annual report. This 2006 annual report also highlights concerns with the treatment of the Baha'i faith in China, Eritrea, Laos and Belarus.

I think it is important to note that the Baha'i faith is one which celebrates peace and human unity. That is why it is significant for us to always defend any religion which is trying to work for peace.

It is, therefore, paradoxical that this resolution is being offered at a time when some in the administration are on a path towards war against Iran.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a copy of the current issue from *Time* magazine which says: "What Would War Look Like?" We are talking about war with Iran, and it says, "A flurry of military maneuvers in the Middle East increases speculation that conflict with Iran is no longer quite so unthinkable." This particular article out of *Time* magazine is very significant. The Navy has said that there is a submarine, a cruiser missile, mine sweepers and mine hunters that are prepared to deploy to the Persian Gulf. It is very serious. A naval blockade of Iran would be an act of war, and if we started with that, Iran would surely escalate.

There have been independent reports published in the *New Yorker* magazine and the *Guardian* that U.S. military personnel have been or are already deployed inside and around Iran gathering intelligence and targeting information, and there are reports published in *Newsweek*, *ABC News* and *GQ* magazine that the U.S. has been planning and is now recruiting members of MEK, a paramilitary group inside of Iran, to conduct lethal operations and destabilizing operations inside Iran. I submit articles from the *New Yorker*, from an antiwar.com Web site, from the *Weekly Standard* with regard to those facts.

Our Director of National Intelligence has said that Iran is a long way away from having a nuclear capability, 5 to 10 years, and that assumes that they are working around the clock, something that has not been proffered. We should keep in mind that last week, according to the *Washington Post*, the U.N. inspectors are disputing an Iran report by a House staff of the House Intelligence Committee which, according to the comment to the IAEA, the Inter-

national Atomic Energy Agency, was "false, misleading and unsubstantiated." I have here a copy of the letter from the IAEA to the House of Representatives Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with respect to misleading and false information that was included in a staff report that is being circulated around Congress, and I submit it for the RECORD.

I have a copy of a letter from myself to CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, he is the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations, which asks for an accounting by the Director of National Intelligence, who was supposed to be charged with the responsibility of reviewing this particular staff report before it reached publication. I submit this for the RECORD.

I have a copy of a *Washington Post* article which characterizes the U.N. inspectors' dispute with Iran or the U.N. inspector disputing the Iran report by the House panel.

Why am I submitting all this in the context of a resolution that has to do with standing up for the rights of the Baha'i to practice their faith? Because, once again, the Baha'i would not want this resolution to be used as part of a series of steps to encourage an attack on Iran. I can state that with certainty, knowing the Baha'i religion as I do, and yet we are seeing a series of steps, covert operations affecting Iran, preparation of bombing targets having already occurred, preparations for a naval blockade. I mean, this all points to the United States moving in a direction of attacking Iran. That is antithetical to the spirit of the Baha'i faith, which we are here today to stand up for.

There will be other resolutions that will relate to Iran which will be on the floor of the House this afternoon, and I expect to be speaking to those as well.

I want to say that, as the Speaker may be aware, it was 4 years ago I warned this House that the administration was taking steps to take this country to war against Iraq, and they had not made their case, and we actually went to war against Iraq based on false pretenses.

I am once again stating to the people of this Congress that we ought to be very careful about these series of initiatives which this administration is putting forth at this time so that we have to be aware that if they are making a case for war based on these resolutions, we should be very careful about what our intention is in passing these resolutions.

I want to thank the gentleman from California for the opportunity to point out these matters relevant to Iran.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 415, condemning the repression of the Iranian Baha'i community and calling for the emancipation of Iranian Baha'is.

I have long been an advocate of a free, independent, and democratic Iran; an Iran that does not destabilize the region, that does not

threaten its neighbors, and that honors its commitments to the international community, especially on the issue of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Since 1982, Congress has declared eight times that it deplores the religious persecution of the Baha'i community in Iran and that we hold the government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, especially members of the Baha'i faith. It is with dismay that I state that this persecution continues unabated and that the time has come for us as a nation of conscious to take action.

Since the Iranian revolution in 1979, the Iranian government has demonstrated its propensity to engage in systematic persecution and discrimination of the more than 300,000 Baha'is who live in Iran. Baha'is constitute Iran's largest religious minority and over the past quarter century, more than 200 Baha'is have been summarily executed or condemned to death. Thousands more have been imprisoned, detained, assaulted, and harassed.

On March 20, 2006, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief revealed the existence of a confidential letter dated October 29, 2005, from the Chairman of the Command Headquarters of Iran's Armed Forces stating that the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, had instructed the Command Headquarters to identify members of the Baha'i faith in Iran and to monitor their activities. The U.N. Special Rapporteur expressed "grave concern and apprehension" about the implications of this letter for the safety of the Iranian Baha'i community.

For years, I have been a supporter of the democratic movement in Iran, and today more than ever, the people of Iran need to be supported, empowered, and protected. In 2005, the Iranian government initiated a new wave of assaults, home raids, harassment and detentions of members of the Baha'i faith; 129 Baha'is are currently awaiting trial for, among other things, charges of "creating anxiety in the minds of the public and those of the Iranian officials." I find this simply unacceptable and call on my colleagues to condemn this form of religious repression.

The only effective way to achieve lasting peace and prosperity in the region, along with effectuating reforms in Iran's polity, is assisting the Iranian people in general and members of the Baha'i faith in particular in their quest to achieve political, social, and religious liberty.

Every government can be judged with the way in which it treats its ethnic and religious minorities. The current Iranian government gets a failing grade for its treatment of the 300,000 Baha'i who live throughout the regions of Iran. I hold the government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of the Baha'i community and call on the government of Iran to cease repressive activities aimed at Iran's Baha'i. I consider the Iranian government's human rights record as a significant factor in our foreign policy towards Iran and call for President Bush and the leaders of nations around the world to demand that the government of Iran emancipate the Baha'i community by granting those rights guaranteed to them by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights covenants.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution condemning the repression of the Iranian Baha'i community and calling for the emancipation of Iranian Baha'is.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. We yield back the balance of our time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I also have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 415.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF IRANIAN CONSTITUTION OF 1906

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 942) recognizing the centennial anniversary on August 5, 2006, of the Iranian constitution of 1906.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 942

Whereas in 1906, one hundred years ago, the people of Iran rose in a peaceful democratic revolution against arbitrary, despotic rulers;

Whereas the people of Iran chose to confront these rulers with peaceful assemblies of thousands of people in the public spaces of Iran until these rulers received their demands;

Whereas these rulers bowed to the wishes of the people on August 5, 1906, and issued a decree for the convocation of a freely elected assembly, the Majles, to write a democratic constitution;

Whereas the Iranian constitution, written pursuant to the decree of 1906, was a democratic instrument providing for—

(1) the establishment of an independent judiciary;

(2) the establishment of an independent legislature with members directly elected by the people;

(3) socio-political progress, including the separation of religion from the affairs of government; and

(4) the commitment of the government to the territorial integrity of Iran;

Whereas the maneuvering of the imperial powers and a fundamentalist clergy crushed the democratic aspirations represented in the constitution of 1906;

Whereas the Iranian constitution of 1906 has nevertheless remained in the forefront of the aspirations of the Iranian people throughout decades of a long struggle towards progress, civil society, and democracy;

Whereas those ideals were abolished by the clerical-led dictatorship of the Ayatollahs in 1979; and

Whereas August 5, 2006, would be an appropriate day to recognize the centennial anniversary of the Iranian constitution of 1906: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the centennial anniversary of the Iranian constitution of 1906;

(2) is mindful of the democratic revolution of 1906 that led to the drafting of the Iranian constitution; and

(3) expresses its profound hope that the people of Iran will once again enjoy a democratic government in the spirit of the Iranian constitution of 1906.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 942 introduced by my friend, my colleague Mr. KING from Iowa. H. Res. 942, Madam Speaker, recognizes the centennial anniversary on August 5 of the Iranian Constitution of 1906.

□ 1600

The resolution acknowledges the democratic revolution of the Iranian people going back 100 years. It notes the democratic political system created from this movement, with clearly defined separation of powers. Finally, the resolution expresses the hope that the people of Iran will be inspired by their democratic history and once again enjoy democratic rule.

You might be surprised to learn that Persia was the first country in the Middle East to introduce a constitution and create a constitutional monarchy with an elected parliament and popular sovereignty in 1906. The then-Shah signed the electoral law and the fundamental law of Persia that established an independent legislature and an independent judiciary.

While the constitutionalist movement was temporarily undermined in 1908 during the reign of Mohammed Ali Shah Qajar, it was later rescued by the reign of his son.

The ideals of the constitutional revolution were abolished with the demise of the dynasty and the rise of an absolute monarchy in 1925, and then with the Iranian revolution in 1979.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is an opportunity for the American people to send a positive message to the Iranian people about their indigenous democratic tradition. We hope that this tradition will be an inspiration for the Iranian people as they seek to increase their political freedoms.

I strongly support the passage of this resolution. I thank Mr. KING for introducing it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to congratulate my friend and distinguished colleague from Iowa, Congressman KING, for introducing this important resolution commemorating Iran's democratic revolution of 1906. I want equally to congratulate my friend and committee colleague, Mr. BLUMENAUER, who introduced the resolution on the very same topic at virtually the same time.

The issues raised by the King and Blumenauer resolutions are both simple and complex. On the one hand, it is important simply that we commemorate the events of 1906, a popular uprising that led to the drafting of a constitution brimming with democratic guarantees.

Indeed, this was a heady time for tens of thousands of Iranian liberals, as the writings of the esteemed contemporary British scholar Edward G. Browne make abundantly clear.

Recalling these events reminds us that the yearning of the people of the Middle East for democracy has a long and storied history. In fact, there were other significant manifestations of democratic sentiment in the Middle East in the late 19th and early 20th centuries including both in Egypt and in the Ottoman Empire.

At the same time, we cannot help but acknowledge that the high hopes of the 1906 Constitutional Revolution were quickly dashed on the shoals of reactionary resistance, foreign interference, and the lack of unity among the constitutionalists. Iran has gone through many permutations since 1906, but it has experienced very little democracy.

Today's Iran is a far cry from that envisioned by the revolutionaries and constitution writers of a century ago. The Iran of today is an authoritarian, intolerant, theocratic regime in which ultimate authority rests with the clergy, and a minority of clergymen at that.

There are elections and there is a parliament in Iran, but candidates must first be approved by an unelected clergy. The democratic promise that Iranians set out for themselves in 1906 remains unfulfilled, but it is not forgotten. It stands as a beacon of democratic hope for Iran and for others throughout the Middle East.

At a time when we have committed our resources to supporting the emergence of a liberal, tolerant Middle East, it is very appropriate that we recall one of the earliest efforts in that region to establish a constitutional democratic regime. And we honor those Iranians who struggled for positive change. That is why I support this resolution and urge all of my colleagues to do likewise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am so pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman

from Iowa (Mr. KING), the prime sponsor and author of the resolution.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding and for her leadership on this important issue. And I also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his support for this resolution and for his leadership on many of these foreign relation issues that we have.

I am very pleased to be here on the floor today, Madam Speaker, to address this issue; and I rise in support of H. Res. 942 to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Iranian constitutional revolution.

The current totalitarian regime of the ayatollahs presents a threat to world peace. It is important to recognize that Iranian history contains within itself the evidence of internal representative constitutional aspirations which would free the Iranian people of oppressive tyranny.

In 1906, the people of Iran brought about a peaceful constitutional revolution to limit the autocratic power of a corrupt regime. As such, it was among the most significant turning points in Iranian history; it and resulted in the establishment of an elected parliament, the Majles, and the creation of a representative system of government, including checks and balances and the separation of powers.

While the constitution that was ultimately drafted as a result of the revolution was never fully implemented in Iran, it presents the Iranian people with an important starting point in their present-day struggle to overcome the tyranny of the ayatollahs.

Much like the situation that we currently see in Iran, before the revolution in 1906 Iran was ruled harshly by leaders who did not have to respond to the will of the people. As the people of Iran watched their leaders squander away their nation's land and resources, they were emboldened by the democratic revolutions that were at that time sweeping through Europe and Latin American. The people of Iran saw what was happening in other countries and demanded similar reforms. Just as today's Iranians see their needs overlooked in their leaders' attempts to hasten the coming of a worldwide radical Islamic state, the destruction of the assets of Iran before the 1906 revolution resulted in widespread poverty, food shortages and plague, though the rulers demonstrated no obligation to relieve the needs of the people.

After years of agitation and a number of failed attempts to bring about representative constitutional reforms in cooperation with Iran's rulers, the reformists chose nonviolent means to establish their demands. Early in 1906, some 16,000 Iranians gathered in the mosques and the public places of Tehran, organized camps, commissaries, and sanitation facilities and established order; and they simply stayed there. In modern terms, it was a giant sit-in that lasted for weeks. And on August 5, 1906, Mozafareddin Shah

signed a decree authorizing the creation of a freely elected Majles which was the first task of writing a permanent constitution. The constitution that was created was a modern representative document created upon the model of the Belgian Constitution that met all the requirements of the four demands of the revolutionary democratic movement.

The establishment of an independent judiciary was one. The second was establishment of an independent legislature, with members directly elected by the people. The third was a socio-political progress, including the separation of religion from the affairs of government. I will repeat, the separation of religion. The fourth was a commitment of the government to the territorial integrity of Iran. And in 1907, in one of the most unfortunate events of the Iranian history, Mozafareddin Shah died, and with him died the full implementation of the representative constitution.

Nevertheless, the 1906 constitution has always served as a beacon of liberty for those striving for freedom in Iran. All people on the face of the Earth ought to have the right to live under a constitutionally prescribed government that is representative and responsive to the will of the people. The 1906 Constitution of Iran provides the people of Iran with a blueprint for constitutional government that is a product of their culture and their needs. It has demonstrated that Iranians could come together, using their own resources and their own traditions, to create a liberal representative constitutional state. And even though a corrupt dictatorial reactionary regime has ruled in Iran since 1979, the 1906 Iranian Constitution inspires hope for a free Iran today.

Madam Speaker, I hope the recognition contained in this bill can help inspire Iranians to rise up and expel their country's dictators. Given the current threat the Iranian regime poses to global security today, the whole world should join in supporting and encouraging the Iranian people's fight for freedom and constitutional representation.

I ask my colleagues for support of this important legislation and pray for the day that all of God's children live in freedom and liberty.

DRAFT 1906 IRAN CONSTITUTION

In the Name of God the Merciful, the Forgiving.

WHEREAS in accordance with the Imperial edict dated the fourteenth of Jumada althani, A.H. 1324 (=August 5, 1906), a decree was issued for the establishment of a National Consultative Assembly, to promote the progress and happiness of our Kingdom and people, strengthen the foundations of our Government and give effect to the enactments of the Sacred Law of His Holiness the Prophet.

AND WHEREAS, by virtue of the fundamental principle (therein laid down), we have conferred on each individual of the people of our realm, for the amending and superintending of the affairs of the commonwealth, according to their degrees, the right to participate in choosing and appointing the

Members of this Assembly by popular election.

THEREFORE the National Consultative Assembly is now opened, in accordance with our Sacred Command; and we do define as follows the principles and articles of the Constitutional Law regulating the aforesaid National Consultative Assembly, which Law comprises the duties and functions of the above-mentioned Assembly, its limitations, and its relations with the various ministries of the country.

On the Constitution of the Assembly.

Article 1—The national consultative assembly is founded and established in accordance with the Imperial edict of the fourteenth of the Jumada al-thani, A.H. 1324 (August 5, 1906).

Article 2—The National Consultative Assembly represents the whole of the people of Iran, who (thus) participate in the economic and political affairs of the country.

Article 3—The National Consultative Assembly shall consist of the members elected in Tehran and the provinces, and shall be held in Tehran.

Article 4—The number of elected members of the national consultative assembly has been fixed, in accordance with the electoral law, separately promulgated, at one hundred and sixty-two, but in case of necessity the number of the members may be increased to two hundred.

Article 5—The members of the national consultative assembly shall be elected for two whole years. This period shall begin on the day when all the representatives from the provinces have arrived in Tehran. On the conclusion of this period or two years, new representatives shall be elected, but the people shall have the option of re-electing any of their former representatives whom they wish and with whom they are satisfied.

Article 6—The members of the national consultative assembly who have been elected to represent Tehran shall, as soon as they meet, have the right to convene the national consultative assembly and to begin their discussions and deliberations. During the period preceding the arrival of the provincial delegates, their decisions shall depend for their validity and due execution on the majority (by which they are carried).

Article 7—On the opening of the debates, at least two thirds of the members of the national consultative assembly shall be present, and, when the vote is taken at least three quarters. A majority shall be obtained only when more than half of those present in the Assembly record their votes.

Article 8—The periods of session and recess of the national consultative assembly shall be determined by the assembly itself, in accordance with such internal regulations as itself shall formulate. After the summer recess, the national consultative assembly must continue open and remain in session from the fourteenth day of the month of Mehr (Oct. 6th), which corresponds with the anniversary of the opening day of the first assembly.

Article 9—The national consultative assembly can sit on occasions of extraordinary public holidays.

Article 10—On the opening day of the national consultative assembly, an address shall be presented by it to His Imperial Majesty, and it shall afterwards have the honor of receiving an answer from that Royal and August quarter.

Article 11—Members of the national consultative assembly, on taking their seats, shall take and subscribe to the following form of oath:

(Form of the Oath.)

"We the undersigned take God to witness, and swear on the Qur'an, that, so long as the rights of the national consultative assembly

and its members are observed and respected, in conformity with these regulations, we will, so far as possible, discharge, with the utmost truth, uprightness, diligence and endeavor, the duties confided to us; that we will act loyally and truthfully towards our just and honored sovereign, commit no treason in respect of either the foundations of the throne or the rights of the people, and will consider only the advantage and well-being of the people and the country of Iran."

Article 12—No one, on any pretext or excuse, shall have any right, without the knowledge and approval of the national consultative assembly, to molest its members. Even in case of the members committing some crime or misdemeanor, and being arrested flagrante delicto, any punishment inflicted upon him must be with the cognizance of the national consultative assembly.

Article 13—The deliberations of the national consultative assembly, in order that effect may be given to their results, must be public. According to the internal regulations of the assembly, journalists and spectators have the right to be present and listen, but not to speak. Newspapers may print and publish all the debates of the assembly, provided they do not change or pervert their meaning, so that the public may be informed of the subjects of discussion and the detail of what takes place. Everyone, subject to his playing due regard to the public good, may discuss them in the public press, so that no matter may be veiled or hidden from any person. Therefore all newspapers, provided that their contents are not injurious to any one of the fundamental principles of the government or the nation, are authorized and allowed to print and publish all matters advantageous to the public interest, such as the debates of the assembly, and the opinions of the people on these debates. But if anyone, actuated by interested motives, shall print in the newspapers or in other publications anything contrary to what has been mentioned, or inspired by slander or calumny, he will render himself liable to cross-examination, judgment and punishment, according to law.

Article 14—The national consultative assembly shall organize and arrange, in accordance with separate and distinct regulations called the Internal Code of Rules, its own affairs, such as the election of a president, vice-presidents, secretaries, and other officers, the arrangements of the debates and formation of committees, etc.

Duties of the Assembly, its Rights and its Limitations.

Article 15—The national consultative assembly has the right in all matters and issues to propose any bill which it regards as conducive to the well-being of the government and the people, after due discussion and deliberation thereof in all sincerity and truth; and, having due regard to the majority of votes, to submit such bill, in complete confidence of safety and security, after it has received the approval of the senate, by means of the Prime Minister of the country, so that it may receive the Royal Approval and be duly carried out.

Article 16—All laws necessary to strengthen the foundations of the country and throne and to set in order the affairs of the realm and the establishment of the ministries must be ratified by the national consultative assembly.

Article 17—The national consultative assembly shall, when occasion arises, bring forward such bills as shall be necessary for the creation, modification, completion or abrogation of any law, and, subject to the ratification by the senate, shall submit it for the royal sanction, so that due effect may thereafter be given to it.

Article 18—The regulation of all financial matters, the construction and regulation of

the budget, all changes in fiscal arrangements, the acceptance or rejection of all incidental and subordinate expenditure, as also the new inspectorships (of finance) which will be founded by the Government, shall be subject to the approval of the national consultative assembly.

Article 19—The national consultative assembly has the right, after the senate has given its approval, to demand from the ministers that effect shall be given to the bills thus approved for the reform of the finances and the facilitation of co-operation between the different departments of the Government by division of the departments and provinces of Iran and their respective offices.

Article 20—The budget of each ministry shall be concluded during the latter half of each year for the following year, and shall be ready fifteen days before the festivities of Norooz. (March 21, the Iranian new year)

Article 21—Should it at any time be necessary to introduce, modify or abrogate any bylaws regulating the (functions of the) ministries, such change shall be made only with the approval of the national consultative assembly, irrespective of whether the necessity for such action has been declared by the assembly or enunciated by the responsible ministers.

Article 22—Any proposal to transfer or sell any portion of the national resources, or of the control exercised by the government or the throne, or to effect any change in the boundaries and frontiers of the kingdom, shall be subject to the approval of the national consultative assembly.

Article 23—Without the approval of the national consultative assembly no concession for the formation of any public company of any sort shall, under any plea whatsoever be granted by the government.

Article 24—The conclusion of treaties and covenants, the granting of commercial, industrial, agricultural and other concessions, irrespective of whether they are granted to Iranian or foreign nationals, shall be subject to the approval of the national consultative assembly, with the exception of treaties which, for reasons of state and the public advantage, must be kept secret.

Article 25—All government and national loans, under whatever title, whether internal or external, must be contracted only with the cognizance and approval of the national consultative assembly.

Article 26—The construction of railroads or chausses, at the expense of the government, or of any company, whether Iranian or foreign, depends on the approval of the assembly.

Article 27—Wherever the assembly observes any defect in the laws, or any neglect in giving effect to them, it shall notify the same to the minister responsible for that department, who shall furnish all necessary explanations.

Article 28—Should any minister, acting under misapprehension, issue on the royal authority, whether in writing or verbal, orders conflicting with one of the laws which have been enacted and have received the royal sanction, he shall admit his negligence and lack of attention, and shall, according to the law, be personally responsible to His Majesty.

Article 29—Should a minister fail to give a satisfactory account of any affair conformable to the laws which have received the royal sanction, and should it appear in his case that a violation of such law has been committed, or that he has transgressed the limits imposed (on him), the assembly shall demand his dismissal from His Majesty, and should his treason be clearly established in a Court of Law, he shall not again be employed in the service of the State.

Article 30—The Assembly shall, at any time when it considers it necessary, have the

right to make direct representations to His Majesty by means of a committee consisting of the president of the national consultative assembly and six of its members chosen by the six ranks. This committee must ask permission, and make an appointment for an audience with His Majesty through the Chief of Protocol. (Wazir-i-Darbar).

Article 31—Ministers have the right to be present at the sessions of the national consultative assembly, to sit in the places appointed for them, and to listen to the debates of the assembly. If they consider it necessary, they may ask the President of the assembly for permission to speak, and may give such explanations as may be necessary for purposes of discussion and investigation.

On the Presentation of Issues to the National Consultative Assembly.

Article 32—Any individual may submit in writing to the Petition Department of the Archives of the assembly a statement of his own case, or of any criticisms or complaints. If the matter concerns the assembly itself, it will give him a satisfactory answer; but if it concerns one of the ministries, it will refer it to that ministry, which will enquire into the matter and return a sufficient answer.

Article 33—New laws which are needed shall be drafted and revised in the ministries which are respectively responsible, and shall then be laid before the national consultative assembly by the responsible ministers, or by the Prime Minister. After being ratified by the assembly, and signed by His Majesty, they shall be duly put into force.

Article 34—The President of the national consultative assembly can, in case of necessity, either personally, or on the demand of often members of the assembly, hold a private conference, consisting of a selected number of members of the national consultative assembly, with any minister, from which private meeting newspaper correspondents and spectators shall be excluded, and at which other members of the assembly shall not have the right to be present. The result of the deliberations of such secret conference shall, however, only be confirmed when it has been deliberated in the said conference in presence of three quarter those selected (to serve on it), and carried by a majority of votes. Should the proposition (in question) not be accepted in the private conference, it shall not be brought forward in the national consultative assembly, but shall be passed over in silence.

Article 35—If such private conference shall have been held at the demand of the president of the national consultative assembly, he has the right to inform the public of so much of the deliberations as he shall deem expedient; but if the private conference has been held at the demand of a minister, the disclosure of the deliberations depends on the permission of that minister.

Article 36—Any minister can withdraw any matter which he has proposed to the assembly at any point in the discussion, unless his statement has been made at the instance of the assembly, in which case statement has been made at the instance of the assembly, in which case the withdrawal of the matter depends on the consent of the assembly.

Article 37—If a bill introduced by any minister is not accepted by the national consultative assembly, it shall be returned, supplemented by the observations of the assembly; and the responsible minister, after rejecting or accepting the criticisms of the assembly, can propose the aforesaid bill a second time to the assembly.

Article 38—The members of the national consultative assembly must clearly and plainly signify their rejection or acceptance of bills, and no one has the right to persuade or threaten them in recording their votes. The signification by the members of the assembly of such rejection or acceptance

must be effected in such manner that newspaper correspondents and spectators also may perceive it, that is to say their intention must be signified by some outward sign such as (the employment of) blue and white voting-papers, or the like.

On the Introduction of Bills and Other Proposals by the Assembly.

Article 39—Whenever any bill is proposed by one of the members of the assembly, it can only be discussed when at least fifteen members of the assembly shall approve the discussion on that bill. In such case the proposal in question shall be forwarded in writing to the President of the assembly, who has the right to arrange that it shall be subjected to a preliminary investigation in a Committee of Enquiry.

Article 40—On the occasion of the discussion and investigation of such bill as is mentioned in Article 39, whether in the assembly or in the Committee of Enquiry, notice shall be given by the assembly to the responsible minister, if any, concerning that bill, that if possible he himself, or, if not, his deputy, shall be present in the assembly, so that the debate may take place in the presence of one or other of them. The draft of the (proposed) bill, with its additions, must be sent from ten days to a month before the time (with the exception of matters added at the last moment) to the responsible minister; and so likewise the day of its discussion must be determined beforehand. After the bill has been discussed in the presence of the responsible minister, and in case it should, by a majority of votes, receive the approval of the assembly, it shall be officially transmitted in writing to the responsible minister, so that he may take the necessary actions to implement it.

Article 41—If the responsible minister cannot, for any reason, agree with the national consultative assembly about the said bill, he must offer his excuses to it and give it satisfaction.

Article 42—Should the national consultative assembly demand explanations on any matter from the responsible minister, the minister in question must give an answer, which answer must not be postponed unnecessarily or without plausible reason, save in the case of secret matters, the secrecy of which for some definite period is to the advantage of the country and the people. In such cases, on the lapse of the definite period the responsible minister is bound to disclose that matter in the assembly.

On the Conditions Regulating the Formation of the Senate.

Article 43—There shall be constituted another assembly, entitled the Senate, consisting of sixty members, the sessions of which, after its constitution, shall be contemporaneous to the sessions of the national consultative assembly.

Article 44—The regulations of the Senate must be approved by the national consultative assembly.

Article 45—The members of this assembly shall be chosen from amongst the well-informed, discerning, pious and respected persons of the realm. Thirty of them shall be nominated by His Imperial Majesty (fifteen of the people of Tehran, and fifteen of the people of the provinces), and thirty shall be elected by the people (fifteen elected by the people of Tehran, and fifteen elected by the people of the provinces).

Article 46—After the convocation of the Senate, all proposals must be approved by both assemblies. If those proposals shall have been originated in the Senate, or by the cabinet of ministers, they must first be amended and corrected in the Senate and accepted by a majority of votes, and must then be approved by the national consultative assembly. But proposals brought forward by

the national consultative assembly must, on the contrary, go from this assembly to the Senate, except in the case of financial matters, which belong exclusively to the national consultative assembly. The decision of the assembly, in respect to the above-mentioned proposals, shall be made known to the Senate, so that it in turn may communicate its observations to the national consultative assembly, but the latter, after due discussion, is free to accept or reject these observations of the Senate.

Article 47—So long as the Senate has not been convoked, proposals shall, after being approved by the national consultative assembly, receive the Royal assent, shall then have the force of law.

Article 48—If any proposal, after undergoing debate and revision in the Senate, be referred by a minister to the national consultative assembly, and be not accepted, such disputed proposal shall, in case of its being of importance, be reconsidered by a third assembly composed of members of the Senate and members of the national consultative assembly elected in equal moieties by members of the two assemblies. The decision of this (third) assembly shall be read out in the national consultative assembly. If it be then accepted, well. If not, a full account of the matter shall be submitted to His Majesty and should the Royal judgment support the view of the national consultative assembly, it shall become effective; but if not, orders will be issued for a fresh discussion and investigation. If again no agreement of opinion results, and the Senate, by a majority of two thirds, approves the dissolution of the national consultative assembly, this approval being separately affirmed by the cabinet of ministers, then the Imperial decree will be issued for the dissolution of the national consultative assembly, and at the same time orders shall be given for the holding of fresh elections, the people, however, have the right to re-elect their former representatives.

Article 49—The new representatives of Tehran must present themselves within the space of one month, and the representatives of the provinces within the space of three months. When the representatives of the Capital are present, the Assembly shall be opened, and shall begin its labors, but they shall not discuss disputed proposals until the provincial representatives shall arrive. If, after the arrival of all its members, the new assembly shall by a clear majority confirm the first decision, His Most Sacred and Imperial Majesty shall approve that decision of the national consultative assembly, and shall order it to be carried into effect.

Article 50—In each electoral period, which consists of two years, orders for the renewal of representatives shall not be given more than once.

Article 51—It is agreed that the kings of our successors and posterity shall regard as a duty of their sovereign state and an obligation incumbent upon them the maintenance of these laws and principles, which we have established and put into force for the strengthening of the edifice of the country, the consolidation of the foundations of the Throne, the superintendence of the machinery of Justice, and the tranquility of the nation.

14 of the month of Dhu'l-Qa'da, in the year of 1324 A.H.

(=December 30, 1906).

“These constitutional laws of the national consultative assembly and the senate, containing fifty-one articles, are correct.

(Dhu al-Qi'dah 14, A.H. 1324’

(=December 30, 1906).

(Underneath the concluding words is the signature of the Muzaffaru'd-Din Shah, and on the back of the page are the seals of the

then Crown Prince or Wali-ahd (the deposed Shah, Muhammad'Ali), and of the late Mushiru'd-Dawla.)

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my good friend and distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) as much time as he might consume.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the gentleman from California, and I appreciate your commitment to constitutional democracies. My statement here today, while I can certainly agree with the sentiment that was expressed and the spirit of this resolution with respect to hoping for constitutional democracies, I think we need to look at the letter of the resolution and put it in the context of the administration's policies.

First of all, this particular resolution expresses its profound hope that the people of Iran will once again enjoy a democratic government in the spirit of the Iranian Constitution of 1906. I would like to read from some research that is available on the Web, Recent Iranian History from Wikipedia. It says that: with the rise of modernization in the late 19th century, desire for change led to the Persian Constitutional Revolution of 1905 to 1911. In 1921, Reza Shah Pahlavi staged a coup against the weakened Qajar dynasty.

During World War II, Britain and the USSR invaded Iran from August 25 to September 17, 1941, to stop an axis-supported coup and secure Iran's petroleum infrastructure. The allies of World War II forced the Shah to abdicate, in favor of his son, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, whom they hoped would be more supportive.

In 1951, a pro-democratic nationalist, Dr. Mohammed Mossadegh, rose to prominence in Iran. Now, Mossadegh was elected its first Prime Minister. As Prime Minister, Mossadegh alarmed the West by his nationalization of an Anglo-Iranian oil company that was later named BP, which controlled all the country's oil reserves.

Britain immediately put an embargo on Iran. Members of British Intelligence Service approached the United States under President Eisenhower in 1953 to join them in Operation Ajax, a coup against Mossadegh. President Eisenhower agreed and authorized the CIA to assist the BIS in overthrowing Mossadegh. The Shah at first attempted to formally dismiss Mossadegh, but this backfired and Mossadegh convinced the Shah to flee to Baghdad.

Regardless of this setback, the covert operation soon went into full swing conducted from the U.S. embassy in Tehran under the leadership of Kermit Roosevelt, Jr. Agents were hired to facilitate violence, and as a result protests broke out across the nation, anti-and pro-monarchy. Protesters violently clashed in the streets leaving almost 300 dead. The operation was successful in triggering a coup, and within days pro-Shah tanks stormed the capital and bombarded the Prime Minister's

residence. Mossadegh surrendered and was arrested on the 19th of August 1953, tried for treason, and sentenced to 3 years in prison.

□ 1615

Now, keep in mind that on March 8 of 1951, Mossadegh submitted to the Iranian mullahs his proposal to nationalize Iran's oil. According to the Cornell University library, the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, most of whose stock was owned by the British Government, had been paying Iran much less than the British Government took from the company in taxes. Mossadegh's nationalization bill scared the company into concessions that were made too late. The Premier was committed to nationalization. Much to the surprise of the British, he went through with it right down to the expulsion of British technicians without whom the Iranians could not run the Abadan refinery. Results? The West lost the Iranian oil supply, and the Iranian Government lost the oil payments.

When we are talking about democracy in Iran, Iran had a democratic government which was overthrown because of oil. So let's celebrate democracy and not try to at the same time praise a process that resulted in an overthrow of democracy.

I think when we look at this particular resolution, you have to read these resolutions to the letter to get an idea of what is going on here.

Here we are expressing the profound hope that the people of Iran will once again enjoy a democratic government in the spirit of the Iranian Constitution of 1906. They had a democratic government. The U.S. helped overthrow it.

One of the last resolutions, we talked about initiating an active and consistent dialogue with other governments in the European Union in order to persuade the Government of Iran to rectify its human rights practices. We should be talking to the Government of Iran if we object to their human rights practices.

Resolution 415 says human rights will be considered a significant factor in the foreign policy of the United States with regard to Iran, but we are not stating that with the other countries that have violated the human rights of their citizens.

My concern is that while these resolutions in and of themselves may have elements that are salutary, at the same time you have to put them in the context of the administration's policy, which is a buildup to war against Iran. That is why I am raising a note of caution here. You have to see why we have three resolutions on the floor of the House dealing with Iran on the same day our President is before the United Nations making a statement which characterizes Iran in much the same way that Iraq was characterized before the United Nations in another visit by the President. I think we have to be very cautious about the path this country is taking.

We can stand for democracy and human rights in Iran. We can do all of those things without taking steps and letting our efforts, which might be in good faith, by the way, without letting those efforts be used as a buildup towards war. I am saying look at all of this in the context in which it is occurring.

Look at Time magazine this week and look at the stories that have been published in The New Yorker. Watch the development of this administration with respect to covert activities in Iran.

Madam Speaker, you might be interested to know that our House Subcommittee on Government Operations, which has jurisdiction over national security and international relations, we were supposed to have a classified briefing by the State Department and by the Department of Defense on this issue on what is going on in Iran. They refused to appear. They still refuse to appear. They are not accountable to Congress. I am raising this issue so my colleagues know that you have to look at the context in which these resolutions are being offered.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for the opportunity to present these observations.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 942, recognizing the centennial anniversary on August 5, 2006, of the Iranian constitution of 1906. I, too, introduced a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Iranian Constitutional Revolution at the same time as Mr. KING, H. Res. 967.

The Iranian Constitutional Revolution was a pivotal event in Persian and Middle Eastern history. In the face of a corrupt and authoritarian Qajar monarchy, and in order to defend Persian interests against British and Russian imperialism, the Persian people rose up and forced the creation of a parliament and the adoption of a constitution containing basic democratic rights for the first time in Iranian history.

In this time that the United States faces very serious and difficult issues with regards to Iran, this historic event demonstrates that the Iranian people's long-standing desire for democratic self-government, free from authoritarian rule or foreign interference. I believe that understanding these values common to the Iranian and American peoples, as well as Iran's political history, will help us develop a constructive policy towards Iran. It is also an important sign of support for the Iranian people and our Iranian-American constituents.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, we have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I also have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 942.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of

those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM NEEDS TO DO MORE TO RESOLVE CLAIMS FOR CONFISCATED REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 415) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam needs to do more to resolve claims for confiscated real and personal property, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 415

Whereas during the establishment of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam as a 1-party state ruled and controlled by the Vietnamese Communist Party, uncompensated confiscation of real and personal property from Vietnamese citizens was a widespread occurrence;

Whereas Article 23 of the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam provides that "[t]he lawful property of individuals and organizations shall not be nationalized";

Whereas according to the Department of State, more work is necessary to adequately protect property rights in Vietnam; and

Whereas the people of the United States are firmly committed to freedom, democracy, and basic human rights for the citizens of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) The House of Representatives—

(A) welcomes recent attempts by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to establish private land use rights for its citizens, and hopes that these rights are quickly expanded to encompass all Vietnamese citizens;

(B) calls on the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to more fully recognize its responsibility to provide equitable, prompt, and fair restitution of property that was confiscated by the government;

(C) calls on the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to direct local officials, particularly in the Central Highlands region, to promptly investigate and resolve complaints about discriminatory and uncompensated confiscation of land;

(D) urges the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to form a national commission for processing restitution claims, and to obligate local government officials, bodies, and agencies to provide all necessary documentation and cooperation to facilitate the implementation of decisions issued by the national commission; and

(E) strongly urges the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam—

(i) to ensure that implementation of land use reforms by local officials does not result in increased inequity in access to land, particularly for the poor and for those out of favor with the Communist Party; and

(ii) to ensure that the government provides fair, prompt, and equitable restitution to former landowners for the property rights of all confiscated lands; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) the President should specifically consider land use rights for individuals in determining whether the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is a country of particular concern for religious freedom under section 402(b)(1)(A) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)(1)(A)); and

(B) the President should direct the Secretary of State to include, in the Secretary of State's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices submitted to the Congress under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the status of land use rights and restitution claims in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 415 expresses the sense of the House that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam needs to do more to resolve claims for confiscated real and personal property. This resolution notes the widespread confiscation of real and personal property that occurred during the establishment of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam as a one-party state ruled by the Vietnamese Communist Party.

