HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 5, 2005

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, creator of all and guide of history, on October 22, 1978, Your servant and priest, Karol Wojtyla, greeted the world, as John Paul II in St. Peter's Square, with the words: ''Be not afraid!''

He wrote later that he could not fully know how far these words would take him and the whole world into the future. ''Their meaning came more from the Holy Spirit than the man who spoke them,'' he said.

Lord, his exhortation, ''Be not afraid!'' is to be interpreted now as having very broad meaning. In a certain sense, it remains an exhortation addressed to all people, an exhortation to conquer fear in the present world and every situation.

It is a prayerful exhortation addressed to America and Members of Congress today: ''Have no fear of that which you yourselves and the founders of this great country have created. Have no fear of all that human history has produced. Have no fear of a world that is every day becoming more dangerous to the human perspective. Have no fear of yourselves!''

You, Lord God, are the source of hope and strength which conquers every fear and sets us free. In You, Lord God, there is more power than anything man, woman, or child could imagine or fear. With You, Lord God, people of faith can take bold steps themselves to rid the world of fear and plant seeds of hope for the least and the most threatened in our midst.

Through You, Lord God, we find peace, reconciliation, unity and freedom, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BURGESS 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 Mr. Monohan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 93

Whereas Howell T. Heflin served as a United States Marine from 1942–1946 and was awarded the Silver Star for bravery;

Whereas Howell T. Heflin served as Chief Justice of the Alabama Supreme Court from 1971–1977;

Whereas Howell T. Heflin served the people of Alabama with distinction for 18 years in the United States Senate; and

Whereas Howell T. Heflin served the Senate as Chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics in the ninety-sixth and one hundredth to one hundred-second Congresses;

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Howell T. Heflin, formerly a Senator from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Howell T. Heflin.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. Con. Res. 95) entitled ''Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010.'', and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints

Mr. GREGG, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. SARBANES and Mrs. MURRAY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Monday, March 21, 2005:

H.R. 1270, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate;

S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2005, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY, VIKTOR YUSHCHENKO, PRESIDENT OF UKRAINE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, April 6, 2005, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency, Viktor Yushchenko, President of Ukraine.

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

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to my colleagues someone that they may already know, Ida May Fuller. Ida May was the recipient of the first Social Security check ever issued. In 1940, the year Ida May began collecting, Social Security was a dream come true for retiring Americans.

For every Ida May, there were 42 younger workers contributing to her retirement. Ida May worked under Social Security for 3 years, paid in $24 and got more than $22,000 in benefits. Ida May Fuller got one heck of a deal.

Fast forward now to 2005, March 15, 2005, the day that my 15th grandchild was born, Keegan Riley Shaw. Today, there are only three workers supporting each retiree; and soon, it will dwindle to two.

If we do not act now to save Social Security, when Keegan walks across the stage at his college graduation, a diploma will not be the only thing he is handed. Try a $600 billion-a-year tax hike. And when Keegan retires and goes to his mailbox to get his Social Security check, unlike Ida May, he will be opening a giant IOU.

I am fighting so that my grandchildren, and every grandchild in

America, have a secure retirement, just like Ida May. Let us start talking about the next generation, not the next election.

PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues, I have recently spent time traveling through my district and listening to my constituents. The President's plan to privatize Social Security was the number one issue for many of my constituents.

Not everyone has the means or ability to prepare for the future, and none of us can protect our families against all the misfortunes that can sweep us into economic hard times.

Mr. Speaker, the President's plan to privatize Social Security is social insecurity, not social security. By forcing people, especially seniors, to rely on private accounts that fluctuate with the market, the President is gambling with our economic safety net. When the market loses ground, as it has in the past year, the safety net for America's seniors could be yanked away, not only for the seniors, Mr. Speaker, but for the survivors and the children.

We need to make sure that Social Security will continue to provide the same safety net against poverty that it has for almost 70 years.