Many individuals and entities, including the Catholic Church and the United Buddhist Church of Vietnam, still have not been adequately compensated for those extensive takings.

Unfortunately, property confiscation is not just a thing of the past. Earlier this year, the State Department noted reports that Vietnamese officials had forced some ethnic minority Protestants to leave their homes without adequate compensation, and that land was seized from other minorities and given to state-owned coffee and rubber plantations. These events underscore the continuing need for equitable restitution and better protection of property rights in Vietnam.

House Resolution 415 urges the Vietnamese Government to investigate confiscation complaints and to provide restitution. It also expresses the sense of the House that our President should consider land rights issues in determining whether Vietnam is a country of particular concern for religious freedom under the International Religious

Freedom Act, and should include reporting on land rights and restitution issues in the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

We appreciate the efforts of this resolution's lead sponsors, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and we thank Chairman HYDE and the Committee on International Relations for moving this resolution forward.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I first want to commend my good friend and fellow Californian Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ for introducing this resolution. Her leadership in Congress on matters related to Vietnam is deeply appreciated.

Since the fall of Saigon more than three decades ago, the Vietnamese Government has confiscated private property of thousands of Vietnamese families. Some of these Vietnamese have fled abroad, while others have continued to live under the repression of the Vietnamese Communist Party.

Sadly, the confiscation of private property by the Vietnamese Government is not a matter of ancient history. Many Vietnamese today complain that local authorities are confiscating their lands without compensation and due process, and that these confiscations are being carried out in a singularly discriminatory fashion.

The Montagnards in Vietnam's Central Highlands, many of whom are Christians, have been particularly subjected to land confiscations. Many Christian Montagnards have lost access to their ancestral lands, and they have been severely marginalized in an economic sense. In some cases, confiscated Montagnard land has been turned over to Vietnamese from lowland areas.

Madam Speaker, the Vietnamese Government has recently made efforts to improve its land reform policies. It is imperative that the government uses this process to end discriminatory land seizures and to ensure that everyone receives adequate compensation for their property.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the author of this important resolution, my good friend from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. LANTOS for yielding me this time.

I would also like to thank my original cosponsor, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and Chairman HYDE, and all of the members of the Committee on International Relations who thought this was an important resolution and who helped me bring it to the floor.

I introduced H. Res. 415 in June 2005 because we began to see a very big pat-

tern of confiscation of land. Now, this had been happening in Vietnam since the fall of Saigon back in 1975 by the Socialist government. But we have seen it happen even more, and particularly to religious institutions and to minorities, including the Montagnards who live up in the highlands.

It is a growing concern, and illegal seizures of personal property from Vietnamese citizens and private organizations just shouldn't be happening. Even though Article 23 of the Vietnamese Constitution prohibits seizure of property without compensation, this has not been enforced.

We must support the people within Vietnam who continue to fight for the right to keep their land. Believe me, they do. They have been demonstrating now for almost 6 months in front of the government buildings in Hanoi asking for land reform, asking to get their lands back. We need to make sure if their lands are taken and they are not gotten back, they should at least be compensated correctly for having them taken from them.

The government claims it is working to improve its human rights record. Well, this Congress can send a clear message that we are looking at what they are doing, and in order to show progress in the area of human rights, we are going to evaluate it step by step, and the first part is to end property seizures and to fairly compensate the citizens and organizations whose land has been unfairly taken.

Congress must be clear with the Government of Vietnam that promises alone are not satisfactory, and that implementation and enforcement are the real measures of this progress. As the President prepares to go to Vietnam, and as Vietnam is looking at entrance into WTO, and as we are looking at normal trade relations with Vietnam, I think it is incredibly important for this Congress to remember how important human rights are here in the United States and for every citizen of the world.

I urge my colleagues to support the people of Vietnam and to send a clear message to the Government of Vietnam by voting for this resolution today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the effort, the legislation and the work of Congresswoman SANCHEZ, who has worked on these issues for a very long time. I also thank the ranking member Mr. LANTOS and the manager Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for their leadership on these issues.

It is interesting that now, with most of the world's leaders at the United Nations, you would almost hope that they would accomplish something. Certainly that would mean to many of the nations that would be appearing there

that they would address some of the questions that have oppressed their citizens for years.

□ 1630

After the Vietnam War, we remain with a divided Vietnam, the North and South Vietnam; but over the years, this Congress and these administrations have moved more closely to try to develop alliances with the United States and North and South Vietnam, under the argument that engagement is responsible and it helps to promote democracy.

I would say that many of the Vietnamese in the Vietnamese community of the United States know that that is still a difficult road. Many are still fighting for family reunification, for the right to visit their families, or the right for their families to be reunited with them. Even though we move closer and closer to trade relationships, we still have harsh conditions in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and that has to do with the ongoing fight for confiscated and personal property that has not been returned.

Unfortunately, as the one-party system was established under the Vietnamese Communist Party, uncompensated confiscation of real and personal property from Vietnamese citizens was widespread and there was no solution. Unfortunately, under this government the confiscation of land as a tool of repression against certain ethnic minorities continued, and it continues even today. Article 23 of the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam provides that the lawful property of individuals and organizations shall not be nationalized.

So I rise today to ask that more attention be given to the providing of this property back to the rightful owners and that the government is asked by the world community to establish a private land use right for some of its citizens and also to establish a way to return this property. We, likewise, believe that this government should remove itself from engaging in repressive procedures that do not allow the right of private property ownership to exist in North Vietnam. We believe it is very important for tools to be put in place so that the rights of the people can be restored.

I hope in this time that the United Nations is gathered that issues dealing with individual rights of citizens and countries that are still repressive become high on their agenda. We need to discuss Sudan. We need to discuss the rights of the people in Iran, and, certainly, Vietnam is one in particular.

So I join in support of H. Res. 415 and ask this Congress to support a strong statement being made to North Vietnam about the rights of its people and the right for the return of private and personal property. This is a time that the statement should be made, but more importantly, this is a time for action.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 415, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—————

**REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO
ISSUE A PROCLAMATION CALLING
FOR OBSERVANCE OF GLOBAL
FAMILY DAY, ONE DAY OF
PEACE AND SHARING**

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 317) requesting the President to issue a proclamation annually calling upon the people of the United States to observe Global Family Day, One Day of Peace and Sharing, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 317

Whereas, in the year 2005, the people of the world suffered many calamitous events, including devastation from tsunami, terror attacks, war, famine, genocide, hurricanes, earthquakes, political and religious conflict, disease, poverty, and rioting, all necessitating global cooperation, compassion, and unity previously unprecedented among diverse cultures, faiths, and economic classes;

Whereas grave global challenges in the year 2006 may require cooperation and innovative problem-solving among citizens and nations on an even greater scale;

Whereas, on December 15, 2000, Congress adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 138, expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should issue a proclamation each year calling upon the people of the United States and interested organizations to observe an international day of peace and sharing at the beginning of each year;

Whereas, in 2001, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 56/2, which invited "Member States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and all the peoples of the world to celebrate One Day in Peace, 1 January 2002, and every year thereafter";

Whereas many foreign heads of state have recognized the importance of establishing Global Family Day, a special day of international unity, peace, and sharing, on the first day of each year; and

Whereas family is the basic structure of humanity, thus, we must all look to the stability and love within our individual families to create stability in the global community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress urgently requests the following:

(1) That the President issue a proclamation annually calling upon the people of the United States to observe Global Family Day, One Day of Peace and Sharing, a day which is dedicated—

(A) to eradicating violence, hunger, poverty, and suffering; and

(B) to establishing greater trust and fellowship among peace-loving nations and families everywhere.

(2) That the President invite former Presidents of the United States, Nobel laureates, and other notables, including American business, labor, faith, and civic leaders, to join the President in promoting appropriate activities for Americans and in extending appropriate greetings from the families of America to families in the rest of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Con. Res. 317, requesting the President to issue a proclamation setting aside a day dedicated to eradicating violence and establishing greater trust among peace-loving nations and families everywhere.

This resolution has a distinguished history, Madam Speaker. In the year 2000, Congress unanimously agreed to a similar resolution. The previous legislation, authored by the late Senator Paul Wellstone from Minnesota, expressed the sense of Congress that a day of peace and sharing should be established at the beginning of each year. This day would encourage people around the world to gather with family, their faith community, and neighbors to share a meal and to pledge to work for peace in the new year. It called upon Americans to match or multiply the cost of that year's meal with a contribution to fight hunger.

In the following year, 2001, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution asking the global community to set aside the first day of the year to recognize the importance of international unity, peace, and sharing.

Today, Madam Speaker, we are considering House Concurrent Resolution 317, sponsored by my colleague Congressman CONYERS, recognizing that in order to implement these resolutions calling for peace and the alleviation of worldwide suffering, we must rely heavily on the family. It is the family that is the basic unit of a civil society. The family is where our values are learned and carried out. Stability and peace in the global community can only be accomplished one family at a time.

A special day where families worldwide can sit down to a meal and pledge

to work locally for peace and to end injustice in their own communities will no doubt have a worldwide impact.

I urge an "aye" vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I would first like to commend my good friend and distinguished colleague, the ranking member of our Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS, for introducing this resolution and for advocating on behalf of Global Family Day for many years. I would also like to thank Chairman HYDE for allowing this resolution to move to the floor.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is very simple and very important. It provides that the Nation should set aside time dedicated to eradicating violence, hunger, and poverty, and to establishing greater trust and fellowship among peace-loving nations and families everywhere.

As we commemorate the lives lost in the tragedy that occurred on September 11, 5 years ago, it is particularly fitting that the President designate a day for eradicating violence and embracing our common humanity.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the author of this resolution, my good friend and distinguished colleague from Michigan, Congressman CONYERS.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise absolutely overjoyed at the action that has been taken by the Committee on International Relations. I begin by commending the distinguished chairman, HENRY HYDE, a current member of the House Judiciary Committee, where he was once chairman; my dear friend from Florida, Subcommittee Chairwoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN; and, of course, the esteemed TOM LANTOS, the ranking member of the committee.

Ladies and gentlemen, I cannot tell you how thrilled I am to see a resolution come back to the floor for the observance of Global Family Day, One Day of Peace and Sharing. It has a long history that the gentlewoman from Florida remembers all the way back to the late Senator Paul Wellstone. And I join all of you as we in the Congress continue to search for a way to find peace in Iraq and Afghanistan, in every corner of the world.

There are widely divergent views about how we arrive at peace; but most of all, we are deeply concerned about the subject. We have families, constituents, individuals who are longing for peace in the world and an end to the

suffering caused by poverty, disease, and hunger. Untold numbers of our friends, neighbors, parents, children are hoping that there can be more understanding, more generosity, more genuine friendship and more caring among people of all faiths and cultures. We struggle with military strategies and budgets, economic considerations, and international issues.

But there is one matter which we can come together on, and this is House Concurrent Resolution 317 that calls upon the President to issue an annual proclamation calling upon the Nation's citizens to observe Global Family Day. It has been done before in the year 2000, and we are so pleased that it is being done today.

I would remind you that in 2001 following the tragedy of 9/11, the United Nations General Assembly took the same action. In more than 20 nations around the globe, the leaders of those countries have personally endorsed this initiative. And here in the Nation's capital, Mayor Anthony Williams proclaimed just 2 months ago that January 1, 2007, would be a day for all Washingtonians to become peacemakers in whatever capacity that they can.

Frequently, this took the role of people breaking bread with someone, some family of another faith, of another community, and the idea was to get to know one another better. It provides a way of saying to the world that we understand that it is the individuals, the 6.6 billion people on this planet, interacting with one another that will allow this to happen.

So I thank the tireless advocates who have worked on this matter across the years. Organizationally, they include the Martin Luther King, Jr. Family Life Institute, the National Association of Former Foster Care Children of America, the Global Family Day Foundation; but, of course, it is the founder of this idea that came to us in the Congress years ago with young children who wanted to start doing something along with the former Senator from Minnesota, and that is Ms. Linda Grover, whose dedication and commitment has inspired all of us to this unique, creative way to bring us all a little closer together.

Again, my thanks to the floor leaders that have managed this.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his work on this resolution, and I ask the gentleman with his consent that I could be added as an original cosponsor.

Mr. CONYERS. Yes. I thought that he was, but if he wasn't, he is now.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4½ minutes to my friend and colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, let me thank my distinguished friend from California for yielding and his leadership, as well as my friend from Texas. Most of all, let me offer my great appreciation for Congressman CONYERS and his service and his commitment and years of working on human rights and justice issues in the United States and his collaboration on this legislation. I thank him for allowing me to be an original cosponsor for something as instructive and as insightful as this legislation is. I am delighted to be joined with a number of cosponsors now, Mr. KUCINICH as well.

And I rise today to applaud the concept, but also to say how vital and how important this idea is. We celebrate Thanksgiving and holidays around the Christmastime. Many of the different faiths call that timeframe in their own faith a name. We have commemorations around the birth of Christ for Christians, and other faiths have their commemorations. We are eager to promote peace, as I am an original cosponsor of the Department of Peace, offered by my good friend from Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH. But I do not know if we realize how crucial it is in this day and time to have a Global Family Day, One Day of Peace and Sharing.

□ 1645

Maybe if you would take a journey with me back to New Orleans, reminiscing and remembering the horrificness of Hurricane Katrina and the time we spent just a few weeks ago, some 28 Democratic Members who traveled throughout the gulf region. We really went to see the improvement, to be able to shake hands and to see where people had moved from the devastation of 2005. But yet we found ongoing devastation.

We bent down and we offered prayers as well as action. And it made me think more and more that we needed to be able to come together as families to address the question of hurricanes and earthquakes, famine and genocide. Because right here in the United States in the gulf region, there are still people who are homeless, not because they are not Americans who have contributed to this country, and veterans and people who have built their homes and raised their families, but because this government has failed to provide them with the resources necessary to go back to their homes, private insurance companies have not been able to provide them with relief to build their homes.

So this day is a broader concept of being able to bring us together, not to forget those who are now hopeless sometimes and helpless, but to be able to say that we want to reunite families.

Then I want you to think of the child soldiers around the world. I thought maybe we had extinguished that. I offered legislation early in my career

about the elimination or the lack of use of child soldiers by cutting some of the foreign relations funding. But yet child soldiers exist. They are still fighting in guerilla warfares around the world. Children who are barely 8 years old, 7 years old, 12 years old have their limbs eliminated because they are now in guerilla warfare. We need this Global Family Day, One Day of Peace and Sharing.

Then, of course, the crisis in Sudan. I am asking the President, as he interacts with, again, the nation of families, to demand that the President of Sudan step aside to allow the African Union peace keepers to enter into their territory, to prevent the famine, the genocide, the brutality, the violence, the violence against women.

For those of us who have been in the Sudan, who have been in Chad where the refugees are, the stories are horrific. If you sit down on the dirt floor as I have done with the women of Sudan to tell you about how they are raped continuously when they simply go out to get wood, in order to provide fire in order to survive. This is a time now that the United Nations when the President can demand, along with the General Assembly and the U.N. Security Council for the Sudan to step aside and the world family to condemn them.

And so this Global Family Day, One Day of Peace and Sharing that the President should call for the United States, should be that we pray for the peace and human rights of the people of Iran, for the troops to come home so that they can be redeployed out of Iraq, and that the Iraqi Government can take their rightful place of leadership.

We pray for those in the gulf region who are now suffering. This resolution is so crucial, so vital, so important, because it is a day of action, because it is calling for action. All of us who are comfortable in our homes right now need to be aware that the world is in trouble.

But the United States, taking the high moral ground, has the opportunity, based upon this wonderful resolution, to be instructive and to gather its people around to ask for the freedom and peace and justice of the people in Sudan, freedom and human rights, and a new day in Iran and a standing down of any military violence by the United States against Iran.

And, as well, the redeployment of our troops out of Iraq, and the governance of the people of Iraq so that we can promote this Global Day of Peace and Sharing.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 317: Requesting the President to issue a proclamation annually calling upon the people of the United States to observe Global Family Day, One Day of Peace and Sharing, and for other purposes.

Global Family Day originated from One Day Holiday, a day of peace and sharing together around the world, and is the first major shared global event to annually celebrate the entire human family, its achievements, and its aspirations.

Global Family Day is an important and necessary day set aside to represent the unity of the human family. At a time of war, hatred, poverty, and friction within our international community, Global Family Day reminds us to remain hopeful, to weather the stormy seas, to look for peace in the midst of the tempest.

We need a Global Family Day, because we are indeed in the midst of a troubling time. In the United States alone, there is plenty to remind of us of the urgency of fighting many of our social maladies.

In 2000, 16.2 percent of persons in the United States under the age of 18 were considered poor.

In that same year, 11.7 million American children younger than 18 lived below the poverty line.

One out of every six American children (16.3 percent) was poor in 2001. More specifically, 30.2 percent of African-American children, 28 percent of Hispanic children, 11.5 percent of Asian and Pacific Islander children, and 9.5 percent of Non-Hispanic White children were poor.

1 in 1,056 children will be killed by guns before the age of 20.

Children make up 12 percent of all crime victims reported to the police, including 71 percent of all sex crimes and 38 percent of all kidnapping victims.

Participation in the observance of Global Family Day is an important gesture of compassion. When we recognize Global Family Day, we support the idea of peace over war. When we recognize Global Family Day, we support the fight against poverty. When we recognize Global Family Day, we support world unity over ill-motivated antagonism.

As the leader of the free world, the United States must foster a sense of empathy, compassion, and brotherhood. We must join our brothers and sisters around the world to build hope at a time of doubt, to spread love and unity in a time of hate and division.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation annually calling upon the people of the United States to observe Global Family Day, One Day of Peace and Sharing, and other purposes.

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for this opportunity to address this resolution, which calls upon the people of the United States to observe Global Family Day, One Day of Peace and Sharing.

The prayer of Saint Francis begins with these words: make me a channel of our peace. And the gentleman from San Francisco, certainly throughout his career and here again today, affirms his work for peace. I want to join with him and the prime sponsor, Mr. CONYERS, in requesting the President to issue this annual proclamation.

This is an important moment when we can unite as a Congress to stand for peace. Because if we can do that for one moment, and we can advocate that it be done for a day, we know that we

have the capacity to master the social arts to the point where we can make peace a practice in our everyday lives, not just the absence of war, but the active practice of a capacity for mutuality, for understanding, for peace-giving, for peace-sharing. We have this capacity.

We showed it last week when we came together on a resolution honoring the Dalai Lama with a Congressional Gold Medal. I want to thank Mr. LANTOS for giving me the opportunity. Because of you, I had the chance to meet the Dalai Lama years ago.

We have this capacity in this Congress to bring our aspirations to the highest level possible and in that way connect with the whole world. Because what this talks about is one day around the world for peace and sharing. So we at this moment unite with a family of humanity. We at this moment stand strong on principles of human unity. We can do that in this moment, and we can do it for many other moments as well.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for his heartfelt and warm words. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague and very good friend from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join with all of those who have expressed an interest and a concern in this resolution. I rise because I firmly move that we have the capacity to go far beyond where we are.

As a matter of fact, I recall John Kennedy once saying that peace is not found only in treaties, covenants and charters, but in the hearts of men.

I suspect that if he were alive today, he would say in the hearts of men and of women. I happen to believe that we learn what we live, and that if we actively pursue the concepts of peace that we find different ways to handle conflict resolution.

I know that there are people who would say, what is the point in talking about this? Well, I will tell you the point. And I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan, because I remember reading a book that said, in the beginning was the word. And, of course, the words go forth. And people internalize those words. So I am pleased to join all of those who have spoken on this issue today. I do believe that peace is possible.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their very significant statements. We have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent

resolution, H. Con. Res. 317, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—————

CONDEMNING HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN AND EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE IRANIAN PEOPLE

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 976) condemning human rights abuses by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran and expressing solidarity with the Iranian people.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 976

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran was elected through a controlled and fixed election process which does not allow the Iranian people to freely elect their leaders;

Whereas the Government of Iran is unaccountable to the will of the Iranian people;

Whereas the Government of Iran is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;

Whereas the Government of Iran within both its legal framework and everyday practice continues to violate the civil and human rights of its citizens, in particular women, religious and ethnic minorities, and vocal opponents of the regime;

Whereas the Government of Iran practices discrimination against the aforementioned groups through denial of access to education and employment, seizure of private property, violent suppression of peaceful protest and freedom of assembly, arbitrary arrest and detention, physical and mental torture, cruel, inhuman, and degrading punishment, such as public executions, hanging, and stoning, and extra judicial killings of dissidents and ordinary citizens;

Whereas the Constitution of Iran promotes religious intolerance and prohibits religious freedom by endorsing one religion to the exclusion of other religious beliefs;

Whereas an unelected theocratic ruler and clerical elite exert control over the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Iranian Government;

Whereas the Iranian judiciary is not independent and can be subject to arbitrary dismissal by the clerics;

Whereas on December 16, 2005, the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution discussing the human rights violations by the Government of Iran and insisting that Iran eliminate in law and in practice discrimination toward the aforementioned groups;

Whereas international human rights organizations have called for investigations into violent crackdowns of peaceful protests and other human rights violations which the Government of Iran has ignored;

Whereas Iran sent to the June 2006 inaugural meetings of the United Nations Human Rights Council Saeed Mortazavi, Tehran's Prosecutor General responsible for jailing hundreds of journalists and linked to the 2003

arrest, imprisonment, and murder of an Iranian-Canadian photojournalist, showing a blatant disregard for the issue of human rights reform; and

Whereas the Department of State's Country Report on Human Rights Practices and Report on International Religious Freedom document the human rights abuses by the Government of Iran and list Iran as a "Country of Particular Concern": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the human rights abuses perpetrated by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran and strongly urges the international community to bring pressure on Iran to halt discrimination and violence toward its citizens, in particular women, religious and ethnic minorities, and vocal opponents of the regime;

(2) urges the Government of the United States to continue to pressure the Government of Iran into making measurable improvements in the human rights situation for the Iranian people; and

(3) expresses its unity with all Iranian people and shares their desire to see Iran become a free country with transparent, democratic institutions and equal rights for all.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of freedom for the Iranian people, and I want to thank Congressman CROWLEY and Congressman LANTOS for their efforts in support of this resolution. I want to thank Chairwoman ROSLEHTINEN for her tireless efforts to see Iran become a free and democratic state.

For nearly 30 years, Iranians have lived under the extremist policies of religious clerics. Their human rights violations against the Iranian people defy common belief. The Iranian people deserve, indeed desire, the opportunity to live in a free and democratic society.

This is the dream of the vast majority of Iranians, and we should help them make this dream come true. It has been far too long since we have looked at the human rights record of one of the most evil regimes of the modern era. We know that Iran is the single largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. And we know that their leaders wish to continue inflicting terrible pain and suffering on any group of people who do not share their extremist beliefs.

However, we must also remember the pain and suffering of the Iranian people

at the hands of their leaders. Congress, the President, and the international community must address the excessive human rights abuses by Iran's Government. Since the Khomeini revolution in 1979, Iran has been ruled by a string of tyrants who use religion and politics as an excuse to persecute their own people.

Religious, ethnic, and gender discrimination are practiced every day by the Iranian judicial courts and the clerics who run them. People or groups critical to their government are given few rights under the law and no rights in practice.

The Government of Iran practices discrimination against its own people by denial of access to education and employment, seizure of private property, violent suppression of peaceful protest and freedom of assembly, arbitrary arrest and detention, physical and mental torture, cruel, inhumane and degrading punishment such as public executions, hangings and stoning, and extra-judicial killings of dissidents and ordinary citizens.

Iran's clerical regime has been a serial abuser of human rights since it violently took over the country in 1979. But it is clear that since President Ahmadinejad took power, the abuse of Iranian citizens has increased. Under his rule, Iranians are tortured for simply practicing a different religion, for speaking a different idea, and even for not supporting the extremist mullahs.

The oppression of women under the Iranian regime is perhaps the most brutal and most offensive. Iranian women are not allowed to attend universities, to hold jobs, to drive a car. They are forced to cover their entire bodies in public. In many cases of rape, the accused man will not face any punishment, and the woman in question will be accused of fornication, will be imprisoned, and eventually put to death.

One case involved a young woman who was deeply in love with her husband, and without evidence or reason, and against the pleas of her own husband, was found guilty of adultery. She was buried alive up to her chest in Tehran and then stoned to death.

In other cases of abuse, people have been arrested, beaten, and even killed for eating during the month of Ramadan, or doing anything that the mullahs deemed inappropriate. According to Iranian law, the religious police can interrogate a suspect without a lawyer present, which allows them to beat prisoners until they confess, most often to a crime that they did not commit.

□ 1700

We must never forget these violations when we consider Iran's place in the international community. President Bush has attempted to engage the Iranian Government to end their illegal nuclear weapons program. This effort is crucial to keeping the world safe from a nuclear nightmare.

However, the effort must not end there. The United States and its allies must continue to pressure Iran to end the severe human rights violations against the Iranian people.

It is appropriate for us to raise this issue here today. This evening the President of Iran will address the world from the floor of the United Nations. His pleas and support of a nuclear Iran will fall on deaf ears. His continued defiance of U.N. Security Council resolutions must end, and the international community must begin the process of isolating the Iranian regime until true reform in that country begins.

Human decency requires us to stand unanimously against Ahmadinejad's oppression of his own people. We must continue to pursue freedom for Iran through diplomacy, but we must also not shrink from our responsibility through the option of strength.

We must also pursue the policy of internal resistance and change from within Iran. The policies and extremist views of Iran's religious mullahs are not representative of the entire nation of Iran. There are many Iranian people who desire to be free and are willing to fight for it. I have met with them, and we should do everything we can to forward their cause.

Now is the time to save their countries, for them to save their own countries, for them to save their own societies and for them to save their own religion.

I would like to leave with a few powerful stories of Iranian citizens who were persecuted and killed at the hands of their own government. The first involved an innocent Iranian girl. The religious police will not even respect the private boundaries of the home. A young girl in Tehran was arrested for swimming in her home pool in a bathing suit. She was found guilty of causing a "state of arousal" in a neighbor, from whose house she could be seen. She was sentenced to 60 lashes, but she died after the 30th lash.

Another involved an Iranian photographer in 2003. A single mother, she had struggled to raise a child and to build a career in exile. Her son remembers her as a small but feisty and courageous woman who loved freedom. She left her son for a business trip to Iran and Afghanistan. She was arrested while photographing a group of people inquiring about their detained loved ones. She was interrogated and beaten for refusing to confess to being a spy. She died in a military hospital in Tehran as a result of her torture.

Another case involved a 52-year-old Iranian salesman, 1998. He believed in the Baha'i religion. In the eyes of the state, this made him the apostate, a member of the unprotected infidel community. He, too, was arrested and found guilty of converting a woman to his religion. He was eventually hanged in a public square on July 21, 1998.

These are just but a few stories that highlight the need for this important resolution, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I first would like to commend my good friend and distinguished colleague from Texas for introducing this important resolution and for his powerful and eloquent words.

This body has regularly condemned Iran for its nuclear program, which is clearly designed to build weapons of mass destruction. We have condemned Iran for its support of terrorism and other aggressive policies. But for far too long we have not adequately called attention to the broad range of horrific human rights violations practiced by the Islamist Republic of Iran.

In fact, Madam Speaker, Iran is among the world's leading human rights abusers. It is morally incumbent upon us to affirm our commitment to support the victims of Iranian repression and to express our sympathy for the long-denied democratic desires of the Iranian people. That is exactly what this resolution does.

Madam Speaker, I believe we all are familiar with many aspects of Iranian repression. Iran today is an authoritarian, intolerant, theocratic state, and the Iranians are at the mercy of a cynical, self-indulgent clerical elite, whose extremist views do not even reflect those of the majority of Iranian clergy.

We all know how Iran treats religious minorities, most infamously the Baha'i, and we all know that Iran represses democratic dissent, cooks the elections to make sure that the winners are theocrats unrepresentative of the will of the Iranian people.

But perhaps nothing more eloquently expresses Iran's cynicism about human rights than Iran's willingness to sign all manner of international agreements committing itself to adhere to international human rights standards while, in practice, scorning those very standards. Presumably the Iranian regime thinks it can fool us by signing documents.

In that regard, Madam Speaker, Iran's attitude towards its human rights obligations and its nuclear obligations are two sides of the same coin. Tehran takes neither set of commitments seriously.

By supporting this resolution, we will send a skyrocket message to the Iranian regime and to the Iranian people that we see through the regime's veil of cynicism, that we will keep the pressure on the Iranian regime to cease its repression, and that we look forward to the day when Iran will join the ranks of democratic, human-rights-respecting, law-abiding countries. We will not cease to believe in the goodwill and democratic inclinations of the vast majority of the Iranian people.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my friend from Ohio as much time as he might consume.

Mr. KUCINICH. Once again, I am grateful to the gentleman from California for the opportunity to offer a slightly different perspective. While I continue to associate myself with my good friend Mr. LANTOS in the celebration of the imperative of human rights globally, I have specific concerns about the tenor of this resolution and its relationship to the administration's policy of ramping up for a war against Iran.

Again, I want to state that this is the third resolution that has been brought before this House this evening. You have to read it in the context of administration actions, which have been documented in published reports, that relate to an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of Iran by sending elements of the Department of Defense inside of Iranian territory; number two, by planning a bombing, targets inside Iran; number three, by planning a naval blockade in the Strait of Hormuz where 40 percent of the world's oil flows through.

We have to look at this in a broader context of an administrative foreign policy, which is really aimed at creating not stability, but instability in the region. You can look at the July 2006 Vanity Fair article, which goes into detail about the unfortunate administration escapade of tricking up a case for uranium from Niger with respect to Iraq. One of the administration's key advisers in that article basically made the case for chaos, which is an administration, I believe, policy. Now we are looking at Iran.

Now, this resolution, 976, in the third article, expresses its unity with all the Iranian people, shares their desire to see Iran become a free country with transparent democratic institutions and equal rights for all.

I pointed out earlier in debates that Iran had a democratic government under Mossadegh; that in October of 1951, under Mossadegh, Iran sought to nationalize its oil industry. That then resulted in a draft resolution submitted to the United Nations by the United Kingdom, and supported by the United States and France, as depicting Iran then as a threat to international peace and security.

Then we saw a coup d'etat that was organized by the U.S. and the U.K. Yes, we ought to stand for democracy. We ought to also stand for truth with respect to the historical unfolding of what we say we stand for.

Where does this resolution lead? Does it lead to a continued insistence that the Government of Iran restore human rights to everyone in Iran? If it does, wonderful. We all ought to go along with that. But if his resolution is just another brick on a path towards war, look out. This looks like Iraq all over again, and that is what my concern is.

If this resolution sets us on a path to war, how many of us in the Congress are prepared to see this administration borrow money from China and Japan to go to war against Iran, as they have

borrowed money from China and Japan to go to war against Iraq? We have to look at what we are doing here.

While this resolution, I am sure, will pass overwhelmingly, we have to see that circumstances are being set in order which could lead us towards a path of war against Iran. We have to ask ourselves, is that what we really want?

I can stand here with my colleagues and say, absolutely, I support the religious freedom of the Baha'i. I do. Absolutely. I support human rights for all people in Iran, and I do. Absolutely. I support democratic principles in Iran and every other country in the world, and I do.

But I am not for war against Iran. I don't believe the American people want war against Iran. I don't think they wanted war against Iraq, but they were dragged into it.

I am just offering these remarks as a cautionary note to make sure that we have our eyes open as we walk in the days ahead with respect to policy and Iran. Yes, we need to make sure that Iran has peaceful uses of its atomic energy. We have an obligation to do that.

But, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that we should begin first with direct negotiations with Iran. Second, we should assure Iran that we are not going to attack it. Third, we should demand that Iran open itself up to inspections once again by the IAEA. Fourth, we need assurances, and they are fair, that Iran is not going to be developing nuclear weapons.

There is a way out of this, and I am hopeful that in our stand for human rights, we are not paradoxically beginning a process that would deprive millions of Iranians of their human right to life.

I thank the gentleman from California for his friendship and also for his willingness to see debate in this House of the people. You have always done that, Mr. LANTOS. Whether we have agreed or not, you have always been willing to see the debate continue.

Mr. LANTOS. I thank my friend for his generous words.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 976, condemning human rights abuses by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran and expressing solidarity with the Iranian people.

It is astonishing that the Iranian government denies that there is a human rights issue in the country. The Iranian government suppresses expression and opinion, and persecutes individual for peaceful expression of their political views. Iran is constantly cited and criticized by our Department of State, Amnesty International, and many other human rights watch groups for its human rights record.

I have long been an advocate of a free, independent, and democratic Iran; an Iran that is non-threatening to its neighbors and that honors its commitments in the world community. There is no dissent in the world community about the inherent dangers of nuclear proliferation in the region.

For years, I have been a supporter of the democratic movement in Iran, and today more

than ever, the people of Iran need to be supported, empowered, and given the confidence to create for themselves a new nation. Wars and appeasements are temporary actions, and not even close to a solution.

The only effective way to achieve a lasting peace and prosperity in the region is to support the Iranian people, men, women and children, in their endeavors to make Iran a democratic state.

Democracy is a struggle, but democracy is just. No one should experience the terror of a government that would torture or kill its own. We cannot ignore a country that gleefully thwarts international peace treaties and human rights conventions.

This bipartisan bill sends a very clear message that any government that oppresses its people will not be tolerated, and a smug tyranny is not acceptable. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

May we all soon see peace and stability return to all of the Middle East.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 976, introduced by my colleague, Mr. MCCAUL from Texas.

H. Res. 976, Condemns human rights abuses by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran and expresses solidarity with the Iranian people.

The resolution notes the injustices inflicted upon the people of Iran by an unaccountable government against their will.

It urges the President and the international community to increase pressure on the Iranian government to improve its human rights situation and expresses unity with the Iranian people.

The recent untimely deaths of two political prisoners, reinforces the urgency that Iran free all prisoners of conscience.

The incarceration of student and political opposition activists is a form of intellectual terrorism that seriously undermines indigenous democratic reform.

In addition, the recent decision by the Iranian government to outlaw the Center for Defense of Human Rights, which was established by the first Muslim Woman Nobel Laureate, Shirin Ebadi, is a violation of Iran's post revolutionary constitution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an opportunity for the American people to convey to the Iranian people that we support their efforts to bring freedom to their nation.

As a co-sponsor of this measure and strong advocate for the right of every human being—every Iranian—to live free from intimidation and be able to exercise their fundamental rights, I ask that we render our strong support for this resolution.

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

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 976.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1715

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING THE SUCCESS OF THE ADOPTION AND SAFE FAMILIES ACT OF 1997

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 959) recognizing and supporting the success of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 in increasing adoption and the efforts the Act has spurred including National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month, and encouraging adoption throughout the year.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 959

Whereas since the passage of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, the number of children adopted from foster care has increased significantly, with approximately 51,000 children adopted from foster care in fiscal year 2004 alone;

Whereas despite this remarkable progress, approximately 118,000 children in the United States foster care system are waiting to be adopted, and 49 percent of these children are at least nine years old;

Whereas adoptive families make an important difference in the lives of the children they adopt by providing a stable, nurturing environment for those children;

Whereas National Adoption Day is a collective national effort to find permanent, loving families for children in foster care;

Whereas both National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month are in November;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services launched a series of public service announcements promoting the adoption of children eight and older in 2002;

Whereas more than 6,000 children have been placed into adoptive homes since the Department of Health and Human Services launched www.adoptuskids.org, a national photo listing service for children awaiting adoption across the United States;

Whereas judges, attorneys, adoption professionals, child welfare agencies, and child advocates in 45 States and the District of Columbia participated in 227 events in conjunction with National Adoption Day in 2005; and

Whereas these events finalized the adoptions of more than 3,300 children from foster care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and supports the success of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 and of the efforts it has spurred;

(2) recognizes and supports the goals and ideals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month; and

(3) encourages adoption throughout the year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 959, a resolution that recognizes the successes of the landmark Adoption and Safe Families Act and honors National Adoption Day and Month. I was proud to introduce this resolution and the Adoption and Safe Families Act, which we honor today.

The work of Congress over the past decade has led to dramatic improvements for children in the foster care system. In fact, since 1997, the number of children adopted from foster care has increased significantly, from 28,000 in 1998 to 51,000 in 2004.

I have been pleased to work with my colleagues to refocus Federal child welfare programs, to ensure the best interests of children are first. The way to make that happen is to place children in safe, permanent loving homes. That is why National Adoption Day and Month are so important.

This year, National Adoption Day will take place on November 18, 2006, and is designed for communities around the country to highlight adoptions. Last year, over 227 events were held in 45 States, which finalized the adoption of 3,300 children.

I have been honored to participate in these events the past several years. To be part of such a special occasion reinforces the need for further efforts to move children into adoptive homes. I would like to applaud the Department of Health and Human Services for their efforts in this cause. In 2002, HHS launched a series of public service announcements promoting the adoption of children eight and older and activated the Web site www.adoptUSkids.com. This Web site has helped move 6,000 children into adoptive homes.

The consideration of this resolution today is timely. Tomorrow, the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute will be holding its annual Angels in Adoption awards ceremony. This event also seeks to highlight those who have opened their hearts and their homes.

The couple I nominated this year, Pam and Randy Streu of Midland, Michigan, have three biological children, and have opened their hearts and their home to seven adopted children and almost 50 adoptive foster children placements. They deserve special recognition, not just for the number of children they have helped, but for helping those children that needed the most love. When others may have said the challenge was too great, Pam and Randy stepped in, recognizing that each life was worth fighting for and that it was about hope and love.

I first got involved by helping families with their adoption proceedings in private practice as a court-appointed lawyer. Since that time, I felt that the government should do more to encourage adoption and help those in the foster care system. That is why it is so important to recognize families who make extraordinary efforts to welcome children into their family.

I thank my colleagues who have helped me move this resolution forward, including Mr. HERGER, chairman of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee; Mr. MCDERMOTT, the ranking member of the subcommittee; and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE and Mr. OBERSTAR, co-chairs of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute. I look forward to further working with my colleagues to promote adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak in behalf of H. Res. 959. As was described by Congressman CAMP, the bill recognizes National Adoption Month and National Adoption Day. It commemorates the success of the Adoption and Safe Families Act and encourages adoption.

As Congressman CAMP noted, it is particularly timely that the House take action on this resolution today, the week we have heroes from around the country into Washington celebrating the Angels in Adoption gala in recognition of their extraordinary commitment to the adopted children that have been brought into their families.

I want to tell about the North Dakota family of Pat and Michelle Beyer. They are in town this week. They have quite a story, like each and every family being honored at the Angels in Adoption gala.

Pat is a North Dakota National Guardsman. He is on leave from his service in Iraq. At home, Michelle is raising two naturally born children, three adopted children, each of whom have some special needs, and this wonderful loving couple is now proceeding with the adoption of yet another child with special needs.

Mr. Speaker, your heart goes out to people like this. They really reflect, I believe, the very best of goodwill and compassion in our country. I am so proud of them.

Even as I speak about what they have done to make their home available to children and what we recognize with adopted families everywhere in terms of the homes they create for children, the fundamental and profound truth of adoption, in my view, is that the parents benefit far more than they possibly could contribute to the children. I know a little bit about what I am talking about on this score. These are my children, Kathryn and Scott, adopted from Korea, the best thing that ever happened to me. So I care just enormously about this resolution.

I also want to for a moment congratulate my colleague DAVE CAMP for his role in the passage of what has been a very important piece of legislation to encourage and move adoption forward.

I remember very well 10 years ago with C-SPAN on in my office hearing floor debate about a proposal that was precisely something that had been worrying me for months, because I had

been told in North Dakota by judges that things were out of whack, that in this business of evaluating children in foster care, the best interests of the child were being hopelessly confused and sometimes placed secondary to the goal of family reunification of completely dysfunctional families.

Now, maybe Congress had a role in its earlier legislation in giving some confusion out there to the social services system, but there was one thing we knew, and we knew very clearly, to a person, Republican and Democrat, and I also commend Barbara Kennelly, the lead cosponsor on the legislation, and that was put the best interests of the children first, foremost, exclusively, only. We wanted nothing more than to advance the interests of the children.

The legislation straightened that out, and made no bones about it, and then placed substantial expectations on the system with defined time limits about children who had been just kicked down the road without end in interim foster care arrangements. We wanted them moved out of those arrangements and into permanent adoptive status, to the extent we possibly could.

You know, there are a lot of things we do here, and we sure mean the best as we do them, and we don't always know how they work. Well, the jury is in on this one, and this act has worked, I think perhaps even better than I had hoped it might.

The number of children annually adopted out of the foster care system has nearly doubled, from 27,000 in 1996 to 52,000 in 2004. The North Dakota situation I had been worrying about, we have gone from 41 adopted in 1996 to 128 in 2004. We tripled.

So, again, David Camp, as I told you that day in debate, you have got a real fine piece of work here, and I again commend you for the leadership you have played in such an important bill.

Another aspect of this bill, in addition to the time expectation put forward by Congress, we actually put some money on the table as positive incentives for States that really took the charge to move children into permanent adoptive homes. We have paid out more than \$200 million to States since that legislation. I think it has without question proven to be an extremely effective and cost-effective use of taxpayer dollars. It is also a reminder and something I think we need to keep in mind as we look at what else we can do that the carrot needs to go along with the stick.

Another positive bill we passed in advancing legislation is moving the tax credit for adoption expenses into law and then increasing it so it more appropriately reflects expenses incurred by a family in seeking to adopt.

I have gotten to experience the miracle of adoption in my life, but I don't think that in any way you have to have some kind of financial status to experience this miracle. We want everybody

to be able to experience this miracle, if they want to open their homes and raise children in an adoptive family. So increasing this tax credit from \$5,000 to \$10,000 is important. My Ways and Means colleague, NANCY JOHNSON, has played an important role on that one.

Now, for all the platitudes, and they were especially in commemorating the successes important to make, I know David doesn't feel like we have arrived and gotten the job done. I don't either. We have more to do. There are 118,000 foster children today waiting to be adopted. To find a loving home for every waiting child, we should focus more attention on recruiting adoptive parents and on providing post-adoption services to help families with ongoing medical, counseling and referral needs.

In the passage of this resolution, I hope there is a bit of this vote that represents a recommitment to continuing to explore whatever we can do to unite families, parents who want to provide a loving home to innocent, precious children that so richly deserve it.

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

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his comments, a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. The Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 has proven itself instrumental in increasing adoption in every month of the year. The legislation made it easier to adopt children across State lines, and it also provided some financial incentives to States to improve their foster care systems.

Prior to adoption of the bill, the number of children in foster care and the length of time that they spent in foster care was rapidly increasing. In just two decades prior to the mid-1990s, the number of children in the foster care system more than doubled. The crisis was threatening to overwhelm various State social services departments. More importantly, it was brutally unfair to hundreds and thousands of children.

However, since passage of the bill in 1997, the number of children adopted out of foster care has actually increased by some 65 percent. In 1996, only 31,000 children were adopted. By 2004, that number rose to 51,000. It is a start. We certainly need to have more adoptive families out there.

Moreover, not only are more children being adopted, but they are also spending less time in the foster care system. However, this Congress must not forget that hundreds of thousands of children still remain in the foster care system and more still remains to be done. This year alone, those older foster care children, some 19,000, will age out of the foster care system. Additionally, one in

five children will still languish in foster care for more than 5 years.

□ 1730

I am a board member of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institutes, and it is a very, very worthwhile group out there to promote foster parents, good foster parents, as well as adoption.

I have two beautiful children I gave birth to and one child that I adopted. She was an older, hard-to-place child, and usually in the adoption system the older children, especially someone designated as hard to place, are the last ones to be adopted.

I certainly hope that this resolution will shine some light on the need for more people to step forward and consider adoption of children of all ages. In my heart of hearts, I have a very special place for my adoptive daughter who is now an adult. She was a special needs child. They do require more time, they require more love and certainly a lot of structure, and with that plan, they can become very productive members of society.

We must build on the success of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 by continuing to raise awareness about foster youth and adoption.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the preceding speaker, our colleague, for the personal commitment she has made in this area she indicated, and I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I want to commend him and Mr. CAMP for their outstanding leadership and the passion with which they display relative to this issue and their personal involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the significance of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997. ASFA provided sweeping changes in Federal child welfare law designed to ensure children's safety and to quicken permanent placements in the event that a child could not return home.

By enacting the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, Congress recognized the need to align Federal incentives with the desired goal of providing abused and neglected children safe, permanent homes. This law has helped move States to promote adoption and has helped moved children into permanent homes.

In praising ASFA, I want to take a moment to highlight the need to develop similar policies to promote permanency more broadly. ASFA has done much to promote adoption, but policymakers should extend ASFA's successes to other areas of permanency to address the needs of hundreds of thousands of children for whom adoption is not appropriate.

Using ASFA as a model, the bipartisan Pew Commission on Children in Foster Care recommended that Federal

policies create subsidized guardianship programs and State incentives to promote permanency more broadly, be it via reunification, adoption or guardianship.

Also, we must use our understanding of the implementation of ASFA to make it better. I am particularly concerned about the over 29,000 children who have entered our child welfare system due to parental incarceration, most often from nonviolent acts. The parameters set forth by ASFA do not align well with those of the criminal justice system, leading to a permanent separation of many children from their parents and family.

I encourage my colleagues to consult the wonderful policy brief by the Brennan Center for Justice at the New York University School of Law on the topic. "Rebuilding Families, Reclaiming Lives," draws attention to hurdles created by the lack of consistency in Federal policies with regard to children of incarcerated parents. It also offers policy recommendations to promote stability and well-being for the children.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this second to commend the One Church, One Family, One Child program in Illinois, who are indeed going to be here for the Angels in Adoption gala. They have developed a unique program of recruiting families to become foster parents to children coming out of correctional institutions. I commend them for that outstanding work and note Reverend Parks, Reverend Nelson and Ms. Hunt who have developed a fantastic program with the other members of their board.

Again, I commend the gentlemen for their outstanding work on this issue.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 959, which recognizes and supports the success of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 in increasing adoptions. I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CAMP, for introducing this resolution and for his work to enact legislation to improve the lives of abused and neglected children.

The number of children adopted from our nation's foster care system has substantially increased since enactment of the Adoption and Safe Families Act from 31,000 in 1997 to over 51,000 in 2004. I applaud the judges, attorneys, state officials, and other adoption professionals who have worked tirelessly to move foster children more quickly into permanent, loving families. National Adoption Day in November 2005 finalized the adoptions of more than 3,300 children from foster care and I hope the November 2006 National Adoption Day is even more successful.

There are currently 118,000 foster children available for adoption and we must do more to find them loving families. Almost half of these children are aged 9 or older and therefore at risk of spending their entire childhood in foster care and aging out of the system without a permanent home. In 2003, President Bush signed the Adoption Promotion Act, which extended the availability of adoption incentive payments to the States while promoting the adoption of older children. We will continue to support policies that ensure children who cannot be safely reunified with their parents are

moved quickly into permanent, adoptive homes.

I also wish to recognize the many talented and hardworking staff at the Department of Health and Human Services for their outstanding work in this area. More than 6,000 children have been placed in adoptive homes since the launch of www.adoptuskids.org, a website which connects families with waiting children. We must do more to help connect would-be adoptive parents with these children to ensure every child grows up in a safe, loving family.

Again, I wish to thank the gentleman from Michigan for introducing this resolution. I'd like to personally thank the many child welfare professionals and most importantly all the adoptive families across America who have made a permanent commitment to improve the lives of these vulnerable children. They are the real heroes behind the many improvements we have seen in recent years.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 959 recognizing and supporting the success of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 in increasing adoption and the efforts the Act has spurred including National Adoption Day, National Adoption Month, and encouraging adoption throughout the year.

As the Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I especially understand the importance of providing a stable, safe, loving home for all of our children. Under the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, the number of children adopted from foster care has increased significantly, with approximately 51,000 children from foster care in fiscal year 2004 alone.

This progress must be recognized, yet we know that there is much more work to be done to ensure that every child has a safe, permanent and loving home. On a daily basis, in America, children enter the foster care system as victims of abuse, neglect or abandonment. Most of them will wait at least five years before being adopted. Siblings will be separated from each other and most will have moved at least three times before being adopted. It is currently an unfortunate fact that one in five children will never be adopted, and will be forced out of the foster care system at the age of 18 with little or no family support.

Modeling the successes of the Adoption and Safe Families Act and National Adoption Day, states have significantly increased adoptions from foster care. National Adoption Day inspires a collective national effort to raise awareness to the 119,000 children in foster care awaiting permanent, loving families. For the last six years, National Adoption Day has seen the dreams of thousands of children come true by working with courts, judges, and attorneys to finalize adoptions and find permanent, loving homes for foster care children.

Let me add that I hope that before we recess, we may have the opportunity to make a further statement with H.R. 1704, Second Chance Act. This important legislation reauthorizes, rewrites, and expands crucial provisions regarding adult and juvenile offender re-entry demonstration projects, in order to address issues of recidivism and the effects of the criminal justice system and child welfare services on families.

The welfare of children must continue to be a priority for all Americans. Every child deserves a warm, safe, stable home environ-

ment. It is imperative that we support and recognize the success of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 of increasing adoption of foster care children. Because children are the future, we must support them in the present.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, seeing no other speakers, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 959.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT AND TEACHER SAFETY ACT OF 2006

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5295) to protect students and teachers, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5295

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Student and Teacher Safety Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics reported in the 2005 Indicators of School Crime and Safety that in 2003 seventeen percent of students in grades 9–12 reported they carried a weapon. Six percent reported having carried a weapon on school grounds.

(2) The same survey reported that 29 percent of all students in grades 9–12 reported that someone offered, sold, or gave them an illegal drug on school property within the last 12 months.

(3) The United States Constitution's Fourth Amendment guarantees "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures".

(4) That while the Supreme Court affirmed the Fourth Amendment's application to students in public schools in *New Jersey vs. TLO* (1985), the Court held that searches of students by school officials do not require warrants issued by judges showing probable cause. The Court will ordinarily hold that such a search is permissible if—

(A) there are reasonable grounds for suspecting the search will reveal evidence that the student violated the law or school rules; and

(B) the measures used to conduct the search are reasonably related to the search's objectives, without being excessively intrusive in light of the student's age, sex, and nature of the offense.

(5) The Supreme Court held in *Board of Education of Independent Sch. Dist. 92 of Pottawatomie County vs. Earls* (2002) that random drug testing of students who were participating in extracurricular activities was reasonable and did not violate the

Fourth Amendment. The Court stated that such search policies effectively serve the School Districts interest in protecting its students' health and safety.

SEC. 3. SEARCHES BASED ON REASONABLE SUSPICION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency shall have in effect throughout the jurisdiction of the agency policies that ensure that a search described in subsection (b) is deemed reasonable and permissible.

(b) SEARCHES COVERED.—A search referred to in subsection (a) is a search by a full-time teacher or school official, acting on any reasonable suspicion based on professional experience and judgment, of any minor student on the grounds of any public school, if the search is conducted to ensure that classrooms, school buildings, school property and students remain free from the threat of all weapons, dangerous materials, or illegal narcotics. The measures used to conduct any search must be reasonably related to the search's objectives, without being excessively intrusive in light of the student's age, sex, and the nature of the offense.

SEC. 4. ENCOURAGEMENT TO PROTECT STUDENTS AND TEACHERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A local educational agency that fails to comply with section 3 shall not, during the period of noncompliance, receive any Safe and Drug Free School funds after fiscal year 2008.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "Safe and Drug Free School funds" includes any funds under Part A of Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5295.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It gives me great pleasure to rise in support of H.R. 5295, the Student and Teacher Safety Act of 2006, of which I am a cosponsor. This bill is designed to help schools take actions to keep students and property safe from harm and destruction.

We have an obligation to make the learning environment in which our children attend free from weapons and drugs. By allowing school officials the ability to use their experience and intuition, we are eliminating these threats of violence before they have an opportunity to occur.

Specifically, this bill encourages local school agencies to establish policies that put parents and students on notice that weapons and drugs will not be tolerated within school bounds, and gives power to school officials and full-time teachers to enforce such policies. We all know that the threat of weapons

and drugs in school can create an intimidating and threatening environment making teaching and learning difficult.

The Supreme Court has ruled, and here today we should agree, that “apart from education, the school has the obligation to protect pupils from mistreatment by other children, and also to protect teachers themselves from violence by the few students whose conduct in recent years has prompted national concern.”

Mr. Speaker, violence in our schools is simply not acceptable. Nothing is more important than the safety and the well-being of our children. Parents should feel secure that when children go to school, they will be completely safe. I say that again, completely safe. This bill provides some assurance that we are doing all that we can as parents, as educators and as leaders of this Nation to protect our children.

If we do not take a stand to keep our schools safe, to keep our children safe, and to allow our teachers to feel that they are in an environment where they are protected, then how can we achieve this goal?

Unless addressed by Congress, public school children will continue to be unnecessarily exposed to unacceptable levels of crime and school violence.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS), for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 5295, the Student and Teacher Safety Act of 2006. A vote for this bill is a vote in support of school officials and teachers who fight to keep weapons and drugs out of our public schools every day and a vote to allow our children to have a safe learning environment.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the original cosponsors of the Zero Tolerance for Guns and Weapons in Schools, I have long supported the effort to make our schools safer, and, in fact, schools are among the safest places in our entire society for children, but this legislation, I do not quite understand what it is trying to do.

The suggestion here is that if we just pass this law, that somehow schools will become safer. The fact of the matter is every school district, every State has a policy with respect to the bringing onto campus of drugs, which it is illegal to have on campus, off campus, in your own home or anywhere else, and the use in bringing on weapons, which we have a very strong zero tolerance policy against the bringing of any guns or weapons onto school sites.

It seems to me that this legislation is somehow founded in the idea that if the Congress just votes, this will, in fact, happen.

Tragically, what we have seen is while people are asking us to vote on

this policy, which is already in place in most school districts, or all school districts in all of the States in accordance with the State court decisions and in accordance with the Supreme Court decisions, what we have is that the Republicans are masking the fact that what they do is they keep gutting the Safe and Drug-Free School Grants to the States. They cut those grants from \$437 million in 2005 to \$346 million in 2006, and the House Republicans want to cut them even further to \$310 million next year.

So the very funds that this Congress has determined and we worked in partnership with States and school districts over the last several years to make our schools safer, to help educate children about the dangers not only of the drugs and of weapons and various kinds of social behavior, they are now in the process of cutting those, but they want to pass a law that says to do what we have as a matter of existing policy, except that this law, in fact, exposes the district to much more litigation now because now, under the guise of this law, they have to go back through, and if a student is searched under this law, the questions are raised all over again which many districts have tried to settle under State law, under State court interpretations, so that they can have a policy that works, that the schools are on notice of, and the students are on notice of, and that the parents are on notice of. The fact of the matter is that the policy appears to be working across this country.

So, when we get all done with this, I think what we have with this legislation is an effort to try and cover what are the more serious votes taken by this Congress to slash the funding for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools legislation.

Also, this legislation, if it were to be passed into law, fails to take into account additional legal standards that have been imposed by State courts. A uniform search policy can cause difficulties for school districts and would require it to establish policies to address requirements of H.R. 5295, as well as legal standards that apply to respective jurisdictions.

The Congressional Research Service adds that enacting Federal legislation with respect to school-based searches could, therefore, interfere with areas of traditional State and local responsibility, of which there is no showing that the States and local school authorities are not meeting their responsibilities to their students, to the teachers, to the staff in the schools, to the parents and to the communities.

The question is, I guess, just a question of whether or not you think you trust the Congress more simply to pass a law, of which there have been no hearings and no discussion with local officials about how to do this, or whether you trust the people who are running the schools—the school boards, the school administrators, the principals, the district superintendents—

who, in fact, have the responsibility for the safety of the children of their districts and of their schools.

It is not much more complicated than that, and you do not have to take it from me, because the fact is that the National School Boards Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the American Federation of Teachers, the National PTA and the Great City Council Schools all oppose this legislation.

Why do they oppose this legislation? Because this legislation only makes it a very difficult job that they have been working at and policies for the safety of our students that they have been refining over the last decade.

□ 1745

This legislation just throws all of that open to new interpretations, to new exposure to liability on the questions of their actions that they take on a daily basis to keep our schools safe, to keep our children safe.

They understand this policy. They have developed these policies they have done in conjunction with the communities that they represent. Now Congress wants to fly over on suspension without hearings and drop down a new policy, one size sort of fits all, for all of these school districts, for all of the schools, when in fact the people we represent in our communities have been working on these policies a long time before this legislation was ever suggested. They have been working on them successfully, they have been working on them within the intricacies of State and Federal law, and they have developed the policies in cooperation with the communities and with the parents.

And I would hope that we would reject this legislation, and we would let those who have to take the responsibility, those who absorb the liability for their actions, and those who have local cooperation within their communities on engaging these policies, that they would in fact be allowed to go forward and continue those policies, and we would heed the concerns of the Congressional Research Service that we now have a Federal policy that, if it was to pass, requires this kind of reaction by all of the States to see whether or not they comply with this Federal law when in fact they are already complying with the efforts in their communities to keep their schools safe.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with tremendous pride to support the Student and Teachers Safety Act. Drugs and violence simply do not belong in our schools. Our teachers and children are entitled to a safe learning environment, free from weapons and illicit narcotics.

Time and again at the Columbine High School in Colorado; in Jonesboro, Arkansas; and in my home State, at

Heath High School in Paducah, Kentucky, shocking acts of violence have been planned and unfortunately executed in our schools.

Last week in Green Bay, Wisconsin, the situation turned out differently. Local law enforcement reacting to information gathered by school officials were able to thwart an attack being planned by high school students and save lives.

The National Center for Education statistics found in 2003, the last year for which we have statistics, 17 percent of students in grades 9 through 12 reported having carried a weapon; 9 percent of students reported having been threatened or injured with a weapon, such as a gun, knife, or club, on school property. During the same period, 29 percent of students have been offered drugs on school grounds within the previous 12 months.

My friends, these numbers are simply unacceptable. The presence of drugs or weapons in a classroom is not conducive to a productive learning environment. Metal detectors have become a fact of life in many of our schools. Despite that fact, weapons are still appearing in our classrooms.

When I was a child in school, no one doubted who had control of the classroom. Teachers were clear in their ability to control their learning environment. Today, we have the opportunity to restore some of that clarity.

I am a firm believer in our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, and I take my oath of office to defend those rights very seriously. This legislation is simple. This act does not issue a blank check to anyone to conduct random, unfounded, or mass searches. It does not change the fourth amendment standards on search and seizure. In fact, it is the parents and school officials who are empowered by this legislation. These men and women will work together in individual communities across the Nation to develop school safety policies that suit the unique needs of their teachers and students and are based on the constitutional standards set by the Supreme Court. Nothing more, nothing less.

H.R. 5295 requires local education agencies to have policies in place that adopt a standard articulated by the Supreme Court in *New Jersey v. T.L.O.* This standard allows teachers and school officials to use their experience and judgments to make decisions that will help control their classrooms and protect the students.

Our schools and classrooms should be safe places, free from drugs and weapons; and safety should not be a luxury. Parents should be confident in the safety of their children at school. Children should be able to focus on their studies without fear; teachers and school officials should be confident in their judgment and ability to control school property.

I am very proud of the work that we have done with the National Education Association to improve the language of

H.R. 5295 since its original introduction, and I am even more pleased that the National Education Association has endorsed this legislation as a positive step toward a safer learning environment for teachers and students throughout our schools.

A special thank you is due to Chairman MCKEON and his staff for their assistance. I would especially like to recognize the work of three staffers, Joanna Glaze, Taylor Hansen and James Bergeron. I urge all my colleagues to support this simple, commonsense legislation to provide our students and teachers with a safer, more productive learning environment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the expressed intent and expressed purpose of this legislation. But as one who taught for 6 years in probably one of the toughest schools and one of the toughest communities in the country, I have some serious reservations about what this legislation actually does. And I guess my reservations are not unfounded, because I find that the American Association of School Administrators, the National School Boards Association, the Council of Great City Schools, Parent Teachers Association, American Civil Liberties Union, the American Federation of Teachers, and of course my own school district, one of the largest in the Nation, the City of Chicago School System, has some concerns. And many of the concerns expressed is that the legislation is unnecessary, because many school districts already have policies on search that take into consideration State laws and State court decisions. They are concerned that it overrides local and State policies on school searches, and that it establishes one-size-fits-all, although all of us know that circumstances in different locations and locales are very different.

It sends a confusing message to schools on what legal standards are, and it establishes a policy that gives teachers authority to conduct searches when authority for determining who could search should rest with the school board. And, of course, it penalizes schools inappropriately for non-compliance by withholding safe and drug free funds, even though not all school districts receive these funds.

So, Mr. Speaker, while the intent is good, and while all of us want to see our schools be the safe and secure places we know that they need to be, I find this legislation to be duplicative, unnecessary, and that it takes away in some instances rights that should be reserved certainly for local communities to make determinations about. For that reason, I oppose this legislation.

Mr. KUHL of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes at this time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman. Columbine High School, Colorado. East High School, Green Bay. Hubbard Wood School in Winnetka. Each of these schools bore witness to an attack or an attempted attack using a gun in school. I served as a teacher, and I remember the kids who were the brightest lights of our country's future, and I also remember those who bore scrutiny as people who might bring a gun to class. Americans have the right to send their kids to safe, gun-free classrooms. Just last week, alert school officials foiled a Columbine-style attack on a Green Bay school. In my district, we were not so lucky in Winnetka. There, an attacker shot and killed a child and wounded five others in class. Jeffrey Phillips of my own staff was a first grader in that school on that day.

I spoke with a number of fellow teachers who say they hesitate before searching a child. Dan Larsen and Andrew Conneen, teachers at Stevenson High School in Lincolnshire, told me that teachers many times hesitate before searching a book bag for a gun. They worry about being punished; they worried about being sued. This bill reassures teachers that they have the power to search any minor child to make sure that their classroom remains gun free. And the Nation's largest teachers union, the National Education Association, strongly endorsed this bill.

Like all other American workers, teachers deserve to work in a safe, drug-free, and gun-free workplace. Diane Shust and Randall Moody of the NEA wrote: "On behalf of the 3.2 million members of the NEA, we would like to commend you for introducing the Student and Teacher Safety Act. H.R. 5295 will help promote a safe school environment."

The National Education Association knows that there is nothing more important than the safety of children and teachers who have dedicated their lives to education. Let common sense prevail. This bill puts teachers back in charge and makes classrooms safer. If this bill helps one teacher stop one Columbine massacre, then Congress today will have served the Nation well and protected its children. I urge Members to support this bill so strongly backed by the National Education Association.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the so-called Student and Teacher Safety Act. This bill would impose a one-size-fits-all policy on student searches on every school district in the country.

You know, in my experience with children and youth, it is a mistake to assume that every student is as guilty as a few troubled persons, making all youth feel guilty because a few actually are.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would strip Safe and Drug-Free School Acts funding from any school district that decides that local parents, that teachers,

and administrators know better than Congress how to make their schools safe. In fact, the President and the Republican Congress have cut Safe and Drug-Free funding every year since the year 2002.

This bill's proponents argue that it will clarify student search rules for school administrators and teachers, but the American Association of School Administrators has said that the bill simply will create unnecessary new Federal mandates. The American Federation of Teachers has said that the bill will complicate school districts' efforts to develop student search policies. And the National Parent Teacher Association, the PTA, has said that the bill fails to improve the safety of students and school personnel.

Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about school safety, we will reject this bill, we will reject the President's and this Congress's continuing cuts to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, and we will stop any new program that would label all youth as guilty.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 5295, the Student and Teachers Safety Act of 2006, and I commend my friend and colleague GEOFF DAVIS for introducing this important legislation.

According to a 2004 study by the National Center for Education Statistics, one in 10 students reported being threatened or injured with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property; three out of 10 students in grades nine through 12 reported that someone had offered, sold, or given them an illegal drug on school property. Moreover, more than seven out of 10 public schools experienced one or more violent incidents in 1999 and 2000, amounting to over 1.5 million violent incidents.

Louisiana families are demanding safe schools for their children, and H.R. 5295 would codify the guidelines established by the U.S. Supreme Court in *New Jersey v. T.L.O.*, which held that reasonable searches by school officials do not require a warrant signed by a judge if the search would reveal that the student violated the law or school rules.

□ 1800

The bill would also require that any searches be conducted in a manner appropriate to the age, gender and nature of the offense.

This is just codifying what the Supreme Court already has ruled upon, and it simplifies this matter as opposed to confusing it as is suggested by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

This legislation is supported by the National Education Association, and it will help promote a safe school environment for both students and teachers.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5295, the Student and Teacher Safety Act. This legislation builds upon the past efforts of this Congress to bolster school safety, and I commend Mr. GEOFF DAVIS of Kentucky for leading the charge on this legislation.

Enhancing school safety is not a new priority for this House. Earlier this year, we sent to President Bush legislation that included a proposal of my committee colleague Mr. PORTER to provide schools with criminal history records for individuals seeking to work with or around children.

Today we have the opportunity to take another step towards safer classrooms. The Student and Teacher Safety Act simply asks schools to adopt policies that put them in compliance with the legal standard established by the U.S. Supreme Court pertaining to the reasonable nature of student searches. As such, the bill enjoys a tremendous consensus of support, including leading teacher unions and school safety advocates. These groups support the commonsense steps that this bill will take, and I include a letter from the National Education Association for the RECORD at this point.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2006.
Representative GEOFF DAVIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: On behalf of the National Education Association's (NEA) 3.2 million members, we would like to commend you for introducing the Student and Teacher Safety Act (H.R. 5295), which will help ensure a safe teaching and learning environment in all public schools. We thank you and our staff for your willingness to engage in a constructive dialogue and to make changes to your original draft based on our suggestions. With these changes, we are pleased to offer our support for H.R. 5295.

NEA believes that a safe and effective learning climate is necessary for promoting educational excellence in public schools. All students and education employees must be safe from violence, and procedures must be in place to prevent and eliminate all types of disruption or harassment that might occur.

H.R. 5295 will help promote a safe school environment by requiring districts to have in place policies addressing reasonable student searches. Specifically, required policies under your bill must allow education employees or school officials to conduct student searches when acting on reasonable suspicion based on professional experience and judgment. We believe that such policies will help ensure that classrooms, school buildings, school property, and students remain free from the threat of weapons and other dangerous materials.

We believe your bill strikes a proper balance between ensuring the safety of students and educators and protecting student rights.

We thank you for your efforts on this important issue and we look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure great public schools for every student.

Sincerely,

DIANE SHUST,
Director of Government Relations.
RANDALL MOODY,
Manager of Federal Policy and Politics.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, this legislation empowers full-time teachers or school officials, when acting on suspicion based on professional experience and judgment, to search students on public school grounds, and allows States and school districts to conduct reasonable searches to ensure that the schools remain free of all weapons, dangerous materials or illegal narcotics.

I cannot imagine anyone that would oppose this kind of legislation based on the fact that we all, working together, want to make schools safer for our students and teachers.

In order for our Nation's students to get the most out of their education, it is imperative that they feel safe inside the classroom. Last week's report of two Wisconsin teens plotting a school shooting spree only served to underscore the need to ensure that our teachers, administrators and parents have the necessary tools to keep the classrooms safe and focused on what they are meant for, learning. Parents should be at ease when sending their children to school. Teachers and administrators should know that we are empowering them with resources to make sure that we are keeping their workplaces safe. And most of all, students deserve to learn in as safe an environment as possible.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure to bolster school safety.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to thank my friends and colleagues, Mr. DAVIS and Mr. KUHL, for introducing this outstanding legislation, and I am proud to join them in strong support of the Student and Teacher Safety Act.

As a father, I am very concerned about my children's safety during the school day. Every morning, my wife and I, we send our children off to school to prepare them for a better and brighter future. I expect them to learn in a safe, secure and nurturing environment, an environment incompatible with weapons and violence. Unfortunately, statistics show that this may not be the case.

I am shocked by the statistics that describe the threat drugs and guns pose in our schools. According to a national survey of high school students in 2003, 29 percent of students in grades 9-12 reported having been offered drugs on school grounds; 9 percent of students reported having been threatened or injured by a weapon such as a gun or

knife on school property; and almost 7 percent of students in these same grades said they had missed at least one school day because they felt unsafe at or traveling to or from school.

Statistics show America has a problem. It is up to Congress to provide the tools our educators need to combat this threat. Back when I was a student in high school, if a teacher asked me to show them the contents of my locker, I would have complied. It was a simpler time. Today our teachers' hands are tied with incoherent regulations and the constant threat of litigation that prevents them from confidently acting on perceived threats to their students. That is why this act is so important.

H.R. 5295 will provide much-needed clarity for school districts in setting policies for school searches. Specifically, this legislation will require school districts and other local education agencies to create a policy that is firmly founded upon the fourth amendment protections and follows the controlling Supreme Court decision on school searches, *New Jersey v. TLO*.

I am proud to be listed as a cosponsor of this legislation, and I call on my colleagues in Congress to support its passage here today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers other than myself to close, so if the gentleman from California would like to close at this time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is rather interesting that this legislation comes up with no hearings, no discussion with the school districts, no discussion with local authorities who have the obligations to meet the demands that we cavalierly talk about here. This Court decision I believe is 1985. That is what school districts have been struggling with is to try to put in a policy that meets the test of reasonableness and also protects them in terms of liability and the teacher in terms of liabilities.

We cited Columbine here. I can't believe there is a school district in Colorado that doesn't have a policy dealing with guns on campus in compliance with Federal law where there is zero tolerance for guns on campus or you can lose your funding.

Paducah, Kentucky, and the tragedy there, I can't believe there is a school district in Kentucky that has not responded in the years since those tragedies.

The fact of the matter is every school district in the country has a policy like this because they can, in fact, be sued for not having a policy, for not taking reasonable steps to protect their students and faculty and staff.

Here we have the United States Congress apparently read a report of statistics and studies of all of the activities which is illegal under State and

Federal law. They have read that now and have decided 10, 20 years later that the school districts are not doing anything, are not taking action, and the Federal Government has to tell them to take this action. It is incredibly arrogant and an insult to people who every day live on the front lines for the protection of those students and those faculty members and those staff members and for those children whose charge they have to think that somehow they have not developed the best policy they possibly can within the confines of the fourth amendment, within the confines of their State interpretation of State laws.

That is what school districts struggle with all of the time. That is what they do for a living. Those are the measures they can take. This idea that somehow if you codify this Supreme Court decision, the TLO decision, that somehow if you codify this and they are immune from liability, no, they are not. Someone would go to the court and decide it was an unreasonable search, and you will be right back with liability, just as is done all of the time under the fourth amendment.

What school districts have tried to do is to build a policy over a period of years to try to make it the most effective policy and also make sure that they are not exposing the district and others to all kinds of different liabilities, but to have an effective policy.

Does anybody here suggest that is not their purpose? Does anybody suggest that they have not done this since Columbine, they have not done this since Paducah, or they have not done this since the shootings in Oregon? Of course they have.

And you know what, they would probably be in a much better standing if you would keep cutting the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act, if you quit cutting the money that is available to them in education so they could make these policies even more effective, and they could spend even more time with the students working on why these behavior patterns should not be allowed, why schools should be a safe place, why schools should not be allowed to be the street. There should be bright lines between the schools and streets. That is what schools are seeking to do all the time.

But here is the Federal Government 10, 20 years later after the policy was announced saying, I guess you are not doing anything, and we are going to tell you to do it. We are going to tell you to do it this way or the highway.

It just doesn't make any sense. It just doesn't comport with what all of us know is going on in the districts that we represent. Either that, or you have never visited a school, you have never talked to a school administrator, or never talked to a superintendent or a teacher. The fact of the matter is that they struggle with this all of the time, and they do it within the confines of the decision that you say is controlling. They know that. That is

why they hire attorneys. That is why the policy parties that are responsible for coming up with this, that is why they oppose this.

But this will be the Congress who tells them, do it our way, that is the only way; and now we will have to go back through all of these policies and start over from ground zero. It just doesn't make any sense. It denies what we all know is, in fact, taking place in school districts and schools all over this country every day as those individuals struggle to keep those educational institutions safe for the students who are attending them. I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

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

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close on this bill.

It seems as though there is a long distance between this side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle, because my friend Mr. MILLER fails to recognize the statistics that the honorable gentleman from Kentucky mentioned. Regardless of the fact that there are school districts who are attempting to make changes in their disciplinary policies protecting students, the fact is that violence remains a very, very big issue in our schools. It needs to be resolved.

People, like the teachers on the front lines combating this violence and protecting our students, are not necessarily afforded the opportunities to do that. That is what this bill does. I applaud Mr. DAVIS for bringing it forward.

The bill simply asks, and while my friend Mr. MILLER would try to distort what the bill actually does, the bill asks school districts, each and every one of them separately, to develop and implement a policy on school safety. Nowhere in this legislation is language requiring what the policy should look like or how strict or relaxed it should be. The legislation merely allows each and every individual school district to craft unique policies with guidance established by the Supreme Court decision. That Supreme Court decision, and I will quote again, simply says apart from education, the school, and I underline the school, has the obligation to protect pupils from mistreatments by other children and also to protect teachers themselves from violence by the few students whose conduct in recent years has promoted national concern.

Now let's go to the actual language. I don't know whether Mr. MILLER has had an opportunity to read the bill, but the bill itself specifically says each local educational agency shall have in effect throughout the jurisdiction of the agency policies that ensure that a search described in subsection (b) is deemed reasonable and permissible. No question about it.

Some people might concern themselves with the fact that this might be

an overextension of personal rights, but the Supreme Court has defined what is permissible. In no way does this bill give permission for school officials to perform mass or strip searches of students. No way.