GRATEFUL FOR BEING HERE AND THE LEADERSHIP IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, just like the gentlewoman from Texas, I returned from my district late last night.

On the plane ride up here, I could not help but reflect on how grateful I am to my constituents for allowing me the opportunity to serve here in Congress; and, Mr. Speaker, I also reflected on the fact that I was grateful for the leadership we have in this House. I am grateful for the leadership we have in the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), our majority leader.

The majority leader has his critics. None of us are without fault, but recently it seems we cannot pick up a paper without some half-truth or conjecture being put out there as fact. I guess the game plan is to heck with facts, just keep repeating it and eventually it will receive believability.

Mr. Speaker, our majority leader is a target because he is so effective. They cannot beat him in the arena of public debate. Their policies do not sell in the marketplace of ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look back at 10 years of electoral defeats on the other side to prove the point. Well, if they cannot outwork him and outthink him, if people are not buying what they are selling, then the game plan apparently is to tarnish our majority leader, and maybe then they can change the equation.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for our majority leader, and I am grateful to be working with him. This rank-and-file Member will stand with him. I would rather be working with our leader than running with the pack.

KEEP THE TRUST IN SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest my colleague from Florida talking about Ida May Fuller, the first recipient of a Social Security check January 31, 1940. I, too, think that she is a symbol of what this debate is about. The debate is about our commitment to assure that our seniors and disabled and widows and survivors are not subjected to a life of poverty.

We do have far fewer workers today than we had for each Social Security recipient. We also have far fewer dependents today. In many households today there are more workers than there are dependents. We are changing, but this was part of a plan that was approved by President Reagan and Democratic Speaker Tip O'Neill to change the Social Security program in 1983 to build up a $1.3 trillion surplus that will continue building up in the future.

We do not have a problem if we keep the trust in Social Security and use that surplus for what it is used for, rather than spend it on tax cuts for people who do not need it or other frivolous government spending.

I strongly urge that we keep the commitment to the Ida May Fullers of the future by using that money for what it was intended.

TOP PRINCIPALS IN GEORGIA

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor a few of Georgia's top educators. The following principals, Robin Lattizori of Mt. Bethel Elementary School, Angela Bailey of Mountain View Elementary School, Ron Wade of Centennial High School, Dr. Michael Johnson of Kell High School, and Dr. Edward Spurka of Roswell High School, all have been named one of the top 10 principals in Georgia by the State's PTA.

These principals do not just teach; they reach. They inspire students and teachers, and they encourage our kids and our teachers and our parents to work in concert, resulting in more of our young people expanding their horizons and their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, teaching is more than reciting material out of a textbook and hoping that students absorb the information, and being a principal is more than making certain the doors open on time. The love, dedication, and inspiration these leaders display on a daily basis set them apart. They are the energy behind the bright lights of our education system and are working to nurture tomorrow's leaders.

To each of them I send a hearty congratulations and thank you; but most importantly, your students, their parents, and the teachers thank you for the passion with which you do your job. Well done.

NEED TO REIN IN FEDERAL JUDICIARY

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the President signed into law a bill ordering courts to take a new look, a de novo look, at the Terri Schiavo case. In legal terms, this means that a court must approach a case as if they have no prior knowledge of the facts. In a death penalty case, a de novo order reopens the entire case, and the judge issues a stay on the execution.

Instead, in Terri's case, they took a cursory look at the case, did not issue a stay and affirmed her death sentence.

The problem here is not Congress; it is the courts. These judges abandoned Terri's humanity on a technicality, and they blatantly ignored the law that Congress passed.

Since when do judges get to ignore the laws of the land? The fact is that they have been doing it for a long time, in ways that should concern both sides of the aisle in this body.

When judges are viewed as above the law, as immune from accountability, we have ceased to be ruled by the consent of the governed, the people. We need to get courts under control before we slip further towards a Nation ruled by judicial fiat.