Also, Mr. MILLER, let me assure you that while you can make castigations about this side of the aisle trying to balance the budget, nobody on this side of the aisle has suggested that funding for the implementation of this program is to be deleted. As a matter of fact, we openly support increased funding to implement this policy.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Student and Teacher Safety Act of 2006, H.R. 5295. Although this bill seeks a noble end, protecting our children and their teachers, it gives me pause because it authorizes school systems to strip away student's constitutional rights.

All children should feel safe at school. All teachers should be secure while carrying out their mission of teaching our children. We all agree on this. However laudable these goals of safety and security may be, they should not be sought at the expense of the rights of our children.

School is not only a place where children learn math, reading, and writing. School is also a place where children learn how to be citizens in a free society. Being a citizen of this country means living free from the fear of unnecessary searches and government harassment. My fear is that when we expose our children to constant violations of their privacy through limitless drug tests and unreasonable searches during their school years, they will grow up to believe that violations of their constitutional rights are the norm in our country. The future generations that we will depend on to defend the Bill of the Rights may no longer know what those rights are. They may be all too willing to accept ever-increasing government intrusion into their private lives. In an age of warrant-less wiretaps and secret surveillance, this is not a risk I am willing to take.

In addition, this bill does not adequately protect the privacy interests of our students. In 1969, the Supreme Court said that children do not leave their constitutional rights at the schoolhouse door. Yet this bill is so vaguely and broadly worded that it potentially opens a "Pandora's Box" of 4th Amendment violations in our schools. This bill does not require that school officials actually suspect an individual of wrongdoing before searching them. Rather, it allows for searches if a school official thinks that his or her actions will help the school remain drug free.

I am worried that this bill will lead to instances similar to what happened in Goose Creek, South Carolina in November of 2003. School officials in Goose Creek suspected that a student was dealing drugs in the high school.

They then subjected 150 students to a police raid, and drug dogs going through student's backpacks. The searches occurred despite the fact that the suspected drug dealer was absent from school on that day. Not surprisingly, no drugs were found. Unfortunately, 150 students were humiliated by the school officials that are supposed to guide them on their journey to adulthood.

School safety is a vitally important issue. Children must be able to learn in an environ-

ment free from fear and violence. Providing students and teachers with safe schools does not require students to check their civil liberties at the door. The Bill of Rights envisions a balance between individual freedoms and law enforcement. That balance has served our country well for more than two centuries. There is no reason that such a balance cannot be struck in our school system. If we want safe schools we should invest in afterschool and mentoring programs. We should invest in programs that teach children how to resolve conflicts in non-violent ways. We should teach our children that they have privacy rights that follow them wherever they go, including to school. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5295, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5295, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1815

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING AMERICA'S SENIORS

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 874) recognizing and honoring America's seniors, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 874

Whereas older Americans have made countless contributions to the strength of the United States;

Whereas older Americans include members of the "Greatest Generation" who fought in World War I, World War II, the Korean War, and other military conflicts, and have sacrificed at home and abroad to keep America free;

Whereas in the United States and much of the world, older individuals throughout history have been viewed with respect, honor, and dignity as sources of wisdom and experience;

Whereas this year the first of the "baby boom" generation turn age 60, adding to the 49 million Americans who are age 60 or older, including over 5 million who are older than age 85; and

Whereas the talent and experience of older Americans can be utilized to meet community needs in critical areas such as education, health, community-based and faith-based social services, and homeland security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—
(1) *recognizes the importance of older Americans to the Nation's past and future;*

(2) *encourages multigenerational activities providing opportunities for children and students to listen and learn from older Americans; and*

(3) *urges all Americans to honor and respect older Americans, and to offer appreciation for their contributions to the strength of the United States.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New York (Mr. KUHL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Resolution 874.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Resolution 874, a bipartisan resolution to honor older Americans.

Today, supporting the needs of older Americans is more important than ever. More than 49 million people in the United States are over the age of 60, making it the fastest-growing group in the country. By the year 2050, just a short time away, that number will reach nearly 90 million people and comprise almost a quarter of our population.

This resolution recognizes the countless contributions that older Americans have made to the strength of our Nation. They include members of the Greatest Generation, who fought in World War I and in World War II and the Korean War and other military conflicts. They have sacrificed at home and abroad to keep America free.

Mr. Speaker, with an increasing number of Americans as they retire, our Nation can continue to benefit from the rich talent and experience of these citizens. In communities across the United States, older Americans work and volunteer through community-based and faith-based organizations to support education, health services for the poor and other vital community needs. In June the Education and Workforce Committee approved bipartisan legislation to strengthen and reform the Older Americans Act. The Senior Independence Act, as it is called, transforms and modernizes the law to meet the needs of today's seniors and the needs of the Nation as the population ages. Final enactment will help older Americans to identify home- and community-based long-term care options, including consumer-directed care models as well as other supportive services that can help prevent or delay the need for expensive institutional care. These reforms will help millions of Americans stay healthy and remain in their homes and communities and could yield significant savings. I say that again: and could yield significant savings to taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this body is taking this time today to honor older Americans for their many contributions to the strength of our great Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

I would like to express my strong support for House Resolution 874, a resolution recognizing and honoring older Americans. I would like to thank my friend and fellow Texan, Congressman CHARLIE GONZALEZ, for bringing this resolution forward.

As the resolution so eloquently states, older Americans have made countless contributions that have strengthened our Nation. We are gradually bidding farewell to our Greatest Generation that fought for our freedom and values during the Great Depression and two world wars. We must never forget their strength of character and willingness to sacrifice for the greater good of our Nation and our world.

We are now welcoming the baby boom generation into the ranks of older Americans. This presents great challenges and great opportunities for our Nation. The challenge is to keep our intergenerational compact of Social Security and Medicare, not by privatization schemes or giveaways to special interests, but by prudent management and fiscal responsibility. We can meet that challenge.

We have the opportunity to leverage the tremendous talent, the energy, and desire to make a difference that older Americans bring to our communities. This generation of older Americans is healthier and more educated than any generation before it. Its best years are yet to come. Our older Americans continue to make valuable contributions to our society every day. We must not waste this invaluable national resource.

As we celebrate the contributions of older Americans today with this resolution, let us recommit ourselves to honoring them by completing the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act and supporting our Federal programs that improve the quality of life of older Americans and enable them to continue to contribute to their communities and to our great Nation.

I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join my friend Congressman GONZALEZ of Texas and many of my colleagues to support H. Resolution 874, a resolution to recognize and honor older Americans for their role in helping make America great.

It is so important that policymakers in Congress recognize the contributions of our Nation's seniors by keeping their needs in mind as we develop legislation. We must take this responsibility seriously as we consider issues such as Medicare, Social Security, veterans benefits, housing, and health

care. We also owe it to our seniors and our seniors' grandchildren to do a better job of balancing the budget here in Washington, D.C. No matter what the issue, we must always work to ensure that the needs of our seniors do not get overlooked.

I am thankful to the TREA Senior Citizens League, the largest non-partisan seniors group in the Nation, and its national chairman, Ralph McCutchen, for supporting this resolution.

The sacrifice of our seniors and the Greatest Generation should not go unrecognized. And, again, I thank my friend from Texas for introducing this resolutions. And I am pleased to support this resolution and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the resolution.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend and colleague CHARLIE GONZALEZ from San Antonio, who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend Mr. HINOJOSA, my colleague from Texas, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank my colleagues on the Education and Workforce Committee, especially Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER, who was here earlier, for bringing this bill to the floor. I also thank my friend Congressman WALTER JONES for supporting this legislation from the very beginning and serving as its Republican lead. His efforts, in addition to those of his staff, have been very important throughout this process. I would also like to recognize, as Congressman JONES acknowledged, the Senior Citizens League and the important role they have played in promoting and supporting this resolution. Their chairman, Ralph McCutchen, wanted, above all, to see a bill that honors and pays tribute to the many sacrifices made by America's seniors, including those who have served in the military. I certainly appreciate the support demonstrated by this very important organization.

This resolution recognizes the importance of honoring senior citizens. This can be done in countless numbers of ways, from simple gestures of kindness towards a stranger to the actions made by this Congress that will impact seniors as a whole.

We are the policymakers. We should not make policy that makes it more difficult for seniors to vote. We should not have policy that makes it more difficult for seniors to obtain medical care. We should not enact policy that makes it more difficult for seniors to obtain prescription drugs or to afford housing.

This resolution encourages children and students to take time to learn from senior citizens. It is imperative that we as a society facilitate the sharing of information among the different generations.

I don't want anyone to get the idea that this resolution is about seniors

and what they have accomplished in the past. In part it is, but they are not relegated to the past. And let me quickly explain.

Today's seniors are active in our present-day workforce, contributing every day their ideas and their labor. They are part and parcel of this wonderful economy and capitalist system of our country. With their skill, their training, and their education in how they prepare those other generations, they are part of our future.

I would like to end it with an observation. I was trying to figure out what constitutes a senior. Is it someone 60, 70, 80, 90? Well, age is important and it isn't important. It is important in this respect, and I am going to quote Sir Oliver Lodge: "Never throw away hastily any old faith, tradition or convention . . . They are the result of the experience of many generations."

So age is important as far as experience and having the life experiences. I still remember my father, when I used to ask, that was a brilliant man, Dad, where did he go to school? And he said, it was the school of hard knocks. So many times it is just life experiences that will instill that wonderful knowledge that is imparted to succeeding generations.

But age does not constitute and define seniors. And I will end it here with a quote from Satchel Paige: "Age is a case of mind over matter. If you don't mind, it don't matter."

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague DANNY DAVIS from the great State of Illinois, who serves on the Education Committee and the Government Reform Committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of our Nation's senior citizens.

Senior citizens are a vital part of society to whom we have a responsibility of ensuring both economic and physical well-being. Seniors provide vital links to our past as well as serve as the caregivers to over 6.1 million of the Nation's children.

I recognize the importance of caring for our elderly and providing them with the services they need to live independently. I have a Seniors and Eldercare Task Force, composed of an outstanding group of experts who advise me on key issues of importance to the seniors in my district. They advised me on key issues for the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

Within the bipartisan process surrounding this bill, I am pleased that I was successful in including important changes to the act. My local experts said that seniors raising their grandchildren needed great access to financial support and information about

programs for which they are eligible. They said that seniors needed more services in their communities to avoid spending down their assets to qualify for Medicaid. They said that we needed a greater focus on mental health and elder justice. The reauthorization of the Older Americans Act addresses these needs, and I hope that this important legislation will pass this Congress.

However, we must do more to assist grandparent caregivers. These grandparents make up 5.7 million households living with over 6.1 million children, evidence that many of these grandparents are oftentimes caring for more than one child. In my congressional district, there are over 10,000 grandparents who are responsible for their grandchildren's needs. Indeed, the Seventh District of Illinois, my congressional district, has the highest percentage of children living with grandparents in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that you can measure the greatness of a society by how well it treats its young, how well it treats its old, and how well it treats those who have difficulty caring for themselves. In this case when we provide grandparents, senior citizens, with the opportunity to help raise their grandchildren, then we are doing the Nation a great service.

I thank all of those who rose to support this legislation.

□ 1830

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, but I would like to make some closing remarks. I want to say that I had the pleasure of serving, together with Chairman PATRICK TIBERI from Ohio, and together we led our committee through the effort of the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

It was of great satisfaction to me, because we were able to pass amendments and requests for an increase in authorization for this very important act.

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

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support and cosponsor H. Res. 874, a resolution honoring America's senior citizens for their contributions to American life. I am particularly pleased by the language encouraging young people to seek out and talk to our Nation's seniors about these seniors' life experiences. Talking to beloved grandparents, aunts, uncles, or friends about their past is a great way to learn history and gain an understanding of the past that simply cannot be obtained from a textbook.

I hope that, in the limited time left in this congressional session, we would further demonstrate our commitment to America's seniors by voting on my Senior Citizens' Improved

Quality of Life Act, H.R. 5211. H.R. 5211 contains a number of items of great importance to America's seniors. H.R. 5211 helps seniors by:

Repealing all taxes on Social Security benefits. Since Social Security benefits are financed with tax dollars, taxing these benefits is an example of double taxation. The benefits tax also reduces Social Security benefits by subterfuge.

Ensuring that Social Security trust fund money is used only for Social Security. H.R. 5211 requires that all money raised for the Social Security trust fund will be spent in payments to beneficiaries, with excess receipts invested in interest-bearing certificates of deposit. This will keep Social Security trust fund money from being diverted to other programs, as well as allow the fund to grow by providing for investment in interest-bearing instruments. Ending the raid of the Social Security trust fund is a vital first step in any serious Social Security reform plan. Protecting the trust fund also demonstrates our commitment to putting the priorities of the American people ahead of special interest pork barrel spending.

Repealing provisions of Federal law that restrict the ability of senior citizens to form private contracts for health care services. This restriction violates the rights of seniors who may wish to use their own resources to obtain procedures or treatments not covered by Medicare, or to simply avoid the bureaucracy and uncertainty that come when seniors must wait for the judgment of a Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, bureaucrat before finding out if a desired treatment is covered. H.R. 5211 also stops the Social Security Administration from denying Social Security benefits to seniors who refuse to enroll in Medicare Part A. Forcing seniors to enroll in Medicare Part A as a condition for receiving Social Security violates the promise represented by Social Security. Americans pay taxes into the Social Security trust fund their whole working lives and are promised that Social Security will be there for them when they retire. Yet, today, seniors are told that they cannot receive these benefits unless they agree to join another government program.

Allowing seniors who neither want nor need to participate in the Medicare program to refrain from doing so and ensuring seniors have the freedom to use their own resources to obtain quality health care will strengthen the Medicare program for those seniors who do wish to receive Medicare benefits. Of course, H.R. 5211 does not take away Medicare benefits from any senior. It simply allows each senior to choose voluntarily whether or not to accept Medicare benefits.

Ensuring that Social Security benefits only go to American citizens. Proposals, such as those contained in the Reid-Kennedy immigration bill, to allow noncitizens, including those who entered the country illegally, to receive Social Security benefits are a slap in the face to America's workers and seniors. H.R. 5211 ensures that only American citizens who have paid into the Social Security trust fund can receive Social Security benefits.

Providing seniors with a tax credit to help cover their prescription drug expenses not covered by Medicare and repealing Federal barriers that prohibit seniors from obtaining quality prescription drugs from overseas. Even though Congress added a prescription drug benefit to Medicare, many seniors still have

difficulty affording their prescription drugs. One reason is because the new program creates a "doughnut hole," where seniors must pay for their prescriptions above a certain amount out of their own pockets until their expenses reach a level where Medicare coverage resumes. H.R. 5211 helps seniors cope with these costs by providing them with a tax credit equal to 80 percent of their out-of-pocket pharmaceutical costs.

H.R. 5211 also lowers the price of pharmaceuticals by making two changes in the law to create a free market in pharmaceuticals. First, H.R. 5211 allows anyone wishing to import a drug to submit an application to the Food and Drug Administration, FDA, which then must approve the drug unless the FDA finds the drug is either not approved for use in the U.S. or is adulterated or misbranded. Second, H.R. 5211 ensures that lawful internet pharmacies can continue to offer affordable prescription drugs free of Federal harassment.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my support for H. Res. 874 and my hope that Congress will continue to show its appreciation for America's seniors by voting on my Senior Citizens' Improved Quality of Life Act before adjourning for the year.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 874, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A Resolution recognizing and honoring older Americans."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING EFFORTS OF STATE OF NEW YORK TO DEVELOP NATIONAL PURPLE HEART HALL OF HONOR

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 419) recognizing and supporting the efforts of the State of New York to develop the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor in New Windsor, New York, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 419

Whereas George Washington, at his headquarters in Newburgh, New York, on August 7, 1782, devised a Badge of Military Merit to be given to enlisted men and noncommissioned officers for meritorious action;

Whereas the Badge of Military Merit became popularly known as the "Purple Heart" because it consisted of the figure of a heart in purple cloth or silk edged with narrow lace or binding and was affixed to the uniform coat over the left breast;

Whereas Badges of Military Merit were awarded during the Revolutionary War by General George Washington at his headquarters, in Newburgh, New York, on May 3 and June 8, 1783;

Whereas the Badge of Military Merit, an award for military merit in the Revolutionary War, is the inspiration for today's Purple Heart medal;

Whereas on the bicentennial of General Washington's birthday in February 1932, the Badge of Military Merit was redesignated by General Douglas MacArthur, then Chief of Staff of the Army, as the Purple Heart, to be awarded to persons killed or wounded in action against an enemy of the United States;

Whereas more than 800,000 members of the Armed Forces have been awarded the Purple Heart;

Whereas the State of New York has dedicated substantial resources to the creation of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor to be constructed at the New Windsor Cantonment, a New York State Historic Site, in New Windsor, New York, to honor those individuals who have been awarded the Purple Heart and to inform and educate the people of the United States about the history and importance of that distinguished combat award;

Whereas the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor will be a permanent place of remembrance of the service and sacrifices made by the members of the Armed Forces wounded or killed in service to America throughout the Nation's history, both at home and abroad; and

Whereas as the Nation continues to defend the American Way, there will be a need for a distinguished place to honor those who in the future are awarded the Purple Heart for their service and sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes and supports the efforts of the State of New York to develop and maintain the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor in New Windsor, New York, to honor those individuals who have been awarded the Purple Heart and to inform and educate the people of the United States about the history and importance of that distinguished combat award; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States as well as Federal departments and agencies to cooperate, assist, and participate in educating and informing individuals about the history and importance of the Purple Heart and about the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 419, recognizing and supporting the efforts of the State of New York to develop the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor in New Windsor, New York.

Mr. Speaker, let me first take just a moment to thank my colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from

New York (Mrs. KELLY), and the State of New York for establishing a place for Americans to come and honor those men and women of our military who have sacrificed so much for America. They are the individuals who fight for us, who sweat for us, who bleed for us, and, sadly and unfortunately, sometimes who die for us.

The Purple Heart is a unique symbol that recognizes the sacrifices made by the men and women of the Armed Forces, sacrifices made for the freedoms this great country offers, freedoms not just for themselves, but for future generations of Americans.

It is only fitting that we have a place such as the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor to honor those men and women so that future generations can go there and learn about those fine young Americans who have ensured that we can all live free.

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

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 419, which recognizes the efforts of the State of New York to establish the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor.

And, I recognize the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. SUE KELLY, the sponsor of this measure for her efforts. One might wonder why the state of New York is leading the effort to establish a center that focuses on the history and importance of this honored military award. The reason is simple, in the summer of 1782, during the Revolutionary War; General George Washington devised two new badges, one of which was the Badge of Military Merit, which we know today as the Purple Heart.

General Washington at the time wrote ". . . whenever any singularly meritorious action is performed, the author of it shall be permitted to wear on his facings over the left breast, the figure of a heart in purple cloth, or silk, edged with narrow lace or binding." Three soldiers are known to have received the original honor badge, Sergeant Daniel Bissell of the 2nd Connecticut Regiment of the Continental Line, Sergeant William Brown of the 5th Connecticut Regiment of the Continental Line, and Sergeant Elijah Churchill of the 2nd Continental Dragoons, also a Connecticut regiment. However, after the Revolution, the award fell into disuse and was not proposed for use again until after World War I.

In 1927, Army Chief of Staff General Charles P. Summerall directed that proposed legislation be sent to Congress to revive the Badge of Military Merit. However, it was not until 1931, when General Summerall's successor, General Douglas MacArthur pushed forward the idea to reinstate the badge. It was on the 200th anniversary of George Washington's birth, February 22, 1932, that the War Department announced General Order No. 3, which established the Purple Heart.

In 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt extended the award to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and established a uniform application of standards in the Army and

Navy. President Harry S. Truman retroactively extended the eligibility for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard back to April 5, 1917, and in 1962, President John F. Kennedy extended eligibility to any "civilian national of the United States, who while serving under competent authority in any capacity with an armed force . . . , has been, or may hereafter be, wounded" to qualify for the Purple Heart.

Mr. Speaker, the Purple Heart has an illustrious career and it is recognition of the enemy-related injuries a service member sustains. Today, there are more than 800,000 members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Purple Heart. The State of New York has been working to establish a National Purple Heart Hall of Honor at the New Windsor Cantonment in New Windsor, New York to provide a permanent place of remembrance of the service and sacrifices made by men and women in uniform throughout our nation's history. This resolution before us recognizes the efforts of the State of New York, and encourages the education and information on the history and importance of this distinguished combat award.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary sacrifices made by American's veterans by voting "yes" on H. Con. Res 419.

This resolution supports the establishment of a National Purple Heart Hall of Honor in the birthplace of the Purple Heart in New Windsor, New York. The Purple Heart is the oldest and one of the most prestigious honors bestowed upon an American soldier. By passing this legislation today, we recognize the sacrifices of the brave men and women who have received this honor.

The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor will uniquely highlight the stories of the Purple Heart veterans. Every Purple Heart veteran is a hero whose story needs to be held. By hearing these stories we can fully honor their sacrifices and learn from their experiences. The stories will echo within the halls of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, and they should inspire our Nation not only to preserve the legacy of our military heroes, but to better appreciate the freedoms for which they fought.

The Hall of Honor is scheduled to be officially dedicated November 10. It will be located at New Windsor Cantonment, the site in my congressional district. This is the site of the last encampment of the Continental Army, where General George Washington first presented the Badge of Military Merit in 1782. Since then more than 800,000 members of the Armed Forces have been awarded this medal, which is now called the Purple Heart. It is an honor reserved for those soldiers who are wounded or killed while defending the greatest of our principles, freedom.

New York State has done a great deal to make the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor a reality. Governor George Pataki and Bernadette Castro, our State's park and recreation preservation commissioner, led the effort. Our State's senator, Senator Bill Larkin, a retired lieutenant colonel with 23 years of Active Duty in the United States Army, has been a true champion in working on siting the Purple Heart Hall of Honor in New Windsor.

I am also grateful for the efforts of the military personnel subcommittee chairman, JOHN McHUGH of New York, who helped bring this legislation to the floor today.

I want to thank especially Rick Weeks, the State commander of the New York Chapter of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. The Military Order contributed \$500,000 toward the construction of the Hall of Honor.

I will insert this letter of support from the National Military Order of the Purple Heart in the RECORD.

Commander Weeks was also instrumental in gathering support for this resolution. I thank him very much.

While the Hall of Honor is in New York, it is important to remember it is a national institution that will celebrate the sacrifices of soldiers and veterans who have lived in all areas of our country. Passage of this resolution today, as our troops are courageously fighting overseas to defend and preserve democracy, will send a strong message to our Armed Forces and our veterans that our Nation is grateful and continues to be grateful for the sacrifices made by our military men and women.

MILITARY ORDER OF
THE PURPLE HEART,
Springfield, VA, August 1, 2006.

Chairman DUNCAN HUNTER,
House Armed Services Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Military Order of the Purple Heart (MOPH) is in total support of H. Con. Res. 419, which has been referred to your committee. This resolution recognizes and encourages support for the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor. This Hall of Honor, while located in New York, is really a national effort and one that will recognize and honor all our country's men and women who have been recipients of the Purple Heart Medal for their death or wounds received in combat.

MOPH urges you and your colleagues on the committee to support this very worthwhile endeavor in a timely manner.

Respectfully,

JAMES D. RANDLES,
National Commander.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I fully endorse, and I know Members in this Chamber do, the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 419, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr.

KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res 419, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 210, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 622, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 415, 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.

SUPPORTING THE GOAL OF ELIMINATING SUFFERING AND DEATH DUE TO CANCER BY THE YEAR 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 210, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 210, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie	Bishop (UT)	Campbell (CA)	Johnson (CT)	Pascarell
Ackerman	Blackburn	Cannon	Johnson (IL)	Pastor
Aderholt	Blumenauer	Cantor	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
Akin	Blunt	Capito	Johnson, Sam	Payne
Alexander	Boehlert	Capps	Jones (NC)	Pearce
Allen	Boehner	Cardin	Jones (OH)	Pelosi
Andrews	Bonilla	Cardoza	Kanjorski	Pence
Baca	Bonner	Carnahan	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Bachus	Bono	Carson	Kelly	Peterson (PA)
Baird	Boozman	Carter	Kildee	Petri
Baker	Boren	Castle	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pickering
Baldwin	Boswell	Chabot	Kind	Pitts
Barrett (SC)	Boucher	Chandler	King (IA)	Platts
Barrow	Boustany	Chocola	King (NY)	Poe
Bartlett (MD)	Boyd	Clay	Kingston	Pombo
Barton (TX)	Bradley (NH)	Cleaver	Kirk	Pomeroy
Bass	Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Kline	Porter
Bean	Brady (TX)	Coble	Knollenberg	Price (GA)
Becerra	Brown (SC)	Cole (OK)	Kolbe	Price (NC)
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Conaway	Kucinich	Price (OH)
Berman	Brown-Waite,	Conyers	Kuhl (NY)	Putnam
Berry	Ginny	Cooper	LaHood	Radanovich
Biggart	Burgess	Costa	Langevin	Rahall
Bilbray	Butterfield	Costello	Lantos	Ramstad
Bilirakis	Butterfield	Cramer	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
Bishop (GA)	Calvert	Crenshaw	Larson (CT)	Regula
Bishop (NY)	Camp (MI)	Cubin	Latham	Rehberg
			LaTourette	Reichert
			Leach	Renzi
			Lee	Reyes
			Levin	Reynolds
			Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)
			Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)
			Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)
			Linder	Rohrabacher
			Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
			LoBiondo	Ross
			Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman
			Lowe	Roybal-Allard
			Lucas	Royce
			Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger
			E. Rush	Rush
			Mack	Ryan (OH)
			Maloney	Ryan (WI)
			Manzullo	Ryun (KS)
			Marchant	Sabo
			Markey	Salazar
			Marshall	Sánchez, Linda
			Matheson	T. Sanchez, Loretta
			Matsui	Saxton
			McCarthy	Schakowsky
			McCaul (TX)	Schiff
			McCollum (MN)	Schmidt
			McCotter	Schwartz (PA)
			McCrery	Schwarz (MI)
			McDermott	Scott (GA)
			McHenry	Scott (VA)
			McHugh	Sensenbrenner
			McIntyre	Serrano
			McKeon	Sessions
			McKinney	Shadegg
			McMorris	Shaw
			Rodgers	Shays
			McNulty	Sherman
			Meehan	Sherwood
			Meek (FL)	Shimkus
			Meeks (NY)	Shuster
			Melancon	Simmons
			Mica	Simpson
			Michaud	Skelton
			Millender-	Slaughter
			McDonald	Smith (NJ)
			Hefley	Smith (TX)
			Hensarling	Smith (WA)
			Herger	Miller, Gary
			Herseth	Miller, George
			Higgins	Mollohan
			Hinchev	Moore (WI)
			Hinojosa	Moran (KS)
			Hobson	Moran (VA)
			Hoekstra	Murphy
			Holden	Murtha
			Holt	Musgrave
			Honda	Myrick
			Hooley	Nadler
			Hostettler	Napolitano
			Hoyer	Neal (MA)
			Hulshof	Neugebauer
			Hunter	Northup
			Inglis (SC)	Norwood
			Inslee	Nunes
			Israel	Oberstar
			Issa	Obey
			Istook	Olver
			Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
			Jackson-Lee	Osborne
			(TX)	Otter
			Jenkins	Owens
			Jindal	Pallone

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

NOT VOTING—29

Beauprez	Ford	Lynch
Brown (OH)	Gilchrest	McGovern
Burton (IN)	Green (WI)	Miller (NC)
Capuano	Gutierrez	Moore (KS)
Case	Harris	Ney
Crowley	Hyde	Nussle
Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Oxley
DeGette	Keller	Sanders
Dingell	Kennedy (MN)	Strickland
Evans	Kennedy (RI)	

□ 1902

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING FILIPINO WORLD WAR II VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 622, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 622, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie	Boehner	Castle
Ackerman	Bonilla	Chabot
Aderholt	Bonner	Chandler
Akin	Bono	Chocola
Alexander	Boozman	Clay
Allen	Boren	Cleaver
Andrews	Boswell	Clyburn
Baca	Boucher	Coble
Bachus	Boustany	Cole (OK)
Baird	Boyd	Conaway
Baker	Bradley (NH)	Conyers
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Cooper
Barrett (SC)	Brady (TX)	Costa
Barrow	Brown (SC)	Costello
Bartlett (MD)	Brown, Corrine	Cramer
Barton (TX)	Brown-Waite,	Crenshaw
Bass	Ginny	Cubin
Bean	Burgess	Cuellar
Becerra	Butterfield	Culberson
Berkley	Buyer	Cummings
Berman	Calvert	Davis (AL)
Berry	Camp (MI)	Davis (CA)
Biggert	Campbell (CA)	Davis (IL)
Bilbray	Cannon	Davis (KY)
Bilirakis	Cantor	Davis (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Capito	Davis, Jo Ann
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Davis, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Cardin	Deal (GA)
Blackburn	Cardoza	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Carnahan	Delahunt
Blunt	Carson	DeLauro
Boehlert	Carter	Dent

Emerson	Engel
English (PA)	Eshoo
Everett	Farr
Fattah	Feeney
Ferguson	Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Flake
Foley	Forbes
Fortenberry	Fossella
Fox	Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)	Frelinghuysen
Gallegly	Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach	Gibbons
Gillmor	Gingrey
Gohmert	Gonzalez
Goode	Goodlatte
Gordon	Granger
Graves	Green, Al
Green, Gene	Grijalva
Gutknecht	Hall
Harman	Hart
Hastings (FL)	Hastings (WA)
Hastings (WA)	Hayes
Hayworth	Hefley
Hensarling	Herger
Herse	Herse
Higgins	Hinche
Hinojosa	Hobson
Hobson	Hoekstra
Holden	Holt
Honda	Hooley
Hostettler	Hoyer
Hulshof	Hunter
Hunter	Inglis (SC)
Inglis (SC)	Inslee
Inslee	Israel
Issa	Istook
Jackson (IL)	Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee	(TX)
Jenkins	Jindal
Jindal	Johnson (CT)
Johnson (CT)	Johnson (IL)
Johnson (IL)	Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, E. B.	Johnson, Sam
Johnson, Sam	Jones (NC)
Jones (NC)	Jones (OH)
Jones (OH)	Kanjorski
Kanjorski	Kaptur
Kaptur	Kelly
Kelly	Kildee
Kildee	Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Kind
Kind	King (IA)
King (IA)	King (NY)
King (NY)	Kingston
Kingston	

Knollenberg	Kolbe
Kucinich	Kuhl (NY)
LaHood	Langevin
Lantos	Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)	Latham
LaTourette	Leach
Lee	Levin
Lewis (CA)	Lewis (GA)
Lewis (GA)	Lewis (KY)
Linder	Lipinski
Lipinski	LoBiondo
LoBiondo	Lofgren, Zoe
Lofgren, Zoe	Lowey
Lowey	Lucas
Lucas	Lungren, Daniel
Lungren, Daniel	E.
E.	Mack
Mack	Maloney
Maloney	Manzullo
Manzullo	Marchant
Marchant	Markey
Markey	Marshall
Marshall	Matheson
Matheson	Matsui
Matsui	McCarthy
McCarthy	McCaul (TX)
McCaul (TX)	McCollum (MN)
McCollum (MN)	McCotter
McCotter	McCrery
McCrery	McDermott
McDermott	McHenry
McHenry	McHugh
McHugh	McIntyre
McIntyre	McKeon
McKeon	McKinney
McKinney	McMorris
McMorris	Rodgers
Rodgers	McNulty
McNulty	Meehan
Meehan	Meek (FL)
Meek (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Meeks (NY)	Melancon
Melancon	Mica
Mica	Michaud
Michaud	Millender-
Millender-	McDonald
McDonald	Miller (FL)
Miller (FL)	Miller (MI)
Miller (MI)	Miller, Gary
Miller, Gary	Miller, George
Miller, George	Mollohan
Mollohan	Moore (WI)
Moore (WI)	Moran (KS)
Moran (KS)	Moran (VA)
Moran (VA)	Murphy
Murphy	Musgrave
Musgrave	Myrick
Myrick	Nadler
Nadler	Napolitano
Napolitano	Neal (MA)
Neal (MA)	Neugebauer
Neugebauer	Northup
Northup	Norwood
Norwood	Nunes
Nunes	Oberstar
Oberstar	Obey
Obey	Olver
Olver	Ortiz
Ortiz	Osborne
Osborne	Otter
Otter	Owens
Owens	Pallone
Pallone	Pascrell
Pascrell	Pastor
Pastor	Paul
Paul	Payne
Payne	Pearce
Pearce	Pelosi
Pelosi	Pence
Pence	Peterson (MN)
Peterson (MN)	Peterson (PA)
Peterson (PA)	Petri
Petri	Pickering
Pickering	Schultz
Schultz	Waters
Waters	Watson
Watson	Watt
Watt	Waxman

Sanchez, Loretta	Saxton
Saxton	Schakowsky
Schakowsky	Schiff
Schiff	Schmidt
Schmidt	Schwartz (PA)

English (PA) Lewis (CA)
 Eshoo Lewis (GA)
 Etheridge Lewis (KY)
 Everett Linder
 Farr Lipinski
 Fattah LoBiondo
 Feeney Lofgren, Zoe
 Ferguson Lowey
 Filner Lucas
 Fitzpatrick (PA) Lungren, Daniel
 Foley E.
 Forbes Mack
 Fortenberry Maloney
 Fossella Manzullo
 Foxx Markey
 Frank (MA) Marshall
 Franks (AZ) Matheson
 Frelinghuysen Matsui
 Gallegly McCarthy
 Garrett (NJ) McCaul (TX)
 Gerlach McCollum (MN)
 Gibbons McCotter
 Gillmor McCrery
 Gingrey McDermott
 Gohmert McHenry
 Gonzalez McHugh
 Goode McIntyre
 Goodlatte McKeon
 Gordon McKinney
 Graves McMorris
 Green, Al Rodgers
 Green, Gene McNulty
 Grijalva Meehan
 Gutknecht Meek (FL)
 Hall Meeks (NY)
 Harman Melancon
 Hart Mica
 Hastings (FL) Michaud
 Hastings (WA) Millender
 Hayes McDonald
 Hayworth Miller (FL)
 Hefley Miller (MI)
 Hensarling Miller, Gary
 Herger Miller, George
 Herseht Mollohan
 Higgins Moore (WI)
 Hinchey Moran (KS)
 Hinojosa Moran (VA)
 Hobson Murphy
 Hoekstra Musgrave
 Holden Myrick
 Holt Nadler
 Honda Napolitano
 Hooley Neal (MA)
 Hostettler Neugebauer
 Hoyer Northup
 Hulshof Norwood
 Hunter Nunes
 Inglis (SC) Oberstar
 Inslee Obey
 Israel Oliver
 Issa Ortiz
 Istook Osborne
 Jackson (IL) Otter
 Jackson-Lee Owens
 (TX) Pallone
 Jenkins Pascrell
 Jindal Pastor
 Johnson (CT) Payne
 Johnson (IL) Pearce
 Johnson, E. B. Pelosi
 Johnson, Sam Pence
 Jones (NC) Peterson (MN)
 Jones (OH) Peterson (PA)
 Kanjorski Petri
 Kaptur Pickering
 Kelly Pitts
 Kildee Platts
 Kilpatrick (MI) Poe
 Kind Pombo
 King (IA) Pomeroy
 King (NY) Porter
 Kingston Price (GA)
 Kirk Price (NC)
 Kline Pryce (OH)
 Knollenberg Putnam
 Kolbe Radanovich
 Kuhl (NY) Rahall
 LaHood Ramstad
 Langevin Rangel
 Lantos Regula
 Larsen (WA) Rehberg
 Larson (CT) Reichert
 Latham Renzi
 LaTourette Reyes
 Leach Reynolds
 Lee Rogers (AL)
 Levin Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryan (KS)
 Sabo
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schwartz (PA)
 Schwarz (MI)
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Sodrel
 Solis
 Souder
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Nadler
 Sweeney
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Towns
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Westmoreland
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Kucinich Paul
 NOT VOTING—37
 Allen Dingell Kennedy (RI)
 Beauprez Evans Lynch
 Brown (OH) Flake Marchant
 Brown-Waite, Ford McGovern
 Ginny Gilchrest Miller (NC)
 Burton (IN) Granger Moore (KS)
 Buyer Green (WI) Murtha
 Capuano Gutierrez Ney
 Case Harris Nussle
 Cole (OK) Hyde Oxley
 Crowley Jefferson Sanders
 Davis (FL) Keller Strickland
 DeGette Kennedy (MN)

□ 1930

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from Washington on Tuesday, September 19, 2006. As a result, I was not recorded for rollcall votes Nos. 451, 452, and 453. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall Nos. 451, 452, and 453.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE SHELLEY BERKLEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable SHELLEY BERKLEY, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, DC, September 14, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
 Speaker, House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

SHELLEY BERKLEY,
 Member of Congress.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 65

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 65.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4844, FEDERAL ELECTION INTEGRITY ACT OF 2006

Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 109-670) on the resolution (H. Res. 1015) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4844) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require any individual who desires to register or re-register to vote in an election for Federal office to provide the appropriate State election official with proof that the individual is a citizen of the United States to prevent fraud in Federal elections, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SECURE BORDERS

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, this week we will consider legislation that the American people have made clear must be addressed to solve the illegal immigration crisis in our country. For too long, the security and well-being of our Nation has been compromised by open and porous borders.

After months of field hearings and listening to our constituents' concerns, it is clear that Americans from Savannah to Seattle and from San Diego to Syracuse demand tighter border security and stronger immigration laws. Last week, we passed the Secure Fence Act to tackle the problem of illegal aliens coming across the border, and three bills will be brought to the floor this week to ensure that our law enforcement agencies have the tools needed to further deal with this crisis. I call on all of my colleagues here and in the Senate to pass these critical pieces of legislation.

Madam Speaker, no longer can we allow an attitude of indifference toward the sovereignty of our borders. We should pass these bills and speak loudly to those wishing to break our laws that their actions will no longer be tolerated by the United States.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the Iraq war is doing badly, and the President would like the American people to think about something else. With less than 2 months until the midterm elections, the Republicans suddenly fear the democracy they claim to be spreading.

A commentary in today's Asia Times sums it up. The article is entitled,

“Iraq, Trying to Spin the Unspinnable.”

Let me briefly quote from it:

“The power of spin is not infinite; however, as the administration is now discovering, bad news has cascaded out of Iraq at such an astonishing pace that it defies credulity to suggest that the war has not drastically worsened the lives of Iraqis.”

American soldiers have been fighting and dying in Iraq for years to prop up the same flawed and failed policy by the President who cannot win the war, cannot win the peace, and cannot lead the United States out of harm’s way.

The President says stay the course, and Republicans in the Congress refuse to say or do anything independent of the President. No oversight, just blind allegiance. The number of U.S. soldiers killed in Iraq stands at 2,678. Every day in Iraq, on average of two more soldiers die. The number of U.S. soldiers injured in Iraq recently passed another grim statistic, 20,000 physical injuries. Every day in Iraq, 19 U.S. soldiers on average are injured as they try to survive in the middle of a civil war. And we have not yet begun to count the number of U.S. psychological casualties, the soldiers with PTSD. That could be another 20,000 to 30,000 from PTSD alone.

But nothing will change as long as the President has a Republican Congress rubber-stamping his vision. Even Iraqi leaders and parliament get it. Just yesterday, Abdel al-Anisi, a member of the largest party in Maliki’s government said, “We have to determine the nature of our relationship with the Multinational Forces in Iraq, which is to support the role of the government, not to take over its role.”

We are seen as occupiers in Iraq trying to control their oil and trying to dictate their policies, and our presence provokes more violence.

The President would like you to believe that terrorism is a new threat in a new century. The only new thing about the latest threat is how the President has mismanaged our response. Had Republicans in Congress provided any Iraq oversight, the truth would have emerged and we would have changed the course.

But the Republican congressional leaders demand acquiescence by their members, so the President’s flawed war just keeps getting worse.

Throughout history, nations in the East and nations in the West have faced the threat of terrorism. A new book entitled, “What Terrorists Want: Understanding the Enemy, Containing the Threat,” by Louise Richardson, ought to be required reading for Republicans. The author analyzes history to show us that terrorists want three Rs: revenge, renown, and reaction. She doesn’t stop there. The second half of the book is called “The Counter-Terrorists.”

Armed with understanding, not rhetoric, not ideology, the author provides insights into successfully dealing with

the terrorists. If only our President would listen. If only Republicans in Congress would demand the President stop the rhetoric and face the reality. But that can’t happen as long as the special interests receive special treatment by the Republicans.

Another new book, “Imperial Life in the Emerald City,” by a Washington Post reporter, offers a sobering assessment of the extent to which favors meant more than credentials in Iraq.

I submit for printing in the RECORD a story published yesterday in the Christian Science Monitor entitled, “Mistakes Made by U.S. in Staffing Iraq? The new book alleges it wasn’t what but who you knew that determined who got the key jobs.”

As the newspaper story recounts, before anyone could go to Iraq, they were vetted by a Republican political appointee and his staff in the Pentagon who, quoted here, posed blunt questions to some candidates about domestic politics: Did you vote for George Bush in 2000? Do you support the way the President is fighting the war on terror? Two people who sought jobs with the U.S. occupation said they were even asked about Rowe v. Wade. The President sent a 24-year-old over there to open the stock market. That is how the President is running the Iraq war.

The congressional Republicans are doing just as they are ordered. Over the next 7 weeks, the Republicans will offer the American people endless rhetoric. But that will only produce endless casualties until we replace a Republican Congress that merely takes orders. We have to have a Democratic Congress that is willing to provide oversight on what this President is doing. Election is about 50 days away, Mr. President.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 19, 2006]

MISTAKES MADE BY US IN STAFFING IRAQ?
NEW BOOK ALLEGES IT WASN’T WHAT, BUT WHO,
YOU KNEW THAT DETERMINED KEY JOBS
(By Tom Regan)

In the early days after the fall of Baghdad in 2003, many Americans both inside and outside the government indicated a desire to go to Iraq to help with the war effort. But a new book by Washington Post reporter Rajiv Chandrasekaran, “Imperial Life in the Emerald City,” argues that ties to the Bush administration or to the Republican Party regularly trumped years of experience or knowledge in a particular field when key jobs were being assigned.

The result, Mr. Chandrasekaran writes, is that under the leadership of L. Paul Bremer, the first administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority, many inexperienced or unqualified people were given key posts in the rebuilding of Iraq, and often found themselves in situations they could not handle.

Before anyone could go to Baghdad, Chandrasekaran (who had spent six months in Iraq before the war started in March 2003, and then was the Post’s Baghdad bureau chief from April 2003 to October 2004) reports, they first had to go through the office of Jim O’Beirne in the Pentagon.

To pass muster with O’Beirne, a political appointee who screens prospective political appointees for Defense Department posts, applicants didn’t need to be experts in the Mid-

dle East or in post-conflict reconstruction. What seemed most important was loyalty to the Bush administration.

O’Beirne’s staff posed blunt questions to some candidates about domestic politics: Did you vote for George W. Bush in 2000? Do you support the way the president is fighting the war on terror? Two people who sought jobs with the US occupation authority said they were even asked their views on *Rowe v. Wade*.

The result, Chandrasekaran says, was that officials in many key areas, “lacked vital skills and experience.” Many people involved in the effort to rebuild and stabilize Iraq now see this decision making process as “one of the Bush administration’s gravest errors.”

“We didn’t tap—and it should have started from the White House on down—just didn’t tap the right people to do this job,” said Frederick Smith, who served as the deputy director of the CPA’s Washington office. “It was a tough, tough job. Instead we got people who went out there because of their political leanings . . .”

One former CPA employee who had an office near O’Beirne’s wrote an e-mail to a friend describing the recruitment process: “I watched résumés of immensely talented individuals who had sought out CPA to help the country thrown in the trash because their adherence to ‘the President’s vision for Iraq’ (a frequently heard phrase at CPA) was ‘uncertain.’ I saw senior civil servants from agencies like Treasury, Energy . . . and Commerce denied advisory positions in Baghdad that were instead handed to prominent RNC (Republican National Committee) contributors.”

In a review of the book in *The Washington Post*, Moses Naim, editor in chief of *Foreign Policy* magazine, writes that while common wisdom holds that “the decision to invade Iraq and topple Saddam Hussein is still open to debate, American mismanagement of the country after the invasion is not.”

What caused the massive collapse of common sense that doomed the CPA and undermined the US gamble in Iraq? That is the question that every page tacitly forces on the reader. American ingenuity, pragmatism and practical approaches to problem-solving are legendary. But Chandrasekaran shows that what reigned in Iraq was massive incompetence, patently unfeasible schemes, naive expectations and arrogance fueled by ignorance. His book methodically documents the baffling ineptitude that dominated US attempts to influence Iraq’s fiendish politics, rebuild the electrical grid, privatize the economy, run the oil industry, recruit expert staff or instill a modicum of normalcy to the lives of Iraqis. Nor are the book’s complaints Monday-morning quarterbacking. The CPA’s failings caused widespread grumbling at the time. Chandrasekaran tells of a message board on which some Marines had drawn a gravestone inscribed with the words “COMMON SENSE.” The caption underneath it read: “Killed by the CPA.”

But writer, blogger and Republican consultant Rich Galen, who was in Baghdad around the same time as Chandrasekaran, writes at the *Townhall.org* site that many of the portraits of CPA officials and personnel in the book are “appallingly unfair.” The obvious implication being, while coalition military personnel were in constant danger of being injured or killed by ambush or IED, the “naive neocons” of the CPA were lounging about in perfect luxurious safety, eating dates and pomegranates, sipping fine wines and taking an occasional refreshing dip in the “resort-sized swimming pool” . . .

The vast majority of CPA employees lived in trailers (two people per half, shared bathroom, running water a pleasant surprise), ate in the cafeteria (food by Kellogg, Brown & Root a subsidiary of Halliburton); worked in crowded, dusty outdated offices (even by

Saddam standards); and went out into the Red Zone of Baghdad to do their jobs each and every day.

LANCE CORPORAL RYAN ADAM
MILLER—TEXAN

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, to be a police officer or a member of the United States military is a gift, a sacrifice; and it is an honor. The uniform they wear is a commitment to protecting society, guarding the weak, giving back to the community, and fighting the forces of evil. Every day, they risk their lives, and tonight I want to talk about one of these of the rare breed.

Ryan Adam Miller from Pearland, Texas, and 19 years of age, was a third generation marine. His grandfather was a marine in the great World War II. His father Frank was a marine in Vietnam. Ryan was so committed to a future defending others, he graduated from high school early just so he could enlist into the United States Marine Corps and follow in the footsteps of Dad and Granddad, those who came before him.

While Ryan loved the Corps, his dream didn't end with service to his country. He has another wish, another sacrifice he wanted to make. He wanted to finish his military career in the Marine Corps and join another force, the very same police force both his mother and father gave decades of their lives to.

Both Ryan's parents served for years in the Houston Police Department. I know both of them because of my experience as a prosecutor and as a judge. At the last Houston Police Department cadet graduation this summer, I spoke to Ryan's mother Jeannie, who told me her son was coming back to Houston after he finished his tour of duty in Iraq to be a Houston police officer. This dream was almost a reality. Ryan even had planned to wear his mother's badge once he returned home for good.

With two parents who were dedicated law officers, Ryan knew the tough, rugged life that lay ahead. He also knew the joys that came with the job. Both his parents instilled in Ryan community pride, dedication, and passion to serve others. Ryan Adam Miller's goals, commitment, and faith are proof of that.

His mother recalls speaking to him last week when he talked of the fear that battle brings. He told her that he was praying, and God took away the fear of battle. One of Ryan's last acts was to give that peace to his parents, leaving them with the comfort that God would take care of him.

Sadly, he was just days away from returning home when, on September 14, this young marine 5 days ago was killed on patrol by an IED during combat operations against enemy forces in Al Anbar Province, Iraq.

A loss not only for his family and our country, but our community back home in Texas. In these dark days of mourning, many people are no doubt trying to muster an encouraging word to comfort his parents. But it is their fellow police officers who have the most powerful and comforting thing to say. They say to him, they say to his parents, these officers in blue, "He would have made a fine police officer."

Ryan Miller was a fine marine. He was a fine human being, and today as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, I send my best to the Miller family and give them America's support as they fight their own battle over his death.

His death was not a loss, because he gave his life over there for all of us over here. Today we honor Ryan, we honor the parents of this marine and their sacrifices. I also pause today to remember the marines who served with Ryan, and all those who volunteered to defend and protect this great country. They are the fabric of this great Nation.

While the blood of their fellow comrades is the red color in the stripes of Old Glory, these few, these proud, these marines, keep us free to see the stars, stars of liberty, freedom and justice. So Semper Fi, Lance Corporal Ryan Adam Miller, Semper Fi, and God bless these sons of America.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1945

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.)

MORE TROUBLE FOR AMERICA'S
WORKING FAMILIES

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, the latest trade report out of Washington spells more trouble for working families; most immediately for Ohio, Michigan and Indiana, and our Nation's heartland, but, in fact, for our entire Nation.

The U.S. Department of Commerce reported this week that America's trade deficit in the second quarter of this year hit its second highest level in history, rising 2.4 percent to \$218.4 billion more imports into our Nation than exports out. That is just in one quarter.

We are well on our way to another record trade deficit likely to exceed \$800 billion. At this rate, the United States might well post its first trillion-dollar trade deficit this year.

That level of trade deficit throttles real growth in our country and continues the unfortunate path of selling out America. We are not winning the global trade war, we are losing it badly. President Bush's trade policy is no more successful than his foreign policy. Since President Bush took office, we have lost 3 million more good jobs. America's trade deficit in motor vehicles alone has climbed by approximately 20 percent, and the recent announcement by Ford Motor Company of production cutbacks and plant closings will only exacerbate the situation.

Still, the administration clings to the same failed policies. The President will not even meet with the executives of the Big Three. I never thought I would see a day that the President of the United States refused to meet with the leaders of America's automakers. No industrial nation can afford to cash out its domestic automotive industry. One of five jobs here in our country are directly tied to it. But it is true. Apparently that is what this President thinks of the industry that has been the backbone of our economy.

Back in 1975, New York City was in dire fiscal straits, and Gerald Ford refused to help. The New York Daily News ran a famous headline: "Ford to City: Drop Dead." Maybe it is just a matter of time before we see a similar headline about George W. Bush and his lack of concern about the U.S. automotive industry.

The same Commerce Department report showed other statistics which showed the deterioration in our Nation's financial picture. Foreign-owned assets in the United States increased by \$366 billion more during the second quarter. U.S. liabilities to foreigners reported to U.S. banks increased by \$84.2 billion more in the second quarter following an increase of \$148.9 billion in the first quarter.

Who owns the assets of our Nation? Increasingly, foreign interests own our assets, and we owe them money. No wonder people think our country is headed in the wrong direction. It is.

Increasingly, Americans don't own America. Transactions in U.S. Treasury securities shifted to net foreign purchases of \$10.1 billion in the second quarter, almost double the rate in the first quarter. I don't like the fact that foreign interests are buying our country. Indeed, I detest what is happening as un-American and unpatriotic. But foreign official assets in the United States increased \$74.9 billion in the second quarter following an increase of \$75.7 billion in the first quarter. It came as no surprise as a result that our dollar depreciated an additional 3 percent.

What the trade deficit means in real-life terms is that money, usually U.S. currency, is leaving American hands and ending up in the hands of foreign competitors, from the United States to Saudi Arabia and other major oil producers; from the United States to China, now the second largest holder of

U.S. dollar assets; from the United States to Japan, Korea and other major automobile and truck makers who keep their markets closed. So we are left with padlocked factories, a shrinking middle class, diminishing tax bases and all the problems that accompany a shortage of good jobs.

What a shame. What a shame that Washington is so out of touch with the real America. People are rapidly losing hope and trust. They believe their government has been captured by special interests and no longer cares about them, and they are right.

When they see these statistics about what is happening to our country, it is no wonder people are beginning to despair. So our people vote less, they become more cynical, and they conclude their government no longer stands up for them or indeed belongs to them. That, my friends, is a recipe for a rising political radicalism across our Nation. I cannot predict when it will happen, but it will happen.

SUPPORT OF U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS

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. Madam Speaker, the men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol are often exposed to high-risk situations and dangerous environments while working on our southern border. Often working alone in remote areas and rugged landscapes, U.S. Border Patrol agents routinely encounter heavily armed human drug traffickers. Despite these dangerous conditions, the men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol work tirelessly to protect our Nation's borders, and they deserve the utmost praise for their dedication and bravery.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, two U.S. Border Patrol agents who deserve our appreciation have instead become victims of a grave injustice. Agents Ramos and Compean were found guilty in a Federal court for wounding a drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our southern borders into Texas. The agents now face up to 20 years in Federal prison.

Agent Ramos served the Border Patrol for 9 years and was a former nominee for Border Patrol Agent of the Year. Agent Compean had 5 years of experience as a Border Patrol agent. These agents never should have been prosecuted for their actions last year.

By attempting to apprehend a Mexican drug smuggler, these agents were simply doing their job to protect the American people. These agents should have been commended for their actions. But instead, the U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted full immunity to the drug smuggler. Granted full immunity to the drug smuggler for his testimony against our agents.

The drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas, was per-

mitted to return to Mexico, and is now suing the Border Patrol for \$5 million for violating his civil rights. I want to repeat that, Madam Speaker. The drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas, was permitted to return to Mexico, and is now suing the Border Patrol for \$5 million for violating his civil rights. He is not even an American citizen. He is a criminal.

Madam Speaker, I have spoken to numerous people inside Texas and outside of Texas regarding this outrage, including the attorney for one of these agents. I have written to the President of the United States asking him to please look into this matter. I have written two letters to Attorney General Gonzales asking him to reopen this case for a fuller investigation before these men are sentenced in October.

I hope that the American people will agree that this prosecution is an outrageous injustice and that the situation must be investigated.

Madam Speaker, I am going to close in 1 second, but I will tell you I have had the opportunity to talk to these gentlemen, and I will tell you they are fine Hispanic Americans. They are citizens of this great Nation, and they love America. They, like their fellow Border Patrol agents, have a very difficult and tough job, and I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will ask the same question that I am asking: Why and how is it that these Border Patrol agents were doing their job to apprehend a drug smuggler, and yet they are the ones who have been prosecuted, and on October 18 they will be sentenced?

I think this is an injustice, and we are asking for an investigation. I know that Congresswoman Sheila Jackson-Lee has joined us in this effort. I hope that we will look into this because these men and women who serve us on the border deserve our protection. I thank those who serve. God bless America.

STOP THE GENOCIDE IN DARFUR

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. Madam Speaker, after more than 3 violent years, the genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan is getting worse. As Jan Egeland, Undersecretary General for Humanitarian Affairs at the U.N., has said, the coming weeks could see "a man-made catastrophe of an unprecedented scale."

At the end of this month, African Union forces are set to leave Darfur. Currently the only peacekeeping forces in Darfur, the departure of these troops will only embolden the Sudanese Government and the allied Janjaweed militias to continue to murder and displace Sudanese citizens.

As my colleagues know, the crisis in Darfur began in February 2003 when two rebel groups emerged to challenge

the National Islamic Front government in Darfur. Since then, over 400,000 people have died, and nearly 2.5 million have been displaced from their homes. Sadly, it took the United States until July 2004 to recognize that these events in Darfur constituted genocide, and we cannot continue this type of inaction. Far too many times we have seen the horrible consequences of ignoring genocide or failing to get involved quickly.

Madam Speaker, I was pleased to hear that President Bush has finally appointed Andrew Natsios as the special envoy to Sudan. I joined 88 of my colleagues in cosponsoring a resolution calling for the President to appoint such an envoy to demonstrate the United States' commitment to resolving the crisis. This special envoy to Sudan will ensure continuous high-level U.S. engagement in Darfur, and will work to deter a further escalation of violence and humanitarian disaster in the region.

But there is much more, however, that the administration should do to work towards a lasting peace in Darfur. As the most prominent democracy in the world, the U.S. must step forward and take a leadership role in stopping this genocide. Resolving this conflict and ending the violence should be a high priority for this Congress and for the Bush administration.

The United States must pressure Sudanese allies, particularly those in the Arab League, to ensure that the Sudanese Government agrees to U.N. Security Council Resolution 1706. This resolution calls for 22,500 U.N. troops and police officers to be sent into Darfur to bolster the peacekeeping mission.

So far Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir has rejected the U.S. Security Council Resolution 1706 and thus rejected calls for U.N. peacekeeping troops to enter Darfur. But if the African Union peacekeepers leave at the end of September, and al-Bashir is successful in keeping U.N. forces out of the region, the situation in Darfur will spiral into a worsening tragedy.

The United States cannot in good conscience stand idly by as the horrors in Darfur approach 1 million deaths and 3 million displaced. Families are being destroyed, and people are being murdered. The U.S. and the U.N. have a moral obligation to stop this genocide so we can avoid the failures of Bosnia and Rwanda. Have we not learned anything from those mistakes?

The U.S. must work with NATO to impose a no-fly zone over Darfur to ensure military offensives and bombings are brought to an end. The Sudanese Government is escalating an air war by turning Soviet-era Antonov planes into makeshift bombers and using helicopter gunships against mud and thatch huts inhabited by many Sudanese people. We cannot allow these killings to continue, and establishing a no-fly zone will take a step in the right direction to lessen the violence in Darfur.

Madam Speaker, the Sudanese Government has improperly imprisoned

American reporters and killed aid workers to try to eliminate any international presence in the country. This kind of aggression must come to an end. If the international troops are forced out of Sudan, the country will spiral further into a land of violence and brutality.

Finally, the U.S. has a moral obligation to take all possible steps to end the humanitarian crisis in the Darfur region of Sudan. We have seen over and over what can happen if the international community does not intercede when people are being systematically murdered and displaced from their homes.

With the African Union forces planning to depart at the end of the month and the Sudanese Government rejecting U.N. peacekeeping forces, the time for full-scale international involvement is now.

□ 2000

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

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

EARLINE HEATH KING

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am happy to rise today to honor Mrs. Earline Heath King of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for her exemplary artistic career.

Mrs. King is an internationally recognized sculptor whose work decorates private residences and public places around the world. I am honored to recognize a remarkable woman who at all stages of her life has boldly sought to inspire young minds, adorn public spaces, and share her talents so beautifully with others. At a time when many of us worry about regrets regarding a life foregone, Mrs. King discovered a means to express her creativity that continues to inspire both young and old today.

Born in 1913 in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, Mrs. King did not begin her sculpting career until she was 50 years old. However, while growing up, she discovered an early interest in the arts. She recalls drawing advertisements for her father, a local barber, by drawing ladies with the latest hairstyles. In addition, she found artistic inspiration in her mother's own handiwork of embroidery, knitting, and tatting.

However, Mrs. King's first serious interest in the arts began during her studies at R.J. Reynolds High School in Winston-Salem. After her initial evaluation, she was advised to major in

art and music along with her academic curriculum. During this time, Mrs. King learned the basics of art by working in pen and ink, pastels, watercolor, and oils. While in these classes, Mrs. King met her high school sweetheart, Joe King. She recalls that he always came in first in the annual art contest and she usually came in second. Before the conclusion of their senior year, they were married.

Mrs. King was awarded a scholarship in music to Greensboro College the following year, while Joe finished school and worked at the Carolina Theater. The following year they traveled to Washington, D.C. to visit family and tour art museums. Mrs. King was so enthralled with the art opportunities that she applied at a top photography studio for a job as a colorist while she was there. That same day she was offered a job; so the couple quickly packed their belongings and headed for their new home in Washington.

While Mr. KING worked as a commercial artist, Mrs. King sewed and used needlepoint to create hats for friends and family in her little free time. Her hats were noticed by a local milliner, and he suggested that she travel to New York and study with a top milliner. Mrs. King was accepted at the Dache millinery and worked as a copier from nine to six. Each day she was given a hat and a bag filled with materials and required to "copy" the original. She later became a fitter, fitting hats on celebrities such as Greta Garbo, Mary Pickford, and Loretta Young.

During the summer of 1946, Mr. and Mrs. King returned to Winston-Salem. There Mr. KING set up his first professional studio in the old blacksmith's shop of Reynolda Plantation with the help of John Whitaker, the president of Reynolds Tobacco Company. Within a month Mr. and Mrs. King opened a studio that would remain open for the next 50 years.

It was in the latter stages of these years that Mrs. King first grew interested in sculpture. In the mid-1960s, Mrs. King began her studies with Gardner Gidley of Winston-Salem. When first approached by a friend who asked her to attend the sculpture course, Earline hesitantly replied, thanks but no thanks, believing that she had neither the time nor the talent to take the course. According to Earline, when the opportunity presented itself, she went kicking and screaming, but she went. Her studies continued with Bruno Luchesi of New York; followed by Livia Papini of Florence, Italy; and, finally, George Lundeen of Scottsdale, Arizona.

In 1979 she unveiled her first public work, a bronze equestrian monument of Richard Joshua Reynolds, founder of R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company. She has since completed more than 300 portrait commissions including portraits of Governor James B. Hunt, Jr.; Sir Winston Churchill at the Worrell House in London, England; Dr. Armand

Hammer of the Salk Institute in La Jolla, California; and Dr. Camillo Artom of Casa Artom in Venice, Italy.

Her public commissions include: the AirCare memorial for Bowman Gray School of Medicine in Winston-Salem; pieces for the Denver Center for the Performing Arts in Denver, Colorado, Winthrop College in Rock Hill, South Carolina; and works for The Gallery for the Blind at the North Carolina Museum of Art in Raleigh.

Earline's contributions to the art world expand beyond her own commissioned work. Along with five other painters and sculptors, she opened a gallery over 30 years ago in Winston-Salem called Art Gallery Originals. At their gallery in Reynolda Village, Earline still provides a workshop once a year where emerging artists and novice artists can exhibit their creations. In 1993 Earline was honored with a show in the Luigi Bellini Gallery in Florence, Italy, highlighting the extensive works of her career. She was the very first woman sculptor to be exhibited by the gallery. The show was a tremendous success and was attended by both fellow Americans living in Italy and by the diplomatic community.

Her passion for the arts is evident as much today as ever. Mrs. King is now in her 42nd year of sculpture creation, and her artistic fervor and creativity amazes me. The fact that at 50 years of age Mrs. King discovered sculpture and made it her life is truly an inspiration.

Most recently, Mrs. King sculpted the late President Ronald Reagan for the opening of a new Winston-Salem high school named after the President. She continues to work in a variety of media such as terra cotta, polycast, cold cast bronze, and lost wax bronze casting. Each year Mrs. King introduces hundreds of young minds to the inspiring world of creativity through the tutelage of yearly workshops in different communities of North Carolina. Earline's artworks continues to find homes in galleries, public buildings, and private residences of prominent collectors throughout the United States and Europe. Her artwork can be viewed in Midtown, Trotman, and ERL galleries in Winston-Salem; the Tyler White Art Gallery in Greensboro; and Curzon Gallery in Boca Raton, Florida.

Mrs. King's artistic career is one of tremendous inspiration and talent. Her career is marked by a true love for the arts and for creation. I believe that there are few people in life who truly find a passion that keeps them inspired and creating. I believe that Earline Heath King has truly discovered that passion in her life through her art, and I applaud her for the beauty that she has given us all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REICHERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PEACE

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, this Thursday, September 21, is the International Day of Peace, as established by the United Nations a quarter century ago. To recognize it, a coalition of peace and religious organizations are mobilizing thousands upon thousands of people around the country in a week's worth of marches, vigils, and rallies. Their goal: an end to the Iraq occupation and the safe return of our troops back home to the United States.

I have signed their Declaration of Peace Congressional Pledge, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do the same. In addition to troop withdrawal, the pledge calls for important post-occupation steps that I and many of my colleagues have been pushing for some time now: among other things, no permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq; a reconciliation process led by the Iraqis which may include an international peacekeeping presence; Iraqi control over its internal affairs and its rich oil supply; increased support for veterans of the Iraq conflict; the establishment of a peace dividend with the money being spent on occupying Iraq being re-invested in our people so they will have more jobs, stronger schools, better housing, and more efficient and affordable health care.

So how is the Bush administration celebrating International Peace Day? By promising us a semipermanent state of war, an open-ended occupation of Iraq. General Abizaid said today that we will maintain our current troop levels for at least the next 9 months. There you have it. The ultimate expression of "stay the course." So much for last year's predictions by General Casey and others that there would be a significant drawdown in the year 2006.

Keeping 147,000 American soldiers as occupation forces in Iraq through the middle of next year and beyond, what will that mean? It will mean more American casualties. It will mean billions more of the people's dollars sunk in a failed policy. It will mean Iraq will become an even more fertile terrorist training ground. It will mean more violence and venom directed toward Americans by radical jihadists. It will mean that the sectarian strife, the civil war in Iraq will continue unabated.

If that is not bad enough, there is convincing evidence that our finger is on the trigger when it comes to launching a strike against Iran. Retired Air Force Colonel Sam Gardner, who has taught at the Army's National War College, said on CNN yesterday that "we are conducting military operations inside Iran right now. The evidence is overwhelming."

Mr. Speaker, there has to be a better way to manage global conflict. Actually, as he so often did, Martin Luther King, Jr. put it best. He said: "The ultimate weakness of violence is that it is a descending spiral, begetting the very thing it seeks to destroy. Instead of diminishing evil, it multiplies it. Through violence you may murder the liar, but you cannot murder the lie nor establish the truth. Through violence you may murder the hater, but you do not murder hate. Returning violence for violence multiplies violence, adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars."

He continued: "The chain reaction . . . hate begetting hate, wars producing more wars, must be broken or we shall be plunged into a dark a business."

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to go beyond ending the occupation of Iraq to an entirely new national security paradigm, one that emphasizes diplomacy, multilateralism, strong intelligence, containment strategies, weapons inspections, real democracy building, and humanitarian aid. But we must avoid war, rather than making it our default national security strategy.

On this year's International Day of Peace, Mr. Speaker, let us rededicate ourselves to protect the country we love, not by relying on our basest impulses, but on the most honorable and humane of American values.

H.R. 5555, TRAUMA BILL

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to take a little time and speak about the state of our trauma system here in the United States.

I recently introduced a bill, H.R. 5555, the Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act of 2006. H.R. 5555 would provide grants to State trauma systems to improve the coordination of emergency departments and bolster the safety net from point of injury, transportation, to triage and treatment.

Mr. Speaker, traumatic injury is the leading cause of death in the United States for people under the age of 45. It is the third leading cause of death in the general American population, and each day more than 170,000 men, women, and children are injured severely enough to seek medical care. About 400 of these people will die and another 200 will sustain long-term disability as a result of their injuries. The total cost of traumatic injury in the United States is largely due to motor vehicle trauma, an estimated cost of \$260 billion.

Experts estimate that many injury-related deaths could be prevented if a minimum standard of trauma care were available to all Americans. Many areas in the United States do not have appropriate emergency medical services. Several areas report large gaps in

transportation coverage and lack of access to emergency nurses and doctors.

To illustrate this point, I have a map that shows the areas of the country where residents can reach a trauma center within 60 minutes by flying or driving. This map was created by the Trauma Resource Allocation Model for Ambulances and Hospitals, which is a computer model designed to aid State and regional planners in their decisions to locate or relocate designated trauma centers and helicopter pads. It is designed to help maximize access to life-saving trauma care for our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the blue areas are within 1-hour driving distance; the pink areas are within 1-hour flying distance. The 1-hour time limit is not arbitrary. In emergency medicine, the first hour after injury is referred to as the golden hour. Patients treated within this timespan are more likely to recover or have less long-term effects of their injury. The longer a person waits for treatment, the worse the outcome is likely to be.

Mr. Speaker, I represent an area of north Texas around the Dallas Fort Worth Metroplex, and if you drive from Dallas to Los Angeles, you travel about half of that distance in Texas.

□ 2015

Well, that distance in Texas from the Dallas-Ft. Worth area to El Paso is a 10-hour trip. And you can easily make that trip and be outside the range of trauma service almost the entire time. That is a long drive with the potential for an accident throughout.

In fact, it would be possible to drive from Mexico to Canada and always be more than an hour away from a trauma center. Members might find that parts of their districts fall outside the 1-hour marker.

The Institute of Medicine recently put out a report in June of this year titled *The Future of Emergency Care*. They found four things. First, many emergency rooms and trauma centers are overcrowded. Demand is growing; supply is dwindling. Ambulances are often diverted from crowded hospitals to others that may be farther away, delaying treatment time and providing less optimal care. Patients end up boarded in the emergency room while they wait for a hospital room.

Secondly, emergency care is highly fragmented. Cities and regions are often served by multiple 9/11 call centers. Emergency medical services agencies do not coordinate with their emergency rooms and trauma centers. And some emergency rooms are overcrowded, while others remain nearly empty.

There is not effective communication between public safety agencies and public health departments. They often use different radio frequencies and have different emergency plans. Interoperability, which was a big issue during Katrina, is still an ongoing concern.

There is no nationwide standard for training and certification of emergency medical personnel, and Federal responsibility for oversight is scattered across multiple Federal agencies.

Thirdly, critical specialists are often unavailable to provide emergency trauma care. Three-quarters of hospitals report difficulty finding specialists to take emergency and trauma calls. Key specialties are in short supply. Specialists often treat emergency room patients without compensation. And there is extremely high medical liability.

Fourthly, the emergency system is ill-prepared to handle a major disaster. There is little surge capacity. The emergency medical services received only 4 percent of Department of Homeland Security first responder funding in 2002 and 2003. Emergency medical technicians in nonfire-based services have less than 1 hour of training in disaster response, and hospital and EMS personnel lack protective equipment to effectively respond to chemical, biological or nuclear threats.

In response to these four deficiencies, the Institute of Medicine made the following recommendations. One, create a coordinated, regionalized and accountable system. Two, create a lead agency. Three, end emergency department boarding and diversion. Fourthly, increase funding for emergency care. Fifthly, enhance emergency care research. And finally, promote the EMS workforce standards.

I have sought with the bill, H.R. 5555, the Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act, to address this issue. A coordinated and thoughtful plan must be applied to improve our trauma care system in this country.

Anyone or their family member could need trauma care in the blink of an eye. Wouldn't we all want to know that we are receiving the very best trauma care available quickly and efficiently?

□ 2015

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

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

DEMOCRATS AND THE BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Permission to speak out of turn, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of being the first of a series of Democratic speakers tonight about the budget. And my colleagues will talk in some detail about the deficit and the debt and its consequence on the country.

But, if I can, I want to begin with a memory of a 10-year-old child growing

up in Montgomery, Alabama. I remember being 10 years old and listening to a very conservative radio commentator talking about the liberal government in Washington, D.C., spending too much money.

I remember hearing this very skilled radio commentator talk about the fact that amazingly the Government of the United States of America was running a \$36 billion deficit, and that it might rise to \$100 billion the next year.

And I remember hearing that very conservative radio commentator say: If we do not get our hands on our budget, if we do not figure out a way to restore fiscal discipline, there was no way that we can have a strong and solvent economy.

Well, that radio commentator was named Ronald Reagan. He would be elected to the Presidency 2 years later; would forget a lot of what he said. He ended up running up massive deficits during his own time in office.

I begin with that observation, Mr. Speaker, because for the next, what is it, 51 days between now and November 7, we will hear a lot of talk about which party can be trusted to better manage the money of the American people. We will hear a lot of talk in this 51 days about the danger of Democrats being fiscally reckless and irresponsible, and we will be told that all we will do is we will tax people too much, and we will spend too much.

And I looked in the paper today, Mr. Speaker. The President's approval ratings are rising, we are told, and they are rising for one reason. He has gone from a 70 percent approval rating among Republicans to 86 percent.

And when I read the various political reports that we are regularly favored with in this city, I read the Republican's strategy on November 7 hinges on one factor: bringing home the base. Bringing home those Republicans in Tennessee and Missouri and Ohio who drifted away, getting them to come back and to believe again.

So I want to direct my remarks, if I can, at the Republican base for a minute. I am not a member of it. We have got a lot of conservatives in Alabama, and I think I can speak to them. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, I want them to know a few basic facts.

I want them to know that fiscal conservatism has changed its meaning in this city, and the government in which they put their votes and in which they put so much faith is now running up these massive deficits, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors went before a group of Republican-leaning businessmen last week and said, you know what, it doesn't even matter. Deficits are just things that the statisticians worry about.

I want all of the conservative people who are listening tonight, again, many of whom are in my great State of Alabama, to know that, well, you may be a conservative, I bet you care about the security of your border. One of the

reasons we cannot put enough money around enforcing border security is because of these debts and deficits your government is running up.

To all of the conservatives who are listening tonight, you may be a conservative, but I will bet you would love to see the veterans of this country given adequate health care. Well, the government that you value so much, the government to which you have given your votes the last several cycles cannot do it because they cannot afford it.

We had a debate on this floor, Mr. Speaker, just 1 year ago, September of 2005. The subject was whether we were going to provide full funding for health care for Guards and reservists. And our esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle rose in the Chamber and said, we just cannot afford it; it has got to be health care for veterans and reservists, or it has got to be helicopters. We cannot afford to do both. In part, that is because of the debt and the deficits that we have.

I want to say finally to these conservatives, Mr. Speaker, before you go back home so easily, before you go back to your base, understand what your party has become, a conservative party that says the debt does not matter, a conservative party that says that red ink is not important, and a conservative party that cannot find enough money to secure the border or provide benefits for veterans. It is enough to prevent you from going home. It is enough to make you look at an alternative.

Now, my colleagues will talk tonight, Mr. Speaker, about a lot of other lost opportunities. They will talk about the fact that if we could get our fiscal house in order, we could do all kinds of things that we thought we could do just a short time ago. You remember the debates, Mr. Speaker, when there was a \$236 billion surplus. Republicans had ideas on what they could do. They talked about middle-class tax cuts instead of upper-end tax cuts. People on my side of the aisle talked about a refurbished commitment to veterans and the health care and education. We cannot debate any of those things right now because of this debt and these deficits.

So I end with that point. The conservatism that is on the ballot on November 7 is a conservatism of missed opportunities. It is a conservatism that has totally changed the notion of what it means to be fiscally responsible. It is a conservatism that is fading and failing for a reason.

I think a lot of people will come home on November 7, Mr. Speaker, but it will not be to a party that used to call itself conservative, it will be to common sense, it will be to a notion of reasonable sacrifice in this country, of shared sacrifice. And that is why I think the ranks will change so much on November 7.

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.)

WHAT THE CONSTITUTION SAYS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we paused to recognize Constitution Day. I thought it would be appropriate this evening if we spent a few moments looking at the Constitution.