The problem is that though judges are the arbiters of legal disputes, they have become lawmakers just like us. We do not live in a land governed by judges. We live in a land governed by the people; and if we continue to ignore that, we have only ourselves to blame.

AMERICA SUPPORTS YOU

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as Members return from their districts, I know many will have heard from their

constituents who would want to do more to show their support for our men and women in uniform.

Like us in Congress, the Department of Defense has heard that call as well; and to answer it, they have put together a wonderful effort. It is called America Supports You.

A few weeks ago, I met with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Allison Barber, to discuss the importance of letting our military men and women know just how much we in America appreciate the sacrifices they are making in this war on terrorism. That is what America Supports You is all about.

I would like to encourage my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to tell their constituents about this effort and to post a link on their congressional Web site to www.americasupportsyou.com. Everyone should take a few moments to send a message of encouragement and thanks to our men and women in the military and to their families and let them know how much we appreciate the efforts that they are making for peace and to fight in the war on terrorism.

□ 1415

WTO AND U.S. SOVEREIGNTY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the World Trade Organization has now ruled the State of Utah cannot ban Internet gambling within its own borders. The WTO said if the ban was enforced, Utah would be impeding the rights of the small nations of Antigua and Barbados.

Who would have ever thought that Antigua and Barbados would have more control over what goes on in Utah than the people of Utah themselves do?

This is ridiculous. What have we come to? Utah State Representative Sheryl Allen commented on this ruling saying, ''It's not just gambling. The States are losing their authority in a lot of areas.''

Where are those people now who told us that membership in the WTO would not cause any loss of U.S. sovereignty?

Mr. Speaker, we had plenty of free trade before the WTO even existed, and we could do so again. At the very least, we should renegotiate the terms of our membership to allow our States to prohibit Internet gambling if they wish to do so.

TRIBUTE TO MASTER SERGEANT MICHAEL T. HIESTER

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is written, ''If you owe debts, pay debts; if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect.''

I rise humbly today to pay a debt of honor and respect to Army National Guard Master Sergeant Mike Hiester of Bluffton, Indiana. As I saw firsthand last December at Camp Phoenix in Kabul, Afghanistan, Hoosiers have made an extraordinary difference for freedom in Operation Enduring Freedom, and Master Sergeant Mike Hiester was a leader of men in that place.

On March 26, 2005, Mike lost his life while fighting to defend America in Afghanistan. His military vehicle with the 76th Infantry Brigade Army National Guard, Indianapolis, struck a land mine 30 miles west of Kabul, Afghanistan, claiming his life and the lives of three other Indiana Army National Guard.

At his home in Bluffton, Indiana, he was known as a loving husband and father, a member of the Bluffton Fire Department, and he will not soon be forgotten by this grieving community of Bluffton, which will say goodbye to him this week.

I also offer my deepest condolences to his wife Dawn; his two children Emily and Adam; and his parents, Tom and Kay Hiester; as well as his sisters Megan and Michele, and all those across northeastern Indiana and all of our State who cherish the memory of this hero.

Master Sergeant Michael Hiester is a hero whose service and sacrifice bolstered the hopes of millions of Americans and Afghanis, and the memory of his sacrifice and service will forever be emblazoned on the hearts of two grateful nations.

POPE JOHN PAUL'S DREAM FOR FREEDOM LIVES ON

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as the world mourns the passing of His Holiness Pope John Paul II, it is important to note that the struggle for which the Pope lived goes on today. I remember very vividly, back in June of 1989, being in Krakow, Poland, when we saw those active in the Solidarity movement clawing their way to freedom. We all know the outcome of that.

As we watched the Pope decline over the past several weeks and months, I had the honor over the Easter break to join with a bipartisan delegation of our colleagues to travel throughout the Middle East. It is interesting to note, as I said, that the Pope's dream is alive and well. The dream that Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, and today George W. Bush has is one that is encouraging people throughout the world to seek an opportunity to enjoy freedom.