But in order to really understand the milieu in which the Constitution was created, I think we need to go back 11 years before the Constitution was ratified to the Declaration of Independence. In there we read these words: We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal.

Mr. Speaker, we mouth those words today, and then we move on to the next clause, and they mean so little to us compared to what they meant to our Founding Fathers. You see, most of our Founding Fathers came from countries in the British Isles and in Europe that were ruled by a king or an emperor who claimed, and incredibly was granted, divine rights. What that says is that the rights came from God to the king or the emperor, and he would give what rights he wished to the people.

And we made a stark departure from that. Fourscore and 7 years later, Abraham Lincoln was to note that this new experiment might not work. He said in his Gettysburg Address that: We are now engaged in a great war testing whether this Nation or any Nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It took 11 years for the promise of the Declaration of Independence to be fulfilled in the Constitution that was ratified in 1787. The ink was hardly dry on the Constitution before our Founding Fathers wondered if it really was clear that they meant to have a very limited Federal Government with essentially all of the rights belonging to the people.

And so they wrote 12 amendments; 10 of them made it through that process of two-thirds of the House, two-thirds of the Senate, and three-fourths of the State legislatures, and we know them as the Bill of Rights. I think we all too seldom review these Bill of Rights.

The first eight deal with pretty specific rights that the people have, like

the right to worship as they please, and to speak freely, in the first amendment; the right to keep and bear arms, much misunderstood in the second amendment. And then third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eight all deal with specific rights of the people. And then the ninth amendment, seldom referred to, but they wanted to make sure that having enumerated certain rights as belonging to the people, that the reader of the Constitution and these amendments understood that essentially all of the rights belonged to the people.

Notice what they said in the ninth amendment. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people. In other words, just because we did not mention a right in the Constitution or these amendments as belonging to the people, that is where essentially all of the rights belong. So do not disparage these rights to people. They do belong to the people.

And then the most violated amendment in the Constitution, the 10th amendment. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

What this really says in plain everyday English, without the old English and the legalese, is if you cannot find it Article I, section 8, you cannot do it.

Now, we are doing a great many things in this Congress that neither I nor anyone else can find a sound basis for in the Constitution, and this is pretty widely recognized. As evidence of that, I have, and I think this was a joke from Jay Leno, that is one of the places that it was heard. "They keep talking about drafting a Constitution for Iraq. Why don't we just give them ours? It was written by a lot of really smart guys, it has worked for over 200 years, and we are not using it any more."

Mr. Speaker, this general recognition on the part of the citizenry that we are now largely ignoring the Constitution ought to cause us to rethink what we are doing.

I am not saying that the things that we are doing are not things that we ought to be doing. What I am saying is we ought not be ignoring the Constitution. This, I believe, starts us down a very slippery slope. If I can argue it is okay to do these things, like philanthropy, and, by the way, do a Google search for Davy Crockett and farmer, and you will get a great discussion of philanthropy, health care and education, I am not arguing that these are not things that the Federal Government might ought to be doing. I am simply arguing that if we are going to do them, we need to have amended the Constitution, because I am very concerned that if we can ignore the Constitution now, that we can ignore it in the future for some very important civil liberty that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that the general malaise on our part in referring to the specifics of the Constitution will serve us no good purpose in the future, and I think that we need to look at every law that we pass to make sure there is a firm basis in the Constitution.

This is a wonderful document. We have one person in 22. We have a fourth of all the good things in the world. I think it is because of the milieu that was established by this Constitution, the civil rights. No other constitution, no other bill of rights provides such civil liberties. To remain who we are, I think that we need to stick by our Constitution.

□ 2030

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

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

DEMOCRATS ARE PREPARED TO LEAD THE COUNTRY IN A NEW DIRECTION

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the budgets crafted by the Bush administration and the Republican majority do not address our national short-term or long-term objectives or the values of our Nation. It is time for a new direction.

To meet our Nation's goals of economic security for our families and security for our homeland, Democrats have offered a plan.

Democrats believe in paying down the debt and maintaining fiscal restraint and discipline.

Democrats believe in real investment in life-long education which enables every American to reach their potential and strengthens the long-term financial security of our families and our Nation.

Democrats believe in budgets that invest in our armed services to defend our homeland and to protect the men and women who defend us. Democrats believe in tax fairness and tax cuts for the middle class. We believe in helping Americans pay for college, buy their first home, find affordable health insurance, and save for retirement. We understand the priorities of everyday Americans.

The Republican budgets of the last 5 years have failed to meet each of these objectives. At a time when American families are facing stagnant wages and ever-increasing bills for child care, for health care, for college tuition and for

gas at the pump, the Republican Congress has failed to address these day-to-day concerns. Instead, they have enacted tax cuts for the very wealthy. My constituents want Congress to address their needs, not the wants and desires of a select few. It is clear which side the majority has chosen.

Instead of budgeting fairly, the Republicans have relied on smoke-and-mirror, borrow-and-spend gimmicks. They don't include the war in Iraq and the military activities in Afghanistan in their budget, they don't include the massive costs of repealing the estate tax for estates valued at \$10 million or more, and they don't include the full cost of the Medicare part D prescription drug benefit. Despite these efforts to keep costs hidden, their budget schemes create new deficits every year and have added nearly \$3.5 trillion to our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, American families deserve better and they deserve a new direction. Instead of making smart investments in America's future, the Republican budgets have run up massive deficits each year and have added to our national debt, so that as of now our national debt is nearly \$8.5 trillion. This means that we spend more on interest payments on our debt than the combined Federal investments in education, homeland security, and veterans health care combined. The Nation's debt is unsustainable and it is immoral.

Mr. Speaker, American families deserve better. They deserve a new direction.

Mr. Speaker, the budget policies of the Bush administration and this Republican Congress leave our Nation less secure. Their schemes rely on borrowing more and more money from foreign investors. More money, mind you, than the amount borrowed by all past American Presidents combined.

And instead of enhancing our safety at home and bolstering our security abroad, the Republican Congress continues to underfund important security initiatives at our ports, chemical plants and along our borders, this at the same time they are failing to enact many of the 9/11 Commission's recommendations, including enabling our police and firefighters to communicate seamlessly.

Mr. Speaker, American families expect the government to make the necessary investments to keep them safe, and they believe that the American Dream should be available to everyone, not a select few. They deserve a new direction.

Democrats understand that unless we change course, the harmful effects of the Republicans' borrow-and-spend budget policies will only continue.

Democrats have a plan that makes tough, fiscally disciplined choices, to restore our budget to balance and to meet our obligations to American families; Democrats have a plan that fulfills the basic budgetary principles of living within our means; and Demo-

crats have a plan to reduce wasteful spending and make smart investments in all Americans that will ensure the Nation's current and future fiscal well-being and protect the safety, security and freedoms that make our Nation great.

Mr. Speaker, Americans work hard every day. My constituents work hard every day to meet their obligations to their families, to their communities and to their Nation. We must honor their commitment, and we should not and cannot walk away from our obligations to them.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are committed to fiscal responsibility, the Democrats are committed to the future of our Nation, and the Democrats are prepared to lead the Nation in a new direction.

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

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

SUPPORT THE FEDERAL ELECTION INTEGRITY ACT

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Permission to speak out of turn.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take up the Federal Election Integrity Act. The Federal Election Integrity Act will ensure American elections of Americans, for Americans, and by Americans. This measure promotes fairness and simply assures compliance with U.S. law. All citizens in this country hold a stake in our electoral system, and we owe it to our constituents to crack down on voter fraud.

For these reasons, I have long supported photo ID requirements for voters in Georgia. In fact, Georgia enacted into law such a requirement in the past year. Nearly all voters already have a government-issued photo ID, such as a driver's license or a passport.

Georgia made photo IDs available to all citizens and offered them for free to those who could not afford the nominal fee. With these safeguards in place, it makes no sense to argue that photo ID requirements disenfranchise certain segments of our population.

Photo ID requirements actually protect the sanctity of every legal vote. The greatest threat to the constitutional right to vote is voter fraud. A legal voter whose ballot is canceled out by the ballot of an illegal voter has effectively been disenfranchised. We seek not to suppress the vote to promote the sanctity of the vote.

The Federal Election Integrity Act will require in the 2008 election that voters show a photo ID. In 2010 it will

require that voters show a photo ID that could not be obtained without proof of citizenship. I have supported such efforts in the past, and I will support this bill.

Though I have acted consistently throughout my career in public service to promote fair and accurate election, I fear the House debate will be rife with irony. You see, just 2 months ago, this House voted by a lopsided margin to trample the equal protection clause of the Constitution and to violate the sovereignty of the State of Georgia by extending the Voting Rights Act for 25 years.

I joined several of my colleagues from Georgia on this floor to educate Members of the House on our State's tremendous progress on voter equity. We presented hard evidence that the Georgia of 2006 is far removed from the Georgia of 1964. We proved that Georgia is no different than any other State when it comes to voter equality.

After I defended the honor and integrity of my State, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee slurred my State's record. He entered into the RECORD a statement that said: "The record since 1982 makes clear that Georgia and its political subdivisions have not progressed beyond the need for the temporary provisions of the Voting Rights Act." As evidence of ongoing problems in Georgia, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and others cited Georgia's photo identification law.

Now, the nearly 400 Members who voted to penalize Georgia should reflect on that vote. They need to ask themselves what changed between July and September of this year. Why was it bad in July to have a photo ID requirement for my home State of Georgia, but okay in September to have a photo ID requirement nationwide?

Make no mistake, I will be voting for the Federal Election Integrity Act. I only wish it went further, to make all sections of the Voting Rights Act applicable to all States and to make all ballots be in English only.

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

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

SUPPORTING A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking the gentleman from Alabama for organizing this series of 5-minute statements and for his leadership on this issue.

Two weeks short of the end of the fiscal year of 2006 and with no budget in

place for fiscal 2007, I commend my distinguished Democratic colleagues on the Budget Committee for taking this time to call America's attention to the fiscal challenges resulting from the Republicans' misguided policies and the wrong choices they have made for our economy. Misplaced spending priorities and bad decisions have consequences. They are leading us further down the path to fiscal ruin and expanding the wedge between middle-class families and the superwealthy.

I am proud to join my colleagues to highlight the hypocrisy of the over-riding Republican economic philosophy that extending dividends, capital gains and other tax cuts for millionaires and corporations create a rising tide that lifts all boats.

Five years after the President's \$1.5 trillion tax cut, our national debt now approaches \$10 trillion. If our tax cuts performed as promised by those across the aisle, an exploding economy would have wiped out this debt.

We have already proven that more needs to be done than just hope that sooner or later tax cuts will reach Americans who need help the most. But those who do need help must get in line and hope that the benefits of tax cuts for millionaires and corporations will ultimately trickle down to them.

Perhaps the expanding gulf between the haves and the almost-haves is best illustrated by the fact that wages and salaries now make up the lowest share of gross domestic product since the government began keeping records on that in 1947, while corporate profits continue to break all-time records. Meanwhile, the buying power of the minimum wage has sunk to its lowest level in 50 years.

What is missing are policies that ensure that the benefits of higher corporate earnings, productivity and globalization are widely shared, such as real government support for higher education, a progressive Tax Code and affordable health care.

When choices are made at the expense of our safety net, choices that benefit the top 1 percent who will never struggle to pay a mortgage, never struggle to keep up with gas prices, never struggle to put their children through school, it is clear that a new direction for our economy is long overdue.

How can the Republicans argue that this economy is bound in the right direction when our Nation is saddled with record-breaking deficits over 4 consecutive years, combined with deep and painful cuts to hospitals, to schools, and to security? At least the Republicans' budget outlook since 2001 has been consistent. Americans could bank on the American budgets to slash funding for proven homeland security programs, veterans benefits, education and health care priorities, all the while cutting taxes for millionaires who need the break the least.

As real-life indicators of poor Federal spending choices, such as stagnant

wages, soaring crime rates and rising health care premiums and drug prices begin to take their toll on Americans, it is our responsibility to react. Instead, inaction reigns under the direction of the current leadership.

In some cases, this inaction has yielded to half-hearted solutions, such as an energy bill that does more for oil and gas companies than lower gas prices, a Medicare bill that does more for drug companies and HMOs than make life-saving drugs affordable, a pension bill that takes it easy on corporate boards while ignoring the decline of traditional defined benefit plans.

Eleven days away from the start of the fiscal year, the record of this Republican Congress on the economy shows that we have not completed a budget or a single appropriations bill.

Fiscal irresponsibility has reached unprecedented new lows, depending on how you look at it. The debt limit has been raised for the fifth time in as many years to almost \$10 trillion.

Perhaps we shouldn't be worried. After all, the President's budget director said last month that \$200 billion annual deficits are sustainable indefinitely. Apparently normal budget rules don't apply to this administration.

But they do apply to a middle-class family of four living on Long Island whose monthly cost-of-living expenses, due mostly to rising gas prices and health care costs, are rapidly exceeding wage increases. Perhaps their creditors and collection agents will understand that outstanding debts owed by families sinking deeper into red ink are sustainable indefinitely.

We can fix this mess. We have the blueprint; a new direction for America. And we only need to look to past and proven methods, like the pay-as-you-go budget rules that were enforced in the previous administration and produced surpluses that helped us start buying down our national debt.

Indeed, we Democrats resolve to restore what should be the goals of our Federal budget, to reflect the priority of our Nation, to build a strong economy, and to set policies that reflect the values and priorities of the mainstream of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with all of my colleagues who recognize that it is long past time to reverse course on this economy and support a new direction for America.

□ 2045

BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REICHERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to join my Democratic colleagues to call for a new direction in our Federal budget priorities. I want to thank my friend ARTUR DAVIS from the

Budget Committee and the Democratic committee staff for arranging this series of speeches on this very important subject.

The Federal budget is much more than a boring government document or irrelevant policy paper. The Federal budget is our Nation's mission statement. The budget is our collective expression of our national priorities, and it reflects the values of our national leadership. Unfortunately, the values of the current national leadership, as reflected in the Federal budget, are a sorry state of affairs.

I am very proud that during my first term in this United States House, Congress and the President joined together to move toward balancing the Federal budget for the first time in decades. Democrats and Republicans reached across the partisan aisle and worked together to balance the books for the first time in over a generation.

The surpluses generated from the balanced budget were used to pay down the national debt, strengthen the Social Security Trust Fund and to make key investments in essential services like education and health. And we had enough left over to fund cutting-edge research and development that is the gateway to America's economic future and quality of life.

Unfortunately, all of that progress was reversed when the current administration took office. The current administration and the Republican Party bosses here in Congress have passed incredibly irresponsible budgets with disastrous results for our economy and for future generations. These record deficits and rising national debt present a crushing burden as our legacy and produce profound neglect of our basic infrastructure.

Just this morning, the Raleigh, North Carolina, News and Observer reported my State is running billions of dollars short in funding necessary to rejuvenate aging roads, schools and water systems. The 2006 North Carolina Infrastructure Report Card by the American Society of Engineers gave my State a C-minus grade on nine key categories of infrastructure readiness.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Federal Government needs to work in partnership with our States and local communities to meet the needs of our people.

I have worked for several years with my good friend Congressman CHARLIE RANGEL of the Ways and Means Committee to pass Federal legislation to leverage school bonds on the local level. This legislation will make a real difference throughout America to build new schools, relieve overcrowding, enhance safety and improve education for our children. Unfortunately, under the current Republican regime, we cannot even get a hearing on the Rangel-Etheridge bill.

But worse than not passing new bills, the Republican budget fails to pay for the laws they have put on the books. For example, the No Child Left Behind, which the President bragged about as

his signature legislation reform achievement, has never been fully funded. To date, Republicans in the White House and Congress have short-changed our schools roughly \$50 billion that they promised under No Child Left Behind. Talk to any educator. They can tell you. Promises unmet are programs unfulfilled.

This disgraceful record is a direct result of those misguided budgets. I believe in my bones that public education is one of the best investments that we can make in building a bright future, but under the current Federal budget, the taxpayers will pay nearly three times as much to service the interest on the national debt as we will invest in education at the Federal level, and nearly 45 percent of that national debt is held by foreign investors like China, Japan, Europe and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, America needs a new direction. The first place we can start is reversing the current budget priorities that we have that are out of touch with our American values.

I congratulate my colleagues for leading this series of speeches on this important issue.

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

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia 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 Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KIND 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 Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IMMINENT CRISIS IN DARFUR

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues in the House to act quickly on an issue where literally thousands of lives hang in the balance. I speak, of course, of the situation in Darfur, where the Sudanese Government is pursuing a policy of genocide.

This is different than your run-of-the-mill civil war. This is a case in which a government has pursued policies of widespread destruction, rape and murder in order to destroy entire tribes that it considers enemies.

The Sudanese Government and its allies consciously target civilians.

I do not care which term you prefer, a systematic violation of human rights, violations of international law, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide, the undisputable bottom line is that the Sudanese Government is carrying out and supporting acts so reprehensible and so horrible that no one with the ability to try to stop it can, in good conscience, fail to do so.

For the last 3 years, the Sudanese Government and its proxies, the Janjaweed militias, have been attacking villages in Darfur; destroying homes, crops and properties; and killing, raping and torturing innocent civilians in a concerted effort to destroy, or at least displace, the tribes most closely associated with the Darfur rebel groups. As a result of this violence and the resulting starvation, exposure and disease, 300,000 people have died, and 2 million more are refugees.

A cease-fire agreement was reached in 2004, and the Sudanese Government agreed to monitoring by an African Union force of 7,000 troops.

The deployment of this African mission in Sudan, inadequate though it was to oversee an area the size of Texas, forced the Sudanese Government and the Janjaweed militias to be a bit more surreptitious about their genocidal activities, which continued, but at a significantly slower pace.

The Sudanese Government and one rebel faction signed a peace agreement this past May. Nevertheless, the killing by government forces and the Janjaweed militias has continued. In fact, the Sudanese Government has launched a major military offensive to finish the job in Darfur before it is compelled by international pressure to allow the U.N. peacekeepers into the region. This is a major violation of the Darfur peace agreement.

The mandate of the African Union peacekeeping mission in Darfur is set to expire at the end of September, just

over a week from now. At that point there will be no military force protecting the people of Darfur from the central government and the Janjaweed militias, and no official observers to deter the Sudanese military and militias by bearing witness to their acts. The only constraint on the Sudanese Government's genocidal policies will be gone, and many of us are worried that what will follow will rival the level of death and destruction inflicted in Rwanda 12 years ago. Moreover, without the AU peacekeepers in place, humanitarian aid deliveries will grind to a halt, endangering the 3 million people who rely on that aid for survival.

Millions of lives are at stake, and the only practical solution at hand is an extension of the AMIS peacekeeping force's mandate. The AU Peace and Security Council is expected to approve the AMIS mandate tomorrow. We need to do our part as well.

Recently the other body adopted an amendment to the 2007 defense appropriations bill that would increase funding for the African Mission in Sudan by \$20 million. The other body, to its great credit, recognized the fact that only the African Mission in Sudan can prevent the likely deaths of thousands of people.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to adopt this provision in the conference report, in this appropriations bill. We have no morally acceptable choice but to act and act quickly. Let us do our part to prevent more deaths in Darfur.

IRAN'S NUCLEAR AMBITION

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President of Iran has just addressed the United Nations General Assembly. He well could have declared victory. Hezbollah, a creature of Iran, created and funded by Iran, attacked Israel. The resulting conflict diverted attention from Iran's nuclear program and bolstered Iran's position in the Middle East. Our invasion of Iraq has removed from the chess board what was once a bloody rival of Iran for power in its own region, and now Iraq saps America's strength.

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad came to New York with a stamp of approval for his country's nuclear program from the 100-plus members of the nonaligned movement, where he led a festival of America-bashing.

Most importantly, Ahmadinejad has brazenly ignored the August 31 deadline from the United Nations Security Council to cease enrichment of nuclear fuel.

A nuclear Iran would be a catastrophe. That regime has already been listed as number one on the list of state sponsors of terrorism year after year by our own State Department.

With nuclear weapons, Iran could blatantly sponsor the most horrific terrorist events, feeling itself immune from retaliation.

The Iranian regime could terrify its Muslim neighbors and interrupt their oil exports. Conversely, it could inspire Middle East States to develop their own nuclear weapons. If the Tehran regime got just a little bit crazier than they are, it could smuggle a weapon into the United States and then threaten to explode it if we did not change our policies.

Finally, if that regime were about to be overthrown, and many of us look forward to that day, it could use its nuclear weapons against its own people, or it could use them against Israel as a final parting act.

Ahmadinejad declared in one of his recent famous diatribes that the United States should bow down and surrender.

Mr. Amadinijad, we already have. Our unilateral concessions began in 1999 when we opened our markets to Iranian exports, not oil which we could use, but only the stuff Iran cannot sell elsewhere like caviar.

Since then we have acquiesced in World Bank loans to the Iranian Government. We allow corporations to do business in Iran through their foreign subsidiaries. And last year we opened the door to Iran's membership in the WTO. For 6 years, the Bush administration has violated U.S. law by refusing to apply the Iran-Libya Sanctions Acts to billions of dollars of investments in the Iranian oil sector. All this while energy sanctions were effective in changing Libya's behavior.

Most recently, Condoleezza Rice and President Bush personally approved a visa for a five-city U.S. propaganda tour by Amadinijad's predecessor, former Iranian President Khatami. Amazingly, the U.S. taxpayer picked up part of the tab for Khatami's terrorism promotion tour. We paid for the security. As you remember, the last time there were American officials in Iran, there wasn't much security and they were taken hostage and held for 44 days.

There is a certain symmetry to all this, Mr. Speaker. According to the 9/11 Commission, during the administration of Khatami, Iran used its taxpayer dollars to provide safe harbor and protection to al Qaeda terrorists. Now U.S. tax dollars are used to provide safe harbor and protection for Khatami.

The failure of this administration to persuade the U.N. Security Council, particularly Russia and China, to impose sanctions on Iran for developing nuclear weapons is the greatest diplomatic failure of our time. Why have they failed? Because they refuse the concept of linkage. We seek Russia's help on Iran while refusing to make the slightest concession on issues Russia cares about like Moldavia, Chechnya, Obkazia, any reasonable U.S. policy which subordinates these issues that are minor to us to the goal of preventing a nuclear Iran.

Likewise, we refuse to link how China deals with Iran with how we deal with China on trade issues, such as how we choose to respond to their legally questionable currency manipulations.

Mr. Speaker, the options are clear. We can use all our economic and diplomatic power, including linkage, to stop Amadinijad's nuclear weapon program, or we can bow down and surrender.

Actually, the Bush administration has embraced a third option. Talk tough, avoid effective action, especially linkage, and take solace in the fact that the policy failure will not become manifest and Iran will not develop and test a nuclear weapon until after 2008. Bush refuses linkage. We are doomed to a nuclear Iran.

□ 2100

CONGRESSIONAL CONSTITUTION CAUCUS CONSTITUTION HOUR

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor tonight for our weekly Congressional Constitution Caucus Constitution Hour to honor the annual Constitution Day, September 17. September 17 marks the anniversary of the signing of our founding legal document, the U.S. Constitution.

On September 17, 1787, 39 revolutionary and visionary Founding Fathers changed the course of history and this country and the world, securing liberties and freedoms that centuries of civilization had only dreamed of before and that democracies around the world have tried to emulate ever since. I encourage all of my colleagues to use this occasion to remind us all and all Americans of the true intent of the U.S. Constitution and all the rights and the liberties that are guaranteed to them when our government was first formed. Today more than ever before these freedoms are too often encroached upon by every branch of government.

Unfortunately, for most Americans, the Constitution is nothing more than a historical document, really, too often cited, and cited inaccurately, and nearly always greatly misunderstood.

Still more unfortunate, this esteemed body and our Federal Government have lowered the standard of constitutional understanding and adherence, and so it is no wonder the general public has little interest or comprehension of the intent of our Nation's Founding Fathers. Just today, for example, if someone tuned in to see the discussion on C-SPAN of what was going on on the floor, the House was debating, as if, you might say, a school board was debating, for we were looking at legislation of how schools should be run with regard to their securities within their confines.

Thomas Jefferson was once asked the question, why is it that the Federal

Government does not regulate and promote schools throughout the country? And he answered the question by saying: Madam, we shall do so when the Constitution is amended to say that we have the right and constitutional power to do so. But until that time, we shall not.

Here in the House floor today, unfortunately, we were doing just that, acting as if this was one large super-school board for the entire 50 States of this country.

But we were happy to come to the floor, along with my colleague from Utah, earlier this evening and other members of the caucus to help reorient the conversation to the original beliefs of our Founding Fathers and purposes of our founding documents. I think we have become a society that has begun to take for granted our systems of self-government and our liberties and freedoms. You know, gone are the days of the tyrannical rulers that inspired patriots to dump tea in the Boston Harbor or to compel Patrick Henry to cry out, "Give me liberty or give me death," or motivated such important luminaries as General George Washington, who successfully led a patchwork of army of little resources and even less hope to take up arms against one of the mightiest armies in the world for their freedom.

As societies around the world are currently struggling to establish or maintain democracy as the true model of self-government, let us not forget the many rights that we possess and the single document that protects them.

So as we celebrate the anniversary of our signing of our Nation's most significant legal document, let us each and every one of us try to better familiarize ourselves with it. Highlighting and understanding what the Constitution actually says; what the intent of the authors actually was, and how it is now interpreted, stretched, or ignored will empower the public, like our forefathers once did, to stand up for their innate rights and to resist the growth of government at every level.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to let our rights slip away, but tremendously difficult to get them back ever again. The best weapons that we have against either of those things ever happening is to arm ourselves with the knowledge found in the United States Constitution.

And so I conclude as I had once before on this floor, to encourage this House to adopt legislation that is pending right now called the AMERICA Act, which is simply asking every Member of this body to on a yearly basis to simply read the Constitution, and their staffs as well. Let us start in this body to have an understanding of the Constitution and to share that belief with the American public as well.

SUDAN TEETERING ON THE EDGE OF DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. As the end of the session begins to revolve and move toward an end, you begin to hear a lot of discussions about the end of the session business or unfinished business. And I hope as we proceed toward the first conclusion of the 109th Congress, we will view the concept of unfinished business as not only domestic but international. I ask that this body and the administration, this Nation, not have on our clock another Rwanda.

I don't think our former President would mind when I make the remarks that one of the most difficult days and difficult times of that past administration was the failure to act expeditiously on Rwanda. And today we ask that Sudan not be another Rwanda, Sudan that is now teetering on the edge of disaster, human disaster, and the devastation of thousands upon hundreds of thousands of human beings. And what is the reason? The reason simply is one person, one man, one human being, one head of state, one president. The President of Sudan indicates that if the African Union peacekeepers were to set foot on the soil of Sudan, he would consider it an attack and therefore attack individuals dispatched by the world community.

Now, the question becomes, what is the response of this world community? Is it intimidation, to be intimidated? Is it false diplomacy, to sit back and allow this person to brutalize and to, if you will, reject the hand of friendship offered by the collective world community?

I ask that we not be intimidated and oppressed by the President of Sudan and that we demand that African Union peacekeepers who have been dispatched by the United Nations, the very body that has been sent to bring the world nations together to solve problems, do their job. And that requires sometimes enhanced diplomacy, not accepting diplomacy, and certainly a firm hand and firm attitude and firm action.

None of us are asking to provoke violence, but violence already exists in the Sudan. For those of us who have gone, some of us who went through Chad because the Sudanese Government refused to give a number of Members of Congress the diplomatic papers necessary, many just simply went. When I went to Chad and visited with the refugees there in the camps, Chad already as a neighboring country is overwhelmed and being, if you will, undermined by the hundreds of thousands of refugees and the lack of support and resources. I was glad to support an amendment to the foreign operations appropriations to ensure that some of those heavy burdens of Chad would be provided for.

But you have not and cannot understand the devastation of violence in

Sudan if you have not sat down on the ground with the women in a circle as I have in those refugee camps listening to women who would not look at me face to face, who hid their eyes and their faces, who didn't want to talk about the massive rapes over and over again by those who would intimidate, rape, murder their men and them and their children. Women who had to go out to get the firewood because the man could not. The men obviously were not raped, they were brutalized and murdered, and so the women sacrificed their bodies by going out to be raped, because if the men went out they would be murdered. Is this not a call to action? Is this not a reason to tell the President of Sudan to stand down and step aside?

We have gone into conflict and we have had rousing and vigorous debates on lesser items than this. And so to the President who is now at the United Nations, it is time to turn these three days of the general assembly around issues of severity. There is life or death matters going on in Sudan. And might I just say this: just a few weeks ago, there was some sort of survey that categorized the Members of Congress and their response to these issues. Unfortunately, it was a skewed survey, because one of the amendments that it scored was an amendment that this Congress utilize to make a point by taking money away from Egypt. Obviously, that is not the right way to go when you talk about solving the problem of Sudan. The way to solve the problem for Sudan is to put an allotment of dollars that doesn't take away from anyone and enhances both the resources necessary for bringing those violent perpetrators out of there and away from those refugees, and as well supporting the African Union peacekeepers.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2463. An act to designate certain land in New England as wilderness for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation system and certain land as a National Reservation Area, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2864) "An Act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BOND, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. CHAFEE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VITTER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. BOXER,

and Mr. CARPER, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REAL SECURITY SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, 229 years ago today, American forces under the command of General Horatio Gates defeated the British at Saratoga, New York. This battle and the subsequent engagement at Saratoga several weeks later turned the tide of the American Revolution and were crucial in securing the survival of our fledgling Nation.

More than two centuries later, the United States is the most powerful Nation on Earth, but we face myriad challenges to our national security that our revolutionary forebearers could not have imagined.

Throughout much of our history, the security of our Nation was an issue that was above politics. America's leaders put aside their differences and, working together, ensured that our country remained strong and free. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that bipartisan tradition has been cast aside by our GOP colleagues who have sought for the last three decades to portray the Democratic Party as weak on defense or insufficiently concerned with defending the United States. Never mind that this wholly distorts the historical record of Democrats who have always, always answered the Nation's call to lead in the defense of our country. It was Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat, who led America during the first World War and vowed to make the world safe for democracy.

□ 2115

It was Franklin Roosevelt, a Democrat, who guided this Nation and the entire free world through World War II.

It was Harry Truman, a Democrat, who made the tough decisions to use the atomic bomb against Japan to contain Soviet expansionism after the war and to confront the North Korean attack against South Korea in 1950.

It was John Kennedy, a Democrat, who went eyeball to eyeball with Nikita Khrushchev during the Cuban missile crisis.

These great leaders and their successors, including Lyndon Johnson and Bill Clinton, never shied away from the hard fights, and our friends on the other side of the aisle know it. Nevertheless, Republicans have continued to try to scare the American people into believing that only they can protect the country.

This shameful use of national security as a political wedge issue has reached new lows since the September 11 attacks. In 2002 and 2004 and again in this election season, Republicans from President Bush on down have used terrorism as a political issue. In so doing,

they have up-ended America's long tradition of optimism, self-confidence and bipartisanship on national security.

In 1933, President Roosevelt told a Nation shaken by 3 years of depression that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. President Bush has spent the last 5 years telling the American people the only thing we really have to fear is the loss of GOP rule.

My colleagues, including the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the other distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), and the gentleman from my home State of California (Mr. CARDOZA) will join tonight in a message to the American people that we must change course from the administration's policies which have endangered our country, and that Democrats will do a better job at protecting the American people.

Our plan, Real Security, was developed with the assistance of a broad range of experts, former military officers, retired diplomats, law enforcement personnel, homeland security experts and others who helped identify key areas where current policies have failed and where new ones are needed.

The Real Security Plan rests on five pillars. They involve the creation of a 21st century military, a smart strategy to win the war on terror, a plan to secure our homeland, a way forward in Iraq, and a proposal for achieving energy independence for America by 2020.

Under Real Security, a Democratic Congress will rebuild the state-of-the-art military by making needed investments in equipment and manpower so we can project to protect America wherever and whenever necessary.

We have all heard stories of parents throughout the country using their own money to purchase body armor for their children serving in Iraq. I have asked Secretary Rumsfeld about the shortage of body armor and the lack of properly armored vehicles, about hold-ups in the development of equipment to counter roadside bombs that have killed and maimed so many of our troops. Despite his assurances, the last few months have seen a spike in the number of IED attacks against American forces in Iraq, and they seem more lethal than ever.

Under Real Security, Democrats will guarantee all of our troops have the protective gear, the equipment, the training they need and are never sent to war without accurate intelligence and a strategy for success.

I have been to Iraq three times, Afghanistan twice. I visit our troops wounded here at home, there in Germany. I have spoken at the funerals of my constituents killed in Iraq. I have sat with their families as they have mourned. These experiences have reinforced my sense of commitment to ensuring the well-being of America's soldiers and their families and our veterans.

Democrats will enact a GI Bill of Rights for the 21st Century that guar-

antees our troops, Active, Reserve, retired, our veterans and their families, receive the pay, health care, mental health services and other benefits they have earned and deserve.

Our Active military are stretched to the breaking point, but our Guard and Reserves have also been ground down by multiple deployments, falling enlistment and reenlistment. This has, in turn, added to the stress.

I remember meeting one young marine from California when I was in Iraq who had been there for 9 months and was on his way home. His wife, also in the service of this country, was on her way to Iraq. These are the kinds of deployments that are so taxing on our military families.

As a part of Real Security, Democrats will strengthen our National Guard in partnership with our Nation's Governors to ensure it is fully manned, properly equipped and available to meet missions at home and abroad.

The next pillar of Real Security is a broad strategy to win the war on terror. Four-and-a-half years, five years after 9/11, Osama bin Laden is still at large. Al Qaeda has morphed into a worldwide amalgam of discrete cells that are more difficult to track down. When Democrats are in charge, we will make the elimination of Osama bin Laden our first priority. We will destroy al Qaeda and other terrorist networks and finish the job in Afghanistan, ending the threat posed by the Taliban. We propose to double the size of our Special Forces, increase our human intelligence capabilities, and ensure that our intelligence is free from political pressure.

Despite their vow to drain the swamp, the administration has done little to eliminate terrorist breeding grounds by combating the economic, social and political conditions that allow extremism to thrive. Democrats will fight terrorism with all the means at our disposal, using military force when necessary, but also leading international efforts to uphold and defend human rights and renew the long-standing alliances that have advanced our national security objectives.

Under Real Security, we will confront the specter of nuclear terrorism by greatly accelerating the pace at which we are securing nuclear material that can be used to make a nuclear weapon or a dirty bomb. Our goal is to secure loose nukes by 2010. We will redouble our efforts to stop nuclear weapons development in Iran and North Korea. And while Democrats understand that no option can be taken off the table, we are committed to using a muscular diplomacy as the best option for curbing Pyongyang and Iran's nuclear ambitions.

The third pillar of Real Security is homeland security. In the wake of 9/11, there have been numerous commissions and investigations at the Federal, State and local levels, as well as a multitude of private studies. All of them have pointed to broad, systemic and

other flaws in our homeland security program. Almost 2 years ago the bipartisan 9/11 Commission published its report, but most of its recommendations have not yet been implemented.

As a part of Real Security, Democrats will immediately implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, including securing national borders, ports, airports and mass transit systems. We will implement the screening of 100 percent of containers and cargo bound for the United States in ships or airplanes at their point of origin, and we will take steps to better safeguard America's nuclear and chemical plants and our food and water supplies.

Democrats will prevent the outsourcing of critical components of our national security infrastructure such as ports, airports and mass transit to foreign interests that could put America at risk.

Under Real Security, Democrats would provide firefighters, emergency medical workers, police officers, and other workers on the front lines with the training, the staffing, the equipment and the cutting-edge technology that they need.

While the immediate threats to our national security come from terrorists, we face other dangers as well. Democrats are committed to a security strategy that will protect America from biological terrorism and pandemics, including the avian flu, by investing in the public health infrastructure and training public health workers.

The fourth pillar, and the one that will have the most immediate effect on our security and the longest-term effect on our security, is to chart a new course in Iraq that will ensure that in the coming months we see a significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with the Iraqis assuming primary responsibility for securing and governing their country with a responsible redeployment of U.S. forces.

Democrats will insist that Iraqis make the political compromises that are necessary to unite their country, defeat the insurgency, and we will promote regional diplomacy and strongly encourage our allies in other nations to play a constructive role. Those nations now are largely on the sidelines.

As a part of Real Security, Democrats intend to hold this administration accountable for its manipulated prewar intelligence, its poor planning, contracting abuses that have placed our troops at greater risk and have wasted billions of taxpayer dollars.

Our security will remain threatened as long as we remain dependent on Middle East oil. The fifth pillar, and one with far-reaching ramifications for our country and for the world, is to achieve energy independence for America by 2020.

Under Real Security, Democrats will increase the production of alternate fuels from America's heartland: biofuels, geothermal, clean coal, fuel

cells, solar and wind. We will promote hybrid and flex-fuel technology in manufacturing, enhance energy efficiency and conservation measures. All of this we will do, and more, to meet the real national security needs of our country.

We are joined tonight by the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has been a great leader on national security issues. I would invite the minority whip to address us this evening, along with our colleague from Maryland and our colleague from Georgia.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, and I am pleased to join him and certainly adopt his remarks, which I think are fundamental to this debate that will be going on for the next 6 weeks in our country about how we effect Real Security. That is our objective. That is our commitment as Democrats.

We believe that terrorism is a real threat. We believe that we have a responsibility to confront and defeat that threat. That is our responsibility as citizens, and that is our responsibility as elected representatives.

I am pleased to join Mr. SCHIFF, who has been such a leader on national security issues in the Congress; my dear friend from Maryland and colleague Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who has a depth of knowledge and experience in foreign policy issues and national security issues; and my good friend from the State of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT. The State of Georgia has historically had leaders in national defense. On our side of the aisle, most recently was Sam Nunn, one of the most extraordinarily able and thoughtful spokespersons for national security.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for taking this time. Our highest duty as Members of this Congress is to protect the American people, to protect our homeland and to strengthen our national security. We Democrats are proud of our party's strong tradition of leadership in world affairs from Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt to Harry Truman and John Kennedy, indeed to Bill Clinton. Bill Clinton, it will be recalled, most recently marshaled the NATO Alliance, received the imprimatur of the United Nations, confronted the genocide being led by Slobodan Milosevic, defeated and stopped the genocide, stopped the ethnic cleansing, and put Slobodan Milosevic in the dock in trial at the Hague, all without losing a single American life in combat.

These leaders demonstrated that defending America requires our Nation to marshal the full range of its powers, economic and moral, diplomatic and military, to fight for freedom, to foster democracy, and to defeat tyranny and terrorism.

I believe that Members on both sides of the aisle are committed to this Nation's security. Any suggestion to the contrary, in my opinion, is either mistaken or quite possibly malicious par-

tisanship. Furthermore, I believe that members of the loyal opposition, in this case us congressional Democrats, have the responsibility to critique the wisdom and effectiveness of the policies pursued by the majority party. That is what our Founding Fathers conceived. That is what our Founding Fathers believed was absolutely essential for the success of our democracy: A Congress and an executive and indeed a judiciary that provided checks and balances, provided thoughtful alternatives to policies being pursued, and provided constructive criticism. The fact is our Nation and our people are not as safe today as they could and should be.

□ 2130

I accept the fact that we are safer, but I repeat, that we are not as safe as we could or should be. Osama bin Laden, the architect of the worst terrorist attack on America in our history, remains at large. We still have not fully implemented the recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission, for which the commission itself has criticized us sharply. In fact, Tom Kean, the co-chair, the former Republican Governor of the State of New Jersey, the co-chair of the 9/11 Commission and the former Republican Governor, as I said, of New Jersey, recently stated: "We are not protecting our own people in this country. The government is not doing its job." What powerful words and what a call to attention are Governor Kean's words.

Meanwhile, the nuclear threats from North Korea and Iran have increased dramatically in the last 6 years. The Taliban is resurgent in Afghanistan, where roadside bombs have increased 30 percent and suicide bombings have doubled. And anti-Americanism has unfortunately and dangerously risen by substantial proportions. Even former Secretary of State and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell, who has served this country so honorably in uniform and as a diplomat, remarked last week: "The world is beginning to doubt the moral basis of our fight against terrorism."

That is an extraordinary dangerous condition. We cannot nor should we fight this war against terrorists alone. We must have allies. We must have allies who respect us, who believe that our word is credible, and believe that our leadership is based upon values, insight, good intelligence, and conviction. Without question, Madam Speaker, our continuing military action in Iraq has fomented much of this anti-American sentiment.

Let me add that I supported the effort to remove Saddam Hussein as the dictator in Iraq. Democrats, however, as the loyal opposition, believe that we have a duty to honestly appraise the gross miscalculations and, I suggest, even incompetence that have plagued Operation Iraqi Freedom from its very start and to offer alternatives.

The administration ignored the advice of top military commanders and

sent far too few troops to accomplish the task at hand. Recall, if you will, that we sent over a half million troops in the fall of 1990 to confront Saddam Hussein and his army in the late winter of 1991. We sent those troops to eject Hussein from Kuwait. We sent a force one-third, however, the size in 2003 not only to confront Saddam Hussein's army but to take control and stabilize an entire nation of 22 million-plus people and to ensure its stability.

As Tom Friedman of the New York Times has stated: "If we're in such a titanic struggle with radical Islam and if getting Iraq right is at the center of that struggle, why did the Bush administration fight the Iraq war with the Rumsfeld doctrine, just enough troops to lose, and not the Powell doctrine of overwhelming force to create the necessary foundation of any democracy-building project, which is," of course, "security?"

The administration, with Mr. Bremer as its viceroy in Iraq, fired police and security forces and oil workers, which increased, not decreased, instability. It initiated the war before making alternative plans when the Turks told us that we could not come in through the north so we could shut the back door to Baghdad. And as a result, many of those in the Saddam Hussein armed forces escaped and were a basis for an insurgency.

In fact, just this month Brigadier General Mark Scheid revealed that Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld said he would "fire the next person" who talked about the need for a post-war plan. There was no effective plan for post-Saddam Hussein regime nation-building. As a result, chaos occurred.

The administration failed to properly equip our own troops, Mr. SCHIFF has pointed that out, nearly 2,700 of whom have given the ultimate measure of sacrifice in this war. All of us in our districts have lost people in this war.

The administration grossly underestimated the cost of the war at about \$60 billion. Today, the war costs stand at five times that amount, in excess of \$300 billion. All of that has happened, I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, without significant oversight and appropriate hearings being conducted by this Congress, which is our responsibility to our constituents and to our country.

The administration hired inexperienced and unqualified political appointees for the Coalition Provisional Authority, as The Washington Post reported on Sunday. And when confronted with concrete evidence of widespread mistreatment of detainees in American custody, the President failed to hold anyone in his administration accountable.

All of this, Madam Speaker, has undermined the effectiveness of an effort that I supported. Some did not. But whether you supported it or you did not, you must lament the fact that the execution of the policy has been so unsuccessful.

Madam Speaker, as Lieutenant General Gregory Newbold, the former commanding general of the 1st Marine Division, has stated: "What we are living with now is the consequence of successive policy failures." That is not a Democrat or a Republican but a three-star general concerned about his troops, concerned about our country, concerned about the success of an effort given to our Armed Forces.

The current strategy for our military, our security, and the Iraqi people is neither working nor making us more secure. Our colleague Congressman SKELTON of Missouri has pointed out that there is not a single Army non-deployed combat brigade currently prepared to meet its wartime mission. That, Madam Speaker, is an extraordinary assertion and I suggest an accurate one as well.

Meanwhile, the news in Iraq is equally dire. The chief of intelligence for the Marine Corps in Iraq has concluded that prospects for securing that country's Anbar Province are dim and there is almost nothing the U.S. military can do to improve the political and social situation there. Thirty-four people were killed in suicide attacks on Monday in Tal Afar and Ramadi. Fifty-two bound and tortured corpses were found across Baghdad on Friday. And just today General John Abizaid, the commander of the U.S. Central Command, said that the U.S. military will likely maintain or possibly increase current force levels through next spring due to rising sectarian violence and the slow progress of the Iraqi Government.

Madam Speaker, I want the Iraqi Government to succeed. I want democracy to flourish. I want a robust economy creating jobs and hope for its people to be in place. However, Madam Speaker, the policies that we have pursued have not accomplished that objective.

Clearly, Madam Speaker, we need a new direction. I believe, as former National Security Adviser Brzezinski has said, that American and Iraqi leaders should jointly consult on a plan to transition from active American leadership and policing and securing Iraq to increasing Iraqi responsibility.

I do not believe that we should announce an arbitrary timeline, but I do believe that discussions on this transition should be agreed upon and jointly announced.

In addition, the Iraqi Government, not the United States, should then call for a regional conference of Muslim states to ask them to help the new government establish and consolidate internal stability. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that is in the interest of every regional state in the Middle East.

Additionally, the United States should convene a donors' conference of European states, Japan, China, and others to become more directly involved in financing the restoration of the Iraqi economy. A stable, secure, and free Iraq is in the best interest of

the entire international community; and because it is in their interest, they bear a joint responsibility to effect that end.

Madam Speaker, this is our last best chance, in my opinion, to salvage success in Iraq. Our commitment there has been unwavering, but it must not be unending. Our strategy, hampered by gross miscalculations by our civilian leadership, is not working; and we believe that we have a duty to advocate for policy changes that will better serve our security interest and this great Nation we love.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I reiterate, Democrats are committed to defending America, making safe Americans, and defeating terrorists who would harm our Nation and undermine our values. Our policies that we are pursuing have not worked. They need to be changed.

Again, I thank Mr. SCHIFF for his leadership on this hour.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his leadership.

And I particularly appreciate your comments about the proposal that Zbigniew Brzezinski has put forward. It is, I think, exemplary of the new direction in Iraq that Democrats have been advocating.

The administration's policy of stay the course, the sum and substance of it, is more of the same. Indeed, in a nonclassified briefing when I asked Secretaries Rumsfeld and Rice, Director Negroponte and General Pace how are we adapting our strategy given that the sectarian violence is now more prominent than the insurgent violence, how are we changing from a counterinsurgency strategy to one that attempts to stop the civil war, the long and short of it is we weren't. We are simply doing the same thing we have done all along. The same thing that has led us to a place, as you pointed out, where Marine intelligence is saying we lost Anbar Province probably for good. If you keep doing the same thing and you expect the result to be different, you are going to be bitterly disappointed.

And I thank the gentleman for his comments and his leadership on this.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you very much.

Mr. SCHIFF. For a small State, I have to say Maryland produces more than its share of great leaders, particularly on the issue of national security.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFF. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. Of course our small State has given your large State our leader.

Mr. SCHIFF. That is true.

I now yield to my friend and colleague from Maryland, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend and colleague Mr. SCHIFF from California, thank him for organizing these very important national security discussions here on the floor in the House. I also want to thank my colleague from

Maryland STENY HOYER for his terrific leadership on national security and a whole range of issues, and it is great to be here again with DAVID SCOTT, my colleague, from Georgia, who has also been a leader and a very important voice on these important issues to our country.

Mr. HOYER mentioned that we had the important passing about 8 days ago of the solemn occasion of 9/11. It was the 5th-year anniversary of 9/11 and the terrible attacks that took place upon our country. And I do think it is important to go back to that time and remember where those attacks came from because they were launched from Afghanistan. You had a failed state in Afghanistan run by the Taliban; and in that failed state, al Qaeda was able to take hold and find a home, and Osama bin Laden was able to prosper and plot his attacks against the United States.

And after the attacks took place on September 11, 2001, this Congress, this country, and the international community were united in pledging that we would work together to defeat terrorism, to defeat al Qaeda and bring them to justice. And despite that unity, we have not achieved the result. In fact, if you look upon the situation today, there is great division in the world and we have failed to capitalize on that unity to finish the job in Afghanistan and against al Qaeda.

The President declared way back in 2003, May 2003, aboard the aircraft carrier USS *Lincoln*, he had a big banner behind him that said "Mission Accomplished." Well, we haven't come close to accomplishing that mission because as we gather here on the floor today, Osama bin Laden is alive and well somewhere along the Afghan/Pakistan border, al Qaeda continues to plot attacks against the United States. They have become a franchiser. You know how al Qaeda franchises around the world.

□ 2145

We have not made progress at totally dismantling that organization. In fact, what we are seeing in southern Afghanistan is a resurgence of the Taliban as reported by the NATO Commander there, and our own commanders on the ground.

What have we done? We have actually reduced the number of U.S. forces in southern Afghanistan. We disbanded the one unit at the CIA that had the specific mission of going after al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden.

You open the newspaper today and see that the opium crop in Afghanistan is at an all-time high, historic high. And we also know that the Pakistan Government that we had been really relying on to keep the Taliban and al Qaeda on the run in the northwest frontier part of Pakistan, that, in fact, they have now, the Pakistani Government has entered into a nonaggression pact essentially with the Taliban leaders and the leaders in the Waziristan area.

So here we are more than 5 years after those terrible attacks, and we have not completed the job. We have not finished the mission against al Qaeda. And instead, in my view, we have actually reduced our commitment to doing that. And we must make sure that as Americans we are again united today, making sure we finish the mission in Afghanistan and bringing to justice and defeating the organization that, after all, was the organization and the leadership responsible for those attacks of September 11.

Instead, we did take our eye off the ball. We decided, instead of finishing the job in Afghanistan, to go into Iraq. And today, unfortunately, if you look at the situation on the ground, it is a mess.

You know, the Vice President, it was a little more a year ago, he went on national television and said, and I quote, that "the insurgency in Iraq was in its last throes."

Well, just a few weeks ago we had a Pentagon report required by Congress that said that the insurgency, and I quote, "remains potent and viable." And, in fact, the insurgency no longer is our number one problem in Iraq. The real problem is the cycling civil war, whether it is called a civil war, an incipient civil war, incipient of people are being killed in sectarian violence.

So you have a situation where the administration was wrong on so many counts. They were wrong on weapons of mass destruction, they were wrong on the claim that there was a connection between Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein. In fact, we now have a bipartisan report out of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that said definitively there was never any relationship between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda. In fact, they were adversaries, they were ideological opposites. They were wrong on that.

They were wrong on the cost of the war. They totally underestimated the cost of the war. They gave the American people one number that was low-balled. In turn it was a much bigger number.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. VAN HOLLEN, notwithstanding all of those mistakes in judgment and execution of the war, I am sure it gave you great confidence to hear from the Vice President on Meet the Press that if he had to do it all over again, he would do exactly the same thing. That must have encouraged you.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. It was stunning actually, because what you would hope for from our national leaders is some reflection, some understanding that the situation that we encountered in Iraq was not what we expected, that it was not what he said it would be. And, in fact, unfortunately this administration has never come to grips with the huge gap between what they said would happen in Iraq and with what is happening on the ground. That has exposed, I believe, a great credibility gap.

So when the administration says, trust us, we know what we are doing in

Iraq; all you people who raise questions, don't you worry about it, I have to say, that is what they told us many, many years ago. That is what Vice President CHENEY said more than a year ago when he said the insurgency was in its last throes. So asking questions and trying to figure out a better way is, in fact, the patriotic thing to do.

But I think one of the things that is most surprising is the fact that the administration did not really have a postwar plan. They thought things were going to just go so swimmingly in Iraq, that you did not have to plan for really the postinvasion period.

In fact, just about a week ago, there was a general from the Defense Department who not only said that they did not have a postwar plan, but said specifically that Secretary Rumsfeld would punish anybody who came up with a plan, because it would send a signal to the outside world that this would not be as quick and easy as the Secretary of Defense wanted people to think it was.

And let me just, I think it is important to read this excerpt: "Rumsfeld Forbade Planning for Postwar Iraq, General Says." This is out of the Saturday, September 9, Washington Post. "Long before the United States invaded Iraq in 2003, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld forbade military strategists to develop plans for securing a postwar Iraq, the retiring Commander of the Army Transportation Corps said."

Brigadier General Mark Scheid said in an interview, that Rumsfeld said "he would fire the next person" who talked about the need for a postwar plan. And we wonder why we are in trouble today in Iraq. We wonder when we open our newspapers or look at television sets why we see such a mess.

You know, the terrible thing is that there were people in the administration who had worked on a postwar plan. Many people at the State Department had developed different scenarios for what would happen and how to respond. But instead of following that plan, the Defense Department essentially junked it, and Secretary Rumsfeld not only did not come up with a plan, but now we have a brigadier general who said that he threatened to fire people who came up with a plan.

We need to do some more firing. We need to hold people accountable. We need to hold people accountable who made these big, big mistakes.

Now, one of the other things that we have learned recently, and this may be partly due to the fact that they did not have a postwar plan, was the incompetence of many of the civilians that they sent in there to work on the reconstruction phase in Iraq. You know, we recently passed the 1-year anniversary of the terrible Hurricanes Katrina and Rita that struck our States in the Southern United States, struck New Orleans, struck Louisiana, struck Mississippi.

And we know all too well that the people in those regions were hit twice really. First they were hit by a terrible hurricane, and then they were hit by the incompetence of a FEMA that was headed up by people who were not experts in emergency response, but happened to be political favorites in the administration. Michael Brown, we know that his primary credential was he had been the President of the Horse Breeders Association.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. VAN HOLLEN, I am sure if there had been an emergency of a national character involving thoroughbred horses, we would have been prepared.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, the FEMA job, as we know, is one that we have to be prepared for all sorts of things, but you are absolutely right, my colleague. It goes to show, in my view, the kind of disdain that the administration has with respect to what kind of qualifications are required for people who are vested with such important national responsibilities.

And we remember when the President said, "Heck of a job, Brownie," in the midst of the real disaster not just from the hurricane, but in the response.

But what I think we are learning now, unfortunately, is that same kind of cronyism, that same kind of cronyism infected many of the decisions with respect to who we sent to Iraq for that postwar period and reconstruction period.

You would think that in deciding who we should send to Iraq, we would send the people who are highly qualified at reconstruction, people who knew something about Iraq, maybe people who spoke Arabic and the native language if we had them available. But if you look at a very recent article from the Washington Post, we learned that it was not those kind of expert qualifications that made the decision. It had to do with whether or not you were a big political supporter of the Bush administration.

And I think this kind of political cronyism, when it comes to the biggest national security issues we have got, shows an incredible contempt for the American people and their security.

I just think it is very important to read a little passage from this article from the Washington Post. This is an article, September, this past Sunday, September 17. Headline: Ties to GOP Trumped Know-How Among Staff Sent to Rebuild Iraq. After the fall of Saddam Hussein's government in April 2003, the opportunity to participate in the U.S.-led effort to reconstruct Iraq attracted all manner of Americans, restless professionals, Arabic-speaking academics, development specialists, and war-zone adventurers. But before they could go to Baghdad, they had to just get past Jim O'Beirne's office in the Pentagon.

To pass muster with O'Beirne, who is a political appointee who screens prospective political appointees for Defense Department posts, applicants did

not need to be experts in the Middle East or in postconflict reconstruction. What seemed most important was loyalty to the Bush administration.

Jumping down a bit: The decision to send the loyal and willing instead of the best and the brightest is now regarded by many people involved in the 3½-year effort to stabilize and rebuild Iraq as one of the Bush administration's gravest errors.

And one of the people who was set up to be, he was the CPA person over there, said: We did not tap, and it should have started from the White House on down, we just did not tap the right people to do this job, said Frederick Smith, who served as the Deputy Director of the CPA, that is the Coalition Provisional Authority's Washington office. It was a tough, tough job. Instead, we got people who went out there because of their political leanings.

He goes on to give a couple of examples of how people with absolutely no experience in contracts were given responsibilities for a \$18 billion construction budget.

He goes on to talk about, you know, 24-year-old political appointees whose only qualifications were they had been part of the Bush campaign machine. Those are the people that were sent to Iraq to do a very important mission for the American people.

And it is extremely disturbing to discover that the qualifications for those people had nothing to do with their ability to do the job, their expertise to do the job, their past background to do the job; that what it had to do with was whether they were a big political booster of the Bush administration. It points out that many of them were big political contributors to the Bush administration.

Taking that kind of license with our national security, I think, is scandalous. It is important that we begin to hold people to account. Let's begin to have a real national conversation, not just a one-way discussion that the President wants to have.

Let's have some real hearings on Capitol Hill. Let's begin to have some accountability, because we all know that when you have a system that rewards people who fail, that gives a pat on the back to the people who constantly got it wrong, and yet at the same time penalizes the people who got it right in this administration, the people who said we needed more troops on the ground, the people who questioned some of the decisions, it turns out that people who questioned the decisions were ignored or penalized. People like this general who wanted to do some postwar planning was ignored. In fact, they threatened to fire people who did that kind of thing.

□ 2200

If you reward failure, you are going to get more failure. What we are asking I think tonight and on other nights is that we just begin to hold people ac-

countable and that this House of Representatives begin to do its job, and not be a rubber stamp, not just say yes, Mr. President, you know it all, when in fact we know from what is going on in Iraq that they have gotten so much wrong. Let's begin to get it right, and let's begin to ask the hard questions. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank my colleague for his statement tonight and all your tremendous leadership on this. I am confident with Democrats we will not only have a new direction, but we will have a functioning government of checks and balances where there is actual oversight by the Congress of the administration, which every administration needs, no matter how good, but particularly when the administration has made such serious mistakes that have placed this Nation so much in jeopardy. We need oversight.

I would add only one thing, and this you may have watched, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the interview with the President from New Orleans when he went down for the Katrina anniversary, and Brian Williams asked him, "Mr. President, some people have criticized that you have never really asked for a sacrifice of the American people in the war on terror. Is that a fair criticism?"

His answer really struck me, because we have been talking about the American people being brought in and given a chance to contribute to our security and our success with an Apollo-like project for energy independence.

Well, the President's idea of sacrifice, he said, "Brian, that is not true. The American people have sacrificed. After 9/11, our economy was hurt, so American people sacrificed. And they pay taxes. They pay a lot of taxes, Brian."

That was it. That was the sacrifice he was asking. Now, if he had been a little more forthcoming, he might have said, "Now, Brian, they pay taxes. They pay a lot of taxes, although actually they pay less taxes since 9/11, thanks to me, so the sacrifice really is they pay less taxes. That is their contribution."

And you have to ask, where are the Rosie the Riveters? Who is being called upon? These troops of ours that are doing these multiple rotations, they are sacrificing and their families are sacrificing. But what have the rest of us been asked to do? And in this body, I would think at a minimum we could move forward with far-reaching legislation to wean ourselves from reliance on fossil fuels. We could initiate real oversight with vigor. These are the kind of new directions we need to take this country in.

I yield now to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, DAVID SCOTT, a fellow Blue Dog member, who has been such a superb voice on these issues.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Mr. SCHIFF. Of course, it is great to be here with you again, and my good friend CHRIS VAN HOLLEN from

Maryland. He is a tremendous advocate for national security. I have enjoyed his opening remarks and very thought-provoking remarks. And certainly it is always good to be on the floor with our leader, STENY HOYER, who has long been a champion of national security. That is certainly the issue today.

This is the issue that is on the minds of the American people. This is prime time, national security. We have got to make sure the American people not only feel safe, but we guarantee that they are safe. We have the capacity to do that.

As I stand here, I was observing the remarks earlier about the contributions that the great State of Maryland and all of our great States have made to our strong defense and national security, and certainly I am proud to say that Georgia, my State, is certainly at the head of the list on that as well.

I stand here on the shoulders of some great folks who have been strong on national security and helped to secure this country and make us the superior military power that we are, men like Senator Sam Nunn and Senator Richard Russell from my fine State of Georgia. I stand here on the shoulders of those great Democratic leaders who have led the way.

Mr. SCHIFF. If I can interject, Mr. SCOTT, because I don't want to do any disservice to the great State of Georgia, a couple other superb Members who are contemporaries of ours, JIM MARSHALL and JOHN BARROW, great, great advocates and leaders on national security. JIM MARSHALL is a decorated war veteran. So Georgia has got more than its share.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Absolutely. JIM and I have traveled overseas together. He was a decorated war veteran from Vietnam. So we stand tall as Democrats when it comes to national security, without any question.

I want to start my remarks off, because I think today will go down in history as a very profound day, starting with the United Nations. Today presented some very interesting pictures as we watched television. Two speeches, of course, stand out on this day.

I don't think I can remember in history when the President of the United States addressed the United Nations, but yet one of our chief adversaries, one of which he labeled one of the "axis of evil," the President of Iran, Ahmadinejad, came in prime time, while the President spoke earlier, not in prime time.

I am wondering how we got to this point? Where did this president of Iran come from? Five years ago we had never heard of him. Certainly I hadn't. But here he is at the United Nations, in fact upstaging our President. If I were working at the White House, I certainly would not have allowed the President of the United States to be over there on the same day. I felt that was very, very interesting.

It might do us a little good to understand how we got to this point, and the

way we do that, I think, is to start off this discussion by clearly pointing out to the American people something that they are gradually beginning to see, and that is this, that we are fighting two distinct wars; one war is on terror, the other war is in Iraq.

One war is of necessity. It was necessary. That is the war on terror, which is where we went into Afghanistan to go after the terrorist organization that attacked us on 9/11. That was a war of necessity, and we went there because that is where the enemy was that attacked us. That is where al Qaeda was. That is where bin Laden was, on that border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. We got the support of NATO and we got the support of the government of Afghanistan, with their help, and we went in there.

But then we went into Iraq, and we went into Iraq on a lot of manufactured, now we know the truth, incomplete information, maybe false information, perhaps even manipulated information. Those are the facts. That is what is out there. But, nonetheless, we went into Iraq in a war of choice.

Now we need to do a cost-benefit analysis, which brings me to the point I wanted to get to earlier, to segue back in, to show these two connecting points of what happened today, where the President of the United States is upstaged by the President of Iran, a president we did not even know about 5 years ago.

But when you do the cost-benefit analysis on the war of choice, which is the war in Iraq, not the war on terror, which is the war of necessity in Afghanistan, and do a cost-benefit analysis, in other words, look at our cost: 2,600 soldiers, men and women who gave their lives, who were killed; nearly 20,000 wounded; over \$600 billion expended at a rate of \$3 billion every week. That is the cost.

Who benefited? Who benefited? Who benefited? Iraq. When we went into Afghanistan, although we went in on the war on terror, we went after the Taliban, doing, again, Iraq's bidding. That was their enemy.

When we went into Iraq, without question the chief beneficiary of that was Iran. They were the beneficiaries, because Saddam Hussein was their worst blood enemy. We did the dirty work for Iran. On the other account, we established a Shia regime there, a Shia government in Iraq. That, again, was a benefit to Iran.

□ 2210

They were able to control that.

The other thing, all the while we are doing this, they are busy developing their nuclear capacity so that now that they have the nuclear capacity, again, a checkmate and a benefit for Iraq.

So that now my point is simply that because of some of our policies, most definitely going into Iraq, the major beneficiary of our going into Iraq is Iran, which now is boosted on the stage and is here this day, in this country, at

the United Nations, giving a speech. And here is a man who is the sponsor of the very terrorist organization that controlled the Lebanon situation, as well as the Hamas, which controls the Palestinian.

All I am simply saying is our national security policies, our foreign policies have had a devastating impact, and that when we do the cost/benefit analysis, it certainly benefits Iraq. It has taken us away from pursuing the goal of finding and decapitating the head of the mastermind of the terrorist organization that came to destroy us.

That is why the American people are beginning to see this differentiation, and we are not going to be able to find our way out of this unless we finally do so we can understand exactly what this situation in Iraq is doing, and like you, we are not standing here just talking. We are standing here explaining how we earnestly feel as Americans, strong, patriotic Americans, who care about this country, and who resent the President of the United States saying that anytime we question that, we are not patriotic. We are doing our duty that the American people sent us up here to do to raise these important issues.

We cannot stay the course, not this course. Sixty-three percent of the American people say they want a new direction. It is up to Democrats to provide that direction.

The other issue which concerns me is the state of our military. Not only must we explain to the American people and help to dramatize and explain clearly and show how we are dealing with two distinct wars, one of necessity, one of choice, but the drain on the military, we have got to correct that. Our military is in a draining state. We are not meeting our recruiting goals. We are on two and three tours of duty there.

We are in a terrible hole in Iraq, and we have got to extricate ourselves out of it. The challenge is to do so with yet the dignity and the respect that we must do so to honor the sacrifice of our men and women who have given their lives there, while at the same time putting the responsibility on the Iraqis themselves to manifest their destiny. They want democracy. We cannot shove it at them with a gun. They have to feel it in their soul. They have to go forward and grab it. That is not happening, and that is what we have to do to get this moving forward in a way that gives the respect to our military who have given their lives there.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman very much for your comments, for your leadership on this issue. It has been a great pleasure and honor to share a few thoughts with you and our colleague Mr. VAN HOLLEN and our whip Mr. HOYER. Once again, I want to thank the great State of Georgia for sending you to Congress.

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHMIDT). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to come back before the House as representative of the majority party. And as I was sitting and listening to the tail end of my good friends on the other side of the aisle with their recitation of doom and gloom, Madam Speaker, I was reminded of a radio personality who has a wonderful program on daily. He comes on and he introduces his program by saying, "And now for the rest of the story."

So, Madam Speaker, I come before you tonight and before the House with another version of the Official Truth Squad. The Official Truth Squad began a little over a year ago with a group of freshmen Republicans in the United States House of Representatives who had, frankly, grown tired of the lack of response to the disinformation and the misinformation and the distortion and the demagoguery and the hyperbole that we hear over and over and over on the House floor. And, Madam Speaker, you have been treated to a particularly virulent form of that kind of disinformation and misinformation in the past hour.

Before I get into the comments that I had prepared for this evening to talk a little bit about national security and talk about our economy, I do want to point out a couple of items for those folks in the House who are listening and have just heard the comments on the floor.

I think it is important to make certain that we talk about the truth, and when we talk about the truth, I am reminded of Daniel Patrick Moynihan's famous quote. It is one of my favorites. Senator Moynihan was a Democratic Senator from the State of New York, and he said that everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts. Is that not true, Madam Speaker? Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts.

So I am here to point out just a few of the opinions that we have heard this evening that, in fact, bear no resemblance to the truth and bear no resemblance to fact, but that are so divisive to us as a Nation. That is what concerns me, Madam Speaker.

My background is as a physician. I came to Congress after over 20 years practicing medicine, and I knew that when I dealt with my patients and when I dealt with my colleagues, that we had to talk about the truth. We had to talk about real things. We had to talk about facts, because when you did not talk about facts, then you made the wrong diagnosis, and when you make the wrong diagnosis, somebody gets hurt. Somebody gets hurt.

So, Madam Speaker, when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not want to talk about the facts, and they do not want to talk about the

truth, then somebody gets hurt, and in this instance it is the American people. It may even be the American fiber and the American spirit, the unity of America.

What we just heard is a remarkable demonstration of disunity, of division, of folks who, I do not know how long people have been listening, but I did not hear a single solution, not one solution offered.

Churchill said that criticism is easy; it is achievement that is difficult. Another one of my favorite quotes. Criticism is easy, but achievement is difficult.

You just heard a remarkable statement, and we have had a remarkable day with our President going to the United Nations and addressing the United Nations in his annual address. Because we are the host Nation, there is a defined time for that annual address, and it occurs in second speaking order. So it happened to occur during the middle of the day today. My friends on the other side of the aisle want to attribute the fact that the President was not on prime-time television tonight to some remarkable foible of this administration. Madam Speaker, what kind of nonsense is that? What kind of distortion of the truth is that?

So when we hear these kinds of things, it really disturbs me, it saddens me, because it cheapens the debate that we have here when you have that kind of distortion.

The question was asked, how did the President of Iran get to be so strong? But one of the reasons he is so strong is because our friends on the other side of the aisle have not participated in assisting us on an energy agenda that will make it so we have American energy for Americans. There is some truth for you. The folks who continue to throw stones on the other side of the aisle constantly, and we will talk about this this evening, make it so that they put roadblocks in the way of trying to increase American independence in the area of energy.

So, Madam Speaker, in fact, I would appreciate some help from the other side of the aisle for some United Nations reform. We have had a bill on the floor of the House here to reform the United Nations, to reform the United States' participation in the United Nations.

□ 2220

And goodness knows we can't get any support from our good friends on the other side of the aisle, but they are ready, willing, and able to come down to the House floor and criticize the United States for their participation in the United Nations. Are they willing to help us solve the problem? Madam Speaker, I haven't seen that.

I also heard my friend from Maryland this evening talk about the contractors in Iraq. And he used as the font of all wisdom and knowledge about the contractors in Iraq who were hired. Madam Speaker, did you hear who he

used as the resource for all of that? You know, when we were growing up we would have to cite our resources in our papers for school and for university, and it had to be something reliable. Did you hear who we used, Madam Speaker? The Washington Post. Now there is a reliable source for you.

But when he brought that information, he didn't bring it by way of enlightenment; he brought it by way of criticism, by way of division, by way of tearing down those individuals who are working just as hard as they can to make certain that Iraq is restored and has an opportunity to become a democratic and sovereign nation on its own. Division, division, distortion, demagoguery,

misinformation, disinformation. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Maryland to apologize to the Members, to the United States citizens who are working as hard as they can in Iraq as independent contractors, risking their lives just like the military. Some of them have actually been murdered by our enemies in Iraq. So I would hope that the gentleman would reconsider what he said.

Don't you get tired of it, Madam Speaker, that kind of distortion of the fact, that kind of division? I certainly do, and I know my constituents do at home. They get tired of the fighting, of the backbiting. They get tired of three or four individuals who can stand up here for an hour on the floor of the House and not offer one single, one single positive solution to the challenges that confront us as a Nation. And the challenges are big; these are big challenges. They are not Republican challenges, they are not Democrat challenges, they are American challenges.

And so, Madam Speaker, I am pleased to come and have the opportunity at the pleasure of the leadership to be able to come and talk a little bit about some positive things about America, some positive things that we have done, but also to provide some truth. Remember Senator Moynihan's comment, everyone is entitled to their own opinions but they are not entitled to their own facts. So we would like to bring some facts tonight about a couple different areas, primarily national security because it has been talked about just recently, and the issue of the economy, the economic perspective in our Nation. And I think it is extremely important that when we discuss this, that again we remember that truth and facts are important. And so I am going to present some information here that I hope that Members of the House are listening to. I hope that they are listening to, and, frankly, I hope that the American people are listening, because there is some information that I think that they will be extremely, extremely interested in, especially when we talk about votes as it relates to issues on the floor of the House.

So the Official Truth Squad is pleased to be able to come and talk a little bit about national security and about the economy.

Now, there is certainly no more important function of the Federal Government than the security of the American people. And Republicans, as everyone knows, have always been committed to national security. Our Nation's defense, our Homeland Security and border control and the global war on terror are not just priorities for this administration, but they are indeed priorities for all House Republicans. And if there were ever any question in anyone's mind about whether or not we are a Nation that remains at risk because of enemies around the world, then all one has to do is look to a very recent activity in England where the United States, along with our good friends in Great Britain and friends in Pakistan, were able to thwart a plan by our enemies, by our enemies who have sworn to make certain they end our way of life. We were able to thwart a plan to bring down many, many airliners that would kill thousands, thousands of innocent civilians.

So it is clear that the global war on terror is indeed a huge priority. It is a priority for us. I would hope that it would be a priority for all Members of the House. However, the Democrats continue to try to obstruct our security plans, and they have been essentially a party of "no," with no alternative plans to meet our security needs. And I would ask, Madam Speaker, folks to remember just the hour that we have just heard by our good friends on the other side of the aisle, and try to recollect one single solution that was offered. Madam Speaker, I suspect that you, like I, can't remember it, because in fact there were no solutions that were offered.

For instance, Democrats have called time and time again for the redeployment of our troops. And there was a commentator or an interviewer on television recently who asked a member of the Democrat Caucus, where do you want them redeployed to? And he couldn't come up with an answer. But occasionally they will come up with an answer, and oftentimes they will say, well, they ought to be able to redeploy to Okinawa. Well, now there is a thought, Madam Speaker, redeploy the troops from Iraq to Okinawa. If you take a look at the globe, the port of Newport News and Norfolk is closer to Iraq than Okinawa. So redeployment of troops to Okinawa makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

Now, the other side of the aisle, the Democrats are certainly good at saying no, but they are not good at laying forth alternative plans. What they don't seem to understand is the magnitude of the threat of terrorism or indeed what is at stake. Their leader has been quoted as saying, "We don't even have a party position on the war." This is certainly evidenced by their inability to present a plan for combating terrorism in this remarkably difficult and changed post-9/11 world.

There is one Democrat leader who has in fact said that the global war on

terror isn't really all that relevant. Can you imagine, Madam Speaker, we have the remarkable activities in England just last month, the knowledge and understanding that our enemy is making plans day in and day out to try to kill innocent civilians across all free nations, to try to do their best to make certain that we end our way of life, that they end our way of life, and we have a Democrat leader in this House who says that the global war on terror isn't really all that relevant. Well, with a stance like that, our leader says, with a stance like that, it is easy to see why Capitol Hill Democrats have no record of accomplishment on national security issues and lack a coherent agenda on the biggest challenge of the day.

Just this month, House Republicans will continue to focus our floor action on important security issues. We will be authorizing the President's Terror Surveillance Program, which is designed to identify and disrupt terror cells planning to attack against the United States. This is the kind of program that was utilized to assist in the activities that foiled the plot in England.

Now, when I go home, Madam Speaker, I don't know about you, but when I go home and I talk to my constituents and they say, what on Earth are you all arguing about? How can it be that anybody in this Nation believes that we as a Nation don't have the responsibility, in fact don't have the absolute imperative to make certain that we are listening and hearing and determining what our enemies are saying if they are outside the United States? I have significant concern on privacy issues when you are talking about communication between a United States citizen in the United States and another United States citizen in the United States. That is a different issue, Madam Speaker. And when individuals confuse and confound those two, they do a disservice to every single American.

□ 2230

The issue is not whether or not that kind of communication is protected. The issue is, in fact, whether or not we, as elected representatives of constituents all across this Nation, will respond to what they believe, our constituents believe, Americans all across this Nation, is an imperative for our government to do, and that is to have a terrorism surveillance program that lets us know what the bad guys are going to do before they do it. Clearly that is the most effective means of combating the war on terror, is to make certain we know what our enemy is going to do before they do it and then stop them before they do it.

In the House this month, we will be authorizing military tribunals for suspected terrorists. These are noncitizens fighting under any flag. These are terrorists. They have proclaimed to kill you and me and end our way of life as

a Nation. They are not fighting for a nation. They have never signed the Geneva Accords themselves. These are evil people who must be dealt with by different rules. This is unlike any war the world has ever seen. That is not to say that they ought to be treated inhumanely, but they need to be treated with different rules in order for us to gain the kind of information that we need, in addition to being able to hold these people who are interested in doing us great, great harm, great harm.