While we were in the Middle East, we had the chance to go to Beirut, Lebanon, where we met with university students who stood in Martyr Square, and who said they are imprisoned today by the Syrians and that they are trying to claw their way to freedom. So the exact same message, Mr. Speaker, that came forth in 1989 in Eastern and Central Europe is alive and well today. Thank God this Pope lived.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE J. DENNIS HASTERT, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) laid before the House the following communication from J. DENNIS HASTERT, Speaker of the House:

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2005.

Hon. JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CLERK: Consistent with Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I write to record that I have been served with a civil subpoena for documents issued by the Circuit Court for Cook County, Illinois.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII of the Rules of the House.

Sincerely,

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF ZURAB ZHVANIA, PRIME MINISTER OF REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 108) commemorating the life of the late Zurab Zhvania, Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 108

Whereas on the night of February 3, 2005, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia, Zurab Zhvania, died, apparently due to carbon monoxide poisoning caused by a malfunctioning heater;

Whereas the death of Prime Minister Zhvania at the age of 41 is a tragic loss for the Republic of Georgia;

Whereas Zurab Zhvania was a dedicated reformer whose visionary leadership inspired a new generation of political leaders in the Republic of Georgia;

Whereas Zurab Zhvania founded the Citizen's Union Party, which won elections in 1995, making him the Speaker of the Georgian Parliament;

Whereas under the leadership of Speaker Zhvania, the Georgian Parliament was transformed into an effective and transparent legislative institution;

Whereas in November 2001, Speaker Zhvania resigned his position in protest when government authorities attempted to suppress the leading independent television station in the Republic of Georgia;

Whereas Zurab Zhvania formed the United Democrats, a party that blossomed into one of the major forces that brought about the Rose Revolution in the Republic of Georgia in November 2003;

Whereas in the most dangerous hours of the Rose Revolution, when it appeared that armed force could be used against the peaceful protestors, Zurab Zhvania dismissed his bodyguards and led a march to Parliament accompanied only by his young children;

Whereas Zurab Zhvania was named Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia in November 2003, and led governmental efforts to develop and implement far-reaching economic, judicial, military, and social reforms thereby turning the promise of the Rose Revolution into real results that have dramatically improved life in the Republic of Georgia;

Whereas the strong commitment of Zurab Zhvania to the peaceful restoration of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Georgia was most recently displayed in the central role he played in the development of the unprecedented and generous proposal of the Republic of Georgia for resolving the status of South Ossetia peacefully and justly; and

Whereas Zurab Zhvania's vision of the historical destiny of the Republic of Georgia was eloquently expressed before the Council of Europe on April 27, 1999, when he said, ''I am Georgian and therefore, I am European'': Now, therefore, be it.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its sympathy and deepest condolences to the family of Zurab Zhvania for their tragic loss of a son, husband, and father, and to the people of the Republic of Georgia for the death of their Prime Minister;

(2) commends the courage, energy, political imagination, and leadership of Zurab Zhvania that were so critical to the development of a democratic Republic of Georgia;

(3) recognizes that the integration of the Republic of Georgia into Euro-Atlantic institutions will be the completion of the vision of Zurab Zhvania and his most lasting legacy; and

(4) expresses its solidarity with the people and Government of the Republic of Georgia at this difficult time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 108.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, the House considers H. Res. 108, introduced by the esteemed Chair of the Subcommittee on Europe and Emerging Threats, the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY). It is a resolution commemorating the life of the late Zurab Zhvania, who at the time of his death was the Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia.

On February 3, Prime Minister Zhvania died suddenly, apparently as a result of carbon monoxide poisoning caused by a malfunctioning heater. This resolution expresses the House of Representative's sympathy and condolences to the family of Zurab Zhvania and to the people of Georgia for the death of their Prime Minister.

The resolution also commemorates the life of Zurab Zhvania and calls for the completion of his vision to integrate Georgia into the greater European-Atlantic community. Prime Minister Zhvania was a prominent leader in Georgia's Rose Revolution. He was a true reformer, a strong believer in democracy, and a good friend to America. In fact, Georgia recently decided to increase its troop levels in Iraq at the very time when other nations are drawing down their military presence in that country. Georgia also participates in the peacekeeping mission in Kosovo and has troops in Afghanistan.

The death of Zurab Zhvania is a tragic loss for Georgia and all those who support democracy in that nation. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and join my colleague from Michigan in commemorating the extraordinary life and the tragic death of Zurab Zhvania, the late Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia.

While he served in the position of Prime Minister for a relatively short time, all independent observers conclude that he contributed immeasurably to the democratic reform of the Republic of Georgia. He was committed to opening the minds of the Georgian people and inspiring them to move away from the regressive wrongdoings of the Communist establishment.

He will always be known as a true reformer, a strong believer in democratic values, and a good friend of America. We are all saddened by his loss, and I join my colleagues in expressing condolences to the family of Mr. Zhvania.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 108, commemorating the life of the late Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia, Zurab Zhvania. I commend my colleagues, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. WEXLER, for introducing this resolution and I am proud to be a cosponsor. I want to thank them for providing us an opportunity to recognize the life and contributions of Prime Minister Zhvania to the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, on February 3 of this year, the Republic of Georgia suffered a tremendous loss with the untimely passing of their Prime Minister, Zurab Zhvania. An academic and unlikely political hero, Zhvania was elected to the Georgian national parliament in 1992, after the collapse of the Soviet Union. His passion and his eloquence brought him to the attention of Eduard Shevardnadze, and eventually to the office of Speaker of the Georgian Parliament. A champion of democracy and freedom of the press, Zhvania distanced himself from Shevardnadze and joined a party of young reformers who brought about the Rose Revolution in 2003. As the Prime Minister, Zhvania led the economic and social reform efforts that have transformed the lives of the Georgian people.

His visionary leadership in guiding the Republic of Georgia as it reached independence, his commitment to the development of core democratic values, and his tremendous courage in the face of adversity, will make the late Prime Minister Zurab Zhvania a towering figure in the history of the independent Republic of Georgia.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 108.

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. MCCOTTER. 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 motion will be postponed.

COMMENDING OUTSTANDING EFFORTS OF ARMED FORCES AND EMPLOYEES OF STATE DEPARTMENT AND USAID IN RESPONSE TO EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI OF DECEMBER 26, 2004

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 120) commending the outstanding efforts by Members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development in response to the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 120

Whereas on December 26, 2004, an earthquake and tsunami struck the Indian Ocean basin, killing over 250,000 people in Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India, Thailand, Somalia, Burma, Maldives, Malaysia, Tanzania, Bangladesh, and Kenya;

Whereas the response by members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) was immediate, invaluable, and courageous;

Whereas civilian employees of the Department of State and USAID showed great leadership in helping to coordinate relief efforts among donors, United Nations agencies, international organizations, aid agencies, and host governments;

Whereas civilian employees of the Department of State and USAID who were on vacation in some of the hardest hit areas used their expertise and specialized skills to provide immediate assistance to victims and survivors of the tsunami;

Whereas civilian employees of the Department of State and USAID set up remote assistance operations in the affected areas in order to best provide service to United States citizens and citizens of other countries who were affected by the tsunami;

Whereas United States consular officers worked around the clock to locate and identify United States citizens affected by the tsunami, reconnect them with their loved ones, and facilitate their return to the United States, despite the loss of their passports, other identification, and belongings as a result of the tsunami;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces volunteered their unique resources to assess the situation and deliver aid when and where other relief efforts could not;

Whereas the sight of members of the Armed Forces providing aid to tsunami victims and survivors has provided an important boost to the image abroad of the United States;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of USAID worked together to bring clean