This month the House Republicans have passed a resolution to recognize the 5-year anniversary of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. As I go through these, I think it is important for Members of the House as well as Americans all across the Nation to appreciate as these votes come up, watch where the votes go, watch who is supporting these commonsense protections for the American people.

A resolution recognizing the 5-year anniversary of the 9/11 attack, we even had some Members on the other side of the aisle vote against that. They objected strenuously that it came to the floor of the House for a vote.

Strengthening border security. We had a debate on building a fence along the southern border to make sure that our Nation is secure. This week we will deal with some issues that will provide for allowing local law enforcement individuals, both State and local, the right and privilege to detain and retain illegals who come under their jurisdiction until the Federal Government comes and is able to deport them. Right now that is not the case. We will have a bill on the floor that will once and for all end the catch-and-release program that has been operating at the border.

I ask the American people to watch who is voting on these issues. There is no reason on Earth that we ought to apprehend an individual coming across our border illegally and then give him a piece of paper and say, you have to come back in 90 days and we will try you. They just blend into society.

A catch-and-release program does not work. There are over 400,000 individuals who have already in this Nation gone through the process. They were here illegally, they are found to be guilty of another crime and been ordered deported, and yet they are told to come back and report for their deportation date. And the catch-and-release program does not make any sense.

We will have on the floor this week a bill to provide for a catch-and-return policy, which means if they are apprehended coming into our Nation illegally, they are returned to their country of origin.

There was the discovery once again of another tunnel between San Diego or the San Diego area and Mexico. Apparently it was some 400 feet long, and it was used to smuggle drugs and contraband and illegals into the United States. That was just discovered. We

will have a bill on the floor to strengthen the laws as it relates to the building of tunnels for the purpose of bringing drugs and smuggling aliens in.

We will have on the floor funding and protecting American troops, the defense authorization conference report, and defense and military quality of life appropriations conference reports, and then homeland security conference reports which will provide that funding for border security and for the barriers that I talked about.

And it is extremely important to watch who is voting for these things and who is opposing them. Oftentimes what we find is that individuals will say one thing at home, and then they come to Washington, and there is something in the air here that makes them do something different. We respectfully request that folks watch and see who is voting for what.

On the issue of border security, maintaining the integrity of our borders is an economic and a security concern. Americans are worried about the vulnerabilities at our borders, and House Republicans have passed several pieces of legislation to strengthen our borders, put more technology and personnel at the borders, and develop systems to ascertain who crosses the border and for what purposes. We need to know who is coming in to our Nation.

The Republican plan for border security focuses on providing more Border Patrol agents, strengthening security through additional fencing and infrastructure, stricter enforcement, and enhancing State and local law enforcement authority. These are the foundations that must be set before we can begin the next step of immigration reforms. It is imperative, the American people are demanding, that we put our priorities first on controlling the border, making certain we know who is coming into our Nation.

It ought not surprise anybody to get a little truth now, and that is that the Democrats have not supported the efforts to secure our borders. We passed the REAL ID Act, the act that provide for an appropriate form of identification for people traveling on an airplane. This would go a long way in identifying individuals here illegally, and 152 Democrats voted "no," including the top two members of their leadership. They voted against the REAL ID Act.

We passed the Border Protection Antiterrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act, which was the bill that has been proclaimed by those individuals who truly know and appreciate what it is going to take to control and secure our border. They believe it is the most appropriate bill that has come through Congress, certainly more appropriate than the version that came out of the Senate. But on that bill, 164 Democrats oppose that bill, including the top two in their leadership.

So folks may say one thing at home, and when they come to Washington, they oftentimes do something completely different.

On our Nation's defense, people who fight for our freedom must be fully supported. The House Armed Services Committee and our Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and Military Quality of Life have concentrated their efforts on making certain that we meet those needs, as well as helping transform the Department of Defense to meet the threats for the next century.

In the area of intelligence reform, this is where I talked about making certain that we know what the bad guys are going to do it before they do it. Republicans have worked with the administration and intelligence agencies to help transform our intelligence-gathering capabilities and analyzing system. Rather than accept that we need to focus our efforts on this kind of reform, Democrats instead want to focus on just attacking the administration. You hear it over and over again.

Madam Speaker, it is like a broken record. They have tried to discredit the terrorist surveillance program that we talked about and other policies which have helped protect our Nation from further attack. It is not a mistake or just a happenstance that we as a Nation have not been attacked since 9/11. There are incredible individuals working day and night to make certain that we are safe as a Nation.

The 9/11 Recommendations Implementation Act that was proposed in 2004, these are the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission that you hear people talking about on the other side of the aisle all the time and that we should implement them. We had the bill that implemented a significant portion of those, and what happened? A majority, 125 Democrats, including their leader, voting to oppose it, voted "no" to implement significant recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

So, Madam Speaker, remember, you are entitled to your own opinions, but are not entitled to your own facts.

The global war on terrorism is truly the most important activity, most important war of our generation, and it is a war like no other, as we have talked about. It is fought on many different levels: military, intelligence, economic, technology, cyberworld, Internet, all corners of the Earth.

Again, this is not a war that we sought. We didn't go out looking for this. It has been brought to our shores and brought to us, and there are terrorists out there who truly want to kill us, and they say that explicitly.

□ 2240

If you don't believe me, you just ought to listen to them. They are interested in murdering and killing innocent civilians and ending our way of life. If we do not take their words seriously and take them at their word, we do so at our peril. It is the simple and horrible truth, Madam Speaker. We must face this fact and employ all efforts, all efforts, to thwart their many attempts.

Oftentimes the Democrats will talk a good game on protecting the homeland;

but when push come to shove, they certainly demonstrate that they don't understand the real issues that affect our homeland and our national security. Again, they have been the loud party of "no," with no alternative plans to meet our security needs. And although we still cannot fully understand why the terrorists hate our way of life so much, we do understand this much: that we are in a real war.

Almost 5 years after the attacks on 9/11, Islamic extremist groups, jihadists, continue to represent the most immediate threat to the United States and to our allies and to our interests abroad. And at the urging of Osama bin Laden, every American man, woman, and child has become a legitimate target in their jihad. And, again, this is their words. It is not our conjecture. It is not our opinion. It is truth. It is fact.

Now, we are blessed with an absolutely outstanding military that has taken the battle to the enemy, and it is extremely important that we fight these battles at their point of origin. We have many good and faithful allies all around the globe, and we have taken that fight forward, supporting the governments of Iraq and Afghanistan in rooting out the enemy before he can strike again. And we are cooperating with friendly forces from the Philippines to Africa and from the Middle East to South America. And we are united. We are united against this threat.

But the United States, we remain a Nation at war. We are not safe simply because we have not seen an attack on U.S. soil since 9/11. We are safer today because of the professionals of the worldwide network of intelligence and military and law enforcement officials who continue to pressure and strike al Qaeda and its followers. And we must continue the pressure on these radical organizations until victory for all freedom-loving people of the world is assured. September 11, 2001, showed us the danger of Islamic jihadism, and it also taught us that deficiencies in our own system made it possible for terrorists to operate right under our noses.

Our most important duty, as Members of Congress, is to protect our Nation from ever experiencing that lesson again. And for that reason, we must, we must continue to focus on improving our national security, our homeland security, and our intelligence systems.

But, again, the fact of the matter is the Democrats do not seem to understand that the threat of terrorism exists or even what is at stake. Remember what their leader said, they do not even have a party position on the war and an individual in their leadership said they didn't think the global war on terror was really all that relevant.

Recently, just a couple weeks ago, their leader, in a press conference, made a stunning and contradictory assessment that capturing Osama bin Laden, the leader of al Qaeda, the ter-

rorist organization responsible for numerous attacks against the United States, including those of 9/11, would "not make America any safer." "Even if he's caught tomorrow, she said, "I don't think that makes us any safer."

Now, with a stance like that, it is easy to see why Capitol Hill Democrats have no record of accomplishment on national security or their issues and that they lack a coherent agenda on the biggest challenge of the day for this Congress and, yes, this Nation.

As I mentioned, they have called for implementing the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. Over and over they have called, but repeatedly Capitol Hill Democrats have opposed legislation implementing the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission meant to strengthen America's national security and to prevent further attacks.

The 9/11 Commission said: "The government has made significant strides in using terrorism financing as an intelligence tool." So what happened on House Resolution 895, the legislation supporting intelligence and law enforcement programs that track terrorists and condemn with proper congressional oversight the publication of any classified information that could potentially impair the fight against terrorism, that is, implementing one of the 9/11 Commission recommendations? What happened? 174 Democrats voted "no." 174 voted "no."

They call for the immediate implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. One of the 9/11 Commission recommendations was: "The READ ID Act has established statute standards for State-issued IDs acceptable for Federal purposes, though States' compliance needs to be closely monitored." What happened with that bill that the 9/11 Commission said was a wise idea and ought to be adopted? 152 of our friends on the other side of the aisle voted "no." 152.

They talk about immediately implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations. A quote from the 9/11 Commission: "The House and Senate have taken positive steps, but Secretary Chertoff and his team still report to too many bosses. The House and Senate Homeland Security Committees should have exclusive jurisdiction over all counterterrorism functions of the Department of Homeland Security." That is a recommendation of the 9/11 Commission, a recommendation that our good friends say ought to be immediately implemented. So when the proposal comes up to do just that, a majority, 120 of them, vote "no."

Madam Speaker, you are entitled to your own opinions, but you are not entitled to your own facts.

So in the area of national security, I think it is clear. There is a party, there are leaders in this Congress on the Republican side of the aisle who understand the threat, understand the gravity of the situation, understand and appreciate that we have a real enemy, understand and appreciate that that real

enemy is interested in causing significant harm to our Nation and in murdering innocent civilians, and we are taking actions day in and day out, including this week, to make certain that we are more safe and more secure as a Nation.

So I challenge and call on my friends on the other side of the aisle to join us. Don't just talk about it. Don't just come down here and paint doom and gloom. There are people here who are working hard. Remember what Churchill said? "Criticism is easy. Achievement is difficult." "Achievement is difficult." So join us. You might find that being part of the solution instead of just railing against the individuals who are in positions of leadership now is actually beneficial, that your constituents actually appreciate the work that you are doing in a bipartisan manner. Boy, wouldn't that be wonderful? We certainly would welcome you to participate.

Madam Speaker, I talked about the concern that the Official Truth Squad has about all of the disinformation and the misinformation that goes on, and I was looking a little over a year ago for a quote. I am a fan of quotes. I enjoy quotes, and I think that oftentimes individuals in history have given us great perspective on our Nation and great perspective on our principles and the roots of our Nation. And the "politics of division" really irritates me, and I think it does a disservice to our Nation because we are so strong and we are united as a Nation.

But the other side of the aisle seems intent on tearing down, on dividing. You have heard some of it this evening. The extending tax cuts for millionaires you heard tonight and all sorts of remarkable divisive statements. The comment about the contractors in Iraq was a divisive statement, where we have hardworking American citizens who are putting their lives at risk and they get criticized in order for some divisive purpose, to try to gain some political points. Madam Speaker, it is just disheartening to hear that kind of conversation, and it does a disservice to our Nation.

When I attempted to find a quote that would crystallize that emotion, I came across this one, the Reverend William Boetcker, who was a leader and a public speaker in the late 19th and early 20th century. He was trying to crystallize the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln in his social philosophy, and it is one of my favorite quotes. He said: "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot encourage the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred."

□ 2250

You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and

courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. And you cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves.

And so, Madam Speaker, I turn now to addressing the issue of vision and addressing the issue of the economy. House Republicans have realized, certainly do realize the importance of developing and having a vision to focus our efforts and to ensure that we address what is important for the American people. And we came together and highlighted a vision earlier this year that would address this new American century. And we came up with the following vision. We will promote dignity and future of every individual. It is important to talk about the individual. Madam Speaker, often times you hear the folks on the other side of the aisle talk about groups of folks. And again they like to separate people into groups so that they can divide and conquer.

But it is the individual, it is the individual who makes things great. So we will promote the dignity and the future of every individual by building a free society, under a limited, accountable government that protects our liberty, our security, and our prosperity for a brighter American dream.

Now, the Democrats had no such vision. Again, they are the "party of no," they have got no plan to lead the Nation. That is a dangerous way to try to take over the majority of the House of Representatives. And it is clear. We heard it again tonight. Their actions are guided by politics and discrediting the administration over and over again rather than focusing on a positive agenda for the American people.

Again that is the kind of information and the kind of requests that I get at home when I talk to my constituents about a passion for a positive agenda for America. Because, we are a great, great Nation. And we work so well together when we work unified. And that is what folks at home tell me that they would desire, that we move together forward in unity.

Now, I want to talk a little bit about our economy. And I think it is important to appreciate that our economy today is truly remarkably strong. And the numbers prove that. Our Nation has bounced back from the blow that the economy took following the attacks of 9/11. Our unemployment is low. Home ownership across all sectors of our society is the highest it has ever been.

And recently, as I know in your home state, Madam Speaker, the gas prices are falling. Now, we got a lot of criticism for the gas prices going up, so we ought to take a fair amount of credit for them coming down. The most recent economic numbers are truly remarkable.

Although this chart is a little old, the trends are absolutely accurate and correct. Unemployment. The Employment gains continue. 128,000 new pay-

roll jobs were created in August, A total of 5.7 million new jobs since August of 2003.

The unemployment rate is at a point, at a level of 4.7 percent, 4.7 percent. I know that there are some economist amongst our midst who understand and appreciate that full employment is basically 5 percent, used to be 6 percent a number of decades ago, but they revised it downward to 5 percent being full employment. That means that basically folks who are interested having a job have a job.

GDP growth for the second quarter was revised up to 2.9 from an earlier estimate of 2.5 percent. Gasoline prices have fallen recently with the average regular unleaded gasoline falling to below \$2.70 a gallon. I know in my area it is \$2.22 cents when I drove to the airport this morning to come here.

Oil apparently today was down to less than \$62 a barrel, which is a significant move downward. And, Madam Speaker, this is due, these numbers are due to the policies put in place by this Republican Congress and our effort to spur the economy and lay the foundation for the economy of the next century.

Now, elections are coming up. I know that is a surprise to some. But if you heard the kind of comments made earlier on the floor this evening you can tell that elections are coming up. But the American people understand that elections are about choices, and they are about the future. And there is a clear choice between Republicans who are working to enact serious reforms that will grow our economy, and reduce the deficit, and Capitol Hill Democrats who are interested in spending more of America's taxpayer dollars on wasteful Government programs as they see fit.

Now, I want to point out two things on this and the next poster. This poster here has the years down on the lower portion here, 2000-2006. And it has, this blue line here is the number of new jobs created, the number of new jobs created. And since August of 2003, this has 5.3, it is actually 5.7 million new jobs created in that period of time.

There is a vertical dotted green line here. And that vertical dotted green line marks the point where the tax decreases, the appropriate and fair tax decreases for the American people were enacted by this administration and by this Congress. And since that point, what you have seen, again, here is jobs growth going down. Tax decreases put into place, and jobs go up.

These red bars are business investment in these quarters. See business investment down, which means a slower economy, not as many jobs, not as much economic activity or growth. What happens when appropriate, fair tax decreases are put in place? The economy flourishes. No mistake about it. It occurs every time that significant tax reduction is put in place, has been put in place over the last 50 years in our Nation.

President Kennedy knew it. It occurred when he instituted appropriate tax decreases. President Reagan knew it. It occurred when he instituted tax decreases, and occurred with president George W. Bush with the appropriate tax decreases of 2003.

Now, I think it is important to appreciate that the other side truly has no plan for the economy. In fact they have not proposed any plans to address the mandatory programs, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, those things that are on automatic pilot that now comprise about 54 percent of the budget, and unless they are addressed in relatively short order they will cause a significantly greater drain on the economy, decrease the economic growth and activity that we have seen.

The other side is literally blind and has not proposed any proposals to improve or to reform those spending programs. In fact, what they have done is to propose in the last fiscal year 2006 budget, these were their proposals, these were the things that they actually did write down and bring to committees and bring to the floor of the House, new spending to the tune of \$21.5 billion, and new taxes, new taxes to the tune of \$54 billion with again no savings, no savings in Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, those items that if nothing is doing to those three items by 2030, they will consume the entire budget, the entire budget.

So it is not something that you can just say, well, do not worry about it, we do not have to do anything to those items because they will take care of themselves.

Over the past 4 years, if the Democrats had been in control, they talk about their desire to take control of the House and to lead, well, what would have happened if they would have been in control for the last 4 years and had their proposals put in place?

If they had been in control, discretionary spending would have increased by over \$106 billion. Amazingly, although they talk a good game, they have voted consistently against any significant budget reform efforts.

The Deficit Reduction Act, that bill that was passed earlier this bill that saved approximately \$40 billion, \$40 billion saved, the Democrats unanimously, unanimously voted against that bill, the Deficit Reduction Act.

In fact, one of their leaders was heard to say something like, we are not going to give them a single vote on this, and said it with great pride. Again, that is that politics of division, that desire to not be productive, to not be positive about solutions as they come forward here in the Congress.

□ 2300

What about the line item veto? When I go home, I hear folks talk about budgetary improvements we could make here in Washington. Many of them ask about the line item veto, why can't we allow the administration, any

administration, to pick those items in the budget and say no, we ought not be spending money on that specific item. Good idea. I have supported it. The vast majority of my colleagues on the Republican side have supported it.

What happened when the bill came here to the floor for a vote? Well, Madam Speaker, the vote occurred earlier this year, rollcall vote 317, and the number of individuals on their side of the aisle supporting it, 35. The vast majority, 156, voting no.

That is the line item veto. That is one of those proposals that you hear them talk about all the time, wanting to make certain that the line item veto is passed. But when given the opportunity, when given the opportunity to stand up and say yes, that is exactly what we want to do, what do they say? No. "No, we don't believe that we ought to have that kind of reform," even though that is what they say when they go home.

Earmark reform. What about earmark reform? We had the Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act. These are the special projects put into bills. We have had a couple of votes on this.

The first one that we had earlier, H.R. 4975, 192 Democrats vote no, including their top two members of their leadership.

Recently all it was was a sunshine bill. It said that if you are going to put a special project into the budget, that you ought to put your name beside it. I had a bill that I called "sunshine for earmarks." It said that if you are going to have a special project in an appropriations bill, that you ought to have to put your name beside it so that your constituents know you put it in there and they can look at it and say yes, this is what we want our Member of Congress to do, or no, we don't think that is something that he or she ought to be doing, so the colleagues here, Members' colleagues in the House, can know where these kinds of requests are coming from. It is important. It is important to have that kind of sunshine.

It is a simple, simple proposal. It is important for the press to know so that when they are providing their oversight of the fourth estate, that in fact they know who has put these items in.

So what kind of vote did we get? Again, this is a proposal that they talk about all the time. "If we could just have some earmark reform." So we bring it to the floor, call for a vote, it passes because the vast majority of colleagues on my side of the aisle, our side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle supported it. But what did those folks on the other side do? 147 of them, the vast majority voted no, including 15 ranking members. These are Members who are the most senior members on the committees in the United States House of Representatives. These are the individuals, if the other side were to by some chance take over and gain the majority, these are the individuals who would be chairmen. They would be chairs of the committees.

And what do they say with their vote, the vast majority? They say no, we don't want earmark reform. We don't want special project reform. We may say we do, but we really don't. We don't believe it in so much that when given the opportunity to vote for it, they vote no. And the leadership, what did the leadership do? Voted no. That is what they did on the other side of the aisle.

So, Madam Speaker, every single Member, every single individual is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts, and these are the facts about who is truly interested in budgetary reform and earmark reform.

To make matters worse, they are more than eager to raise your taxes. You hear the code words, and the code words recently have become "shared sacrifice." Have you heard that, Madam Speaker, "shared sacrifice?"

What that means is raising your taxes, because they believe that they know how to spend your money better than you. That is one of the principles that they have about how they plan to grow the government, how they plan to cover all these special projects and programs that they wish to have adopted. That would have not only a horrible impact on the economy, but it would also give them even more revenue, increased revenue in the government to spend.

Madam Speaker, when I hear the other side talk, if you just listen to them, you get so doggone depressed. But I am optimistic about the future of this Nation. I am optimistic about this economy.

The United States has the number one economy in the world, and in order to assure that vibrant economy in the 21st century, we in the House have focused on a comprehensive set of policies and incentives that will build on a solid economic foundation.

This won't be accomplished by Federal funds though, because Federal funds don't solve that kind of challenge. That is done by private capital. The private sector, not government bureaucrats, know how money should be spent, what resources are needed and what type of training workers will require. Unfortunately, unfortunately, there are way too many government roadblocks that stand in the way of business development and that deter investment, both here and abroad.

There are steps that we can take and we will take to restore our Nation's competitiveness and ensure that America remains the land of opportunity. We are not the status quo party. The Republicans are not the status quo party. We are the party of change, we are the party of vision, we are the party of entrepreneurship, we are the party of individual responsibility, we are the party of success.

So we will work to address health care security, termination of bureaucratic red tape, lifelong learning, trade fairness and opportunity, tax relief and

simplification, energy self-sufficiency and security, innovation and investment, and ending lawsuit abuse and litigation management.

I tell you, Madam Speaker, that is an agenda that the American people can be proud of. It is an agenda that the American people can embrace with enthusiasm, with optimism, with passion, not with a dour look on your face and say "woe is me, isn't the world awful."

These are the exciting kind of proposals. These are exciting proposals that we will put forward before the House as we continue our leadership, our strong leadership, to bring about increasing American competitiveness.

For 3 years, House Republicans have promoted the House economic competitiveness agenda. This year alone we have passed over 39 pieces of legislation that will help make America more competitive. We have real solutions. Republicans offer real solutions. We invite our colleagues to join us in moving America forward and providing an opportunity for the United States businesses and working families.

But instead, they have no plan, and instead of working with us at the committee level or on the House floor, the Democrats have tried to undermine the economic competitiveness agenda over and over and over again.

Again, their so-called innovative agenda is not innovative. It is a call for increased government spending, presumably fueled by increased taxes. In response to our economic agenda, at so many different points they have been nothing but obstructionists over and over again.

For example, college access for all. They say they are for expanding access to college, yet they voted against the College Access and Opportunity Act, 181 of them, including the top two leaders in their party, 181 of them voted against the College Access and Opportunity Act.

Energy independence, Democrats say they want to end our dependence on foreign oil, and yet they try to obstruct every single plan to access America's own oil and natural gas reserves, such as tapping into ANWR and the OCS.

The Energy Policy Act, 183 Democrats, including their top two leaders, voted no. Refinery Permit Process Schedule Act, 176 Democrats, including their top two leaders, voted no. And the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act, 156 Democrats, including their top two leaders, voted no.

Affordable health care, a difficult challenge for so many large and small businesses around our Nation, Democrats say they want to help employers provide health insurance to their employees. But they vote against every single measure to do so. The HEALTH Act, 185 Democrats, including their top two leaders, voted no. Small Business Health Fairness Act, 165 Democrats, including their top two leaders, voted no. And recently, the Health Information Technology Promotion Act, something

that would truly streamline health care for our Nation, 139 Democrats, including their top two leaders, voted no. So, Madam Speaker, it truly is a remarkable contrast between the two parties.

I want to put up one more chart, because when you think about what would happen if the other side were in fact to be in the majority, I get questions at home, what would they do? What would they do?

Again, elections are about choices and they are about the future, and to determine what they would do, all you have to do is look at the legislation that they have proposed, the legislation they proposed. I presume that is what they would do, don't you, Madam Speaker?

□ 2310

The top two bills that they have proposed, H. Res. 635 and H. Res. 636, the first step in impeaching President Bush resolution and the second step in impeaching President Bush resolution.

Madam Speaker, I do not believe that the American people are interested in leadership in this House of Representatives that has as its number one priority the impeachment of the President of the United States. That is not what the American people are interested in.

What else are they interested in? H.R. 4683, the Federal Health Care System Government-Run Health Care Act. House Democrats want to create a Federal health care system without choices, which would combine the efficiency of the Department of Motor Vehicles and the compassion of the IRS, and they would tax Americans to get to it. They would amend the Social Security Act, the bill would, to impose on the income of every individual a tax equal to 1.7 percent of wages received, and on every employer an excise tax of 7 percent of the wages paid to each employee, and on the self-employment income of every individual a tax equal to the applicable percentage of the self-employment income for such taxable year. Who cosponsors that? Ranking Democrats, remember, the individuals who would be chairmen of the committees, ranking Democrats and senior members of the Democrat Caucus.

Madam Speaker, I do not think that is what Americans are bargaining for. That is not what I hear my constituents say they want when I go home and talk to them which is every single week. They are not interested in the Federal Government running health care.

H.R. 1018, it is called the Permanent Welfare Housing Act. I call it the welfare reform repeal Act. Public housing, this bill would remove provisions that residents of public housing are required to participate in 8 hours per month of either community service or economic self-sufficiency activities in order to retain their public housing. Who are the sponsors? The ranking Democrats, remember folks who would be chair-

men of these committees, and multiple, multiple senior Democrat Members.

Madam Speaker, one of the most incredible and productive and positive pieces of legislation that has passed through this Congress in the past 12 years has been welfare reform. It has put literally millions of Americans back to work, to be productive citizens, to have pride in what they are doing, to believe that they have some worth and they have some input into the productivity of this Nation. What is it that the other side wants to do? Well, they want to repeal portions of it that would provide that kind of sense of accomplishment and sense of participation.

So, Madam Speaker, Republicans understand that it is the American people who built this Nation, American people who built this economy and made this the land of opportunity. Washington's job as the people's representative is to provide national and economic security and to give each individual the freedom and the protection to pursue their American dream.

The imagination and hard work of the American people have built this wonderful and beautiful Nation, and they have made it prosperous. Our task as Members of the United States Congress is to ensure that this remains true for the next century.

Once again, the other side relies on the vague promises and big government programs to solve every perceived problem in the United States. Government is not the answer, and this philosophy, which is truly left over from previous bureaucratic administrations of the 1960s and 1970s, has only slowed down progress in our Nation every single time it has been instituted.

Madam Speaker, we live in a glorious Nation. It is a wondrous Nation, a Nation that is still seen by men and women around the world as a beacon of liberty and repository of hope. I am incredibly proud to serve in the United States House of Representatives and to have the opportunity to share this positive perspective and this positive vision with my colleagues and with the Nation as we have done tonight.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

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

Mr. MOORE of Kansas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for the week of September 18 on account of the death of his father.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COOPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOYLE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, September 20.

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

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

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and September 20.

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, September 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today and September 25.

Mr. BOUSTANY, for 5 minutes, September 21 and 22.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today and September 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WESTMORELAND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2463. An act to designate certain land in New England as wilderness for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation system and certain land as a National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Resources; in addition to the Committee on Agriculture for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on September 18, 2006, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 866. To make technical corrections to the United States Code.

H.R. 2808. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 20, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

9475. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments [USCG-2006-25150] (RIN: 1625-ZA08) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9476. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Public Assistance Eligibility [Docket ID FEMA-2006-0028] (RIN: 1660-AA45) received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9477. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of New Port of Entry at Sacramento, California; Realignment of the Port Limits of the Port of Entry at San Francisco, California [CBP Dec. 06-23] received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9478. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Captain of the Port of Zone Jacksonville, FL [COTP Jacksonville 06-164] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9479. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Confidentiality of Commercial Information [CBP Dec. 06-24] (RIN: 1651-AA57) received September

11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9480. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Yankee Homecoming Fireworks, Newburyport, MA [CGD01-06-037] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9481. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lynch Wedding Fireworks Display, Marblehead, MA [CGD01-06-061] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9482. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Vermont Air National Guard 60th Anniversary Air Show, Burlington Bay, Burlington, VT [CGD01-06-098] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9483. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Great Lakes Water Sport Expo, Buffalo Outer Harbor, Buffalo, NY [CGD09-06-117] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9484. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pentwater Homecoming Fireworks, Pentwater, MI [CGD09-06-135] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9485. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Beverly Homecoming Fireworks, Beverly, MA [CGD01-06-017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9486. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Celebrate Erie, Erie, PA [CGD09-06-146] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9487. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction Project, Construction Vessels and Equipment Under and in Immediate Vicinity of West Span, Tacoma Narrows, Gig Harbor, WA [CGD13-06-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9488. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation: Annual Dragon Boat Races, Portland, Oregon [CGD13-06-007] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9489. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Patapsco River, Inner Harbor, Baltimore, MD [CGD05-06-043] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9490. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; March of Dimes Paddle Erie, Erie, PA [CGD09-06-147] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 17, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9491. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Susquehanna River, Port Deposit, MD [CGD05-06-042] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9492. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Atlantic Ocean, Ocean City, MD [CGD05-06-064] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9493. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Event, Bogue Sound, Morehead City, North Carolina [CGD05-06-057] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9494. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; N.E. 14th Street Bridge, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1055.0, Pompano, FL [CGD07-05-162] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9495. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Duwamish Waterway, Seattle, WA [CGD13-06-015] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9496. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (Alternate Route), Great Dismal Swamp Canal, South Mills, NC [CGD05-06-017] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9497. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Townsend Gut, Boothbay and Southport, ME [CGD01-06-019] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9498. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regu-

lations, Seattle Seafair, Lake Washington, WA [CGD13-06-038] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9499. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Atlantic Ocean, Atlantic City, NJ, Change of Time [CGD05-06-037] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 5622. A bill to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EHLERS: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 4844. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require any individual who desires to register or re-register to vote in an election for Federal office to provide the appropriate State election official with proof that the individual is a citizen of the United States to prevent fraud in Federal elections, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 109-666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5811. A bill to implement the Protocol of 1997 to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 3849. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to implement pesticide-related obligations of the United States under the international conventions or protocols known as the PIC Convention, the POPs Convention, and the LRTAP POPs Protocol (Rep. 109-668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5483. A bill to increase the disability earning limitation under the Railroad Retirement Act and to index the amount of allowable earnings consistent with increases in the substantial gainful activity dollar amount under the Social Security Act (Rept. 109-669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. CAPITO: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1015. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4844) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require any individual who desires to register or re-register to vote in an election for Federal office to provide the appropriate State election official with proof that the individual is a citizen of the United States to prevent fraud in Federal elections, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-670). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of September 15, 2006]

H.R. 4777. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than September 22, 2006.

[The following action occurred on September 18, 2006]

H.R. 6054. Referral to the Committees on the Judiciary and International Relations extended for a period ending not later than September 22, 2006.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 6092. A bill to provide that no Federal funds may be used for the design, renovation, construction, or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States unless the President transmits to Congress a certification that the United Nations has adopted internationally-recognized best practices in contracting and procurement; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr.

BASS, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6093. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to require the disclosure of information relating to the fair market value and safety of damaged motor vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 6094. A bill to restore the Secretary of Homeland Security's authority to detain dangerous aliens, to ensure the removal of deportable criminal aliens, and combat alien gang crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 6095. A bill to affirm the inherent authority of State and local law enforcement to assist in the enforcement of immigration laws, to provide for effective prosecution of alien smugglers, and to reform immigration litigation procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUYER (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Ms. HERSETH):

H.R. 6096. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the Survivors' and Dependents' Educational Assistance program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr.

ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. OTTER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 6097. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow additional transit systems greater flexibility with certain mass transportation projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARROW (for himself, Mr. BOS-

WELL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MELANCON, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6098. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to eliminate funding shortfalls for the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) for fiscal year

2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 6099. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion are fully informed regarding the pain experienced by their unborn child; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 6100. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for certain servicemembers to become eligible for educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 6101. A bill to amend the Legal Services Corporation Act to provide appropriate removal procedures for the Inspector General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 6102. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Lawyers Road, NW in Vienna, Virginia, as the "Captain Christopher Petty Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. HART, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DENT, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 6103. A bill to amend the Act establishing the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area in order to include Butler County, Pennsylvania, within the boundaries of that heritage area; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FARR (for himself and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 6104. A bill to build operational readiness in civilian agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. HERSETH:

H.R. 6105. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to help ensure that no Service hospital or outpatient health facility is closed unless Congressional reporting requirements regarding the hospital or facility are current; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JINDAL (for himself, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 6106. A bill to extend the waiver authority for the Secretary of Education under title IV, section 105, of Public Law 109-148; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 6107. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of establishing an office within the Internal Revenue Service to focus on violations of the internal revenue laws by persons who are under investigation for conduct relating to commercial sex acts, to establish a Whistleblower Office within the Internal Revenue Service, and to increase the criminal monetary penalty limitations for the underpayment or overpayment of tax due to fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 6108. A bill to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to make grants to communities to be used for outreach efforts to encourage participation in the national flood insurance program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. HART, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 6109. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for enhanced protection of sensitive personal information processed or maintained by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 6110. A bill to require persons seeking Federal Energy Regulatory Commission approval for a liquefied natural gas facility to identify employees and agents engaged in activities to persuade communities of the benefits of such approval; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER:

H.R. 6111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the Tax Court may review claims for equitable innocent spouse relief and to suspend the running on the period of limitations while such claims are pending; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6112. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands in Denali National Park in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 95. A joint resolution recognizing the 66th anniversary of the Battle of Attu and the end of Imperial Japanese control of the Aleutian Islands of Alaska during World War II and urging the Secretary of the Interior to work to protect the historic sites associated with the battle and the Aleutian World War II National Historic Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.J. Res. 96. A joint resolution recognizing the contributions of the Christmas tree industry to the United States economy and urging the Secretary of Agriculture to establish programs to raise awareness of the importance of the Christmas tree industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DREIER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL, Ms. HART, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REYES, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. WYNN):

H. Con. Res. 476. Concurrent resolution supporting the observance of Breast Cancer Awareness Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARROW:

H. Res. 1014. A resolution recognizing the life of Erskine "Erk" Russell and his outstanding contributions to the University of Georgia, Georgia Southern University, the State of Georgia, and the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H. Res. 1016. A resolution encouraging all offices of the House of Representatives to hire disabled veterans; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 284: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 339: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 389: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 408: Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 475: Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 550: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 566: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 583: Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 602: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 668: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 699: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 759: Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
 H.R. 817: Mr. POE.
 H.R. 898: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 910: Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 941: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 959: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 997: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 1059: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

- H.R. 1070: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1227: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 1245: Ms. Velázquez, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1298: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1310: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1356: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 1376: Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1415: Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 1426: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1472: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1498: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1506: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1517: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1554: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1588: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 1649: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1688: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1694: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1951: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 1994: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 2051: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 2052: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2053: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2076: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2184: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2317: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2567: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 2631: Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 2716: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 2719: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 2877: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2939: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 3006: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3248: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 3326: Mr. COSTA and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 3406: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3715: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 3954: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 4033: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 4198: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4215: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 4217: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 4239: Mr. GRAVES.
H.R. 4597: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4727: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 4751: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 4824: Mr. OSBORNE.
H.R. 4830: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 4844: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 4910: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 4924: Mr. KIND, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 4992: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 5014: Mr. WEXLER and Ms. HERSETH.
H.R. 5072: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5099: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 5108: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 5148: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 5150: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 5171: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 5242: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 5291: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 5295: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 5312: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 5313: Mr. TIBBERI.
H.R. 5390: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 5399: Mr. WALSH, Mr. MICA, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 5420: Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 5436: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 5472: Mr. HALL, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIMMONS, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 5476: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 5483: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 5519: Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 5533: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 5554: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 5555: Mrs. KELLY and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 5562: Mr. MATHESON, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 5624: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 5635: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 5685: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 5704: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. TIBBERI.
H.R. 5707: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 5740: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5746: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 5755: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 5770: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5771: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 5772: Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 5817: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 5834: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STARK, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 5836: Mr. GORDON, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5844: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 5850: Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5853: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5862: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 5866: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 5890: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 5891: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 5916: Mr. OBEY.
H.R. 5929: Mr. EVANS, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WELLER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 5941: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 5948: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 5960: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 5965: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 5983: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 5989: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HYDE, Ms. BEAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. HASTERT.
H.R. 5990: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HYDE, Ms. BEAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. HASTERT.
H.R. 5992: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 6038: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 6045: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 6046: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 6054: Ms. GRANGER and Mrs. Schmidt.
H.R. 6057: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. MACK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HALL, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 6063: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 6064: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 6078: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. POE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HALL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 6080: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 6083: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OWENS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.J. Res. 58: Mr. BONILLA.
H. Con. Res. 174: Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Con. Res. 222: Mr. DOYLE.
H. Con. Res. 348: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H. Con. Res. 452: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Con. Res. 465: Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. PICKERING.
H. Con. Res. 469: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 470: Mr. STARK and Mr. PALLONE.
H. Con. Res. 471: Mr. DICKS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. HART, Mr. SULIVAN, and Mr. GINGREY.
H. Res. 533: Mr. WEXLER.
H. Res. 622: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DAVIS of California, and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 745: Mr. SHAW, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
H. Res. 759: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H. Res. 825: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H. Res. 874: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H. Res. 888: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. FARR.
H. Res. 940: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 943: Mr. EHLERS.
H. Res. 944: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STARK, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KIND, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. POMEROY.
H. Res. 959: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 962: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H. Res. 964: Mr. STARK and Mr. DOYLE.
H. Res. 973: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 984: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H. Res. 988: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. PEARCE.
H. Res. 990: Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 992: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FARR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SOUDER, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 999: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 1001: Mr. KINGSTON.

H. Res. 1012: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. RUSH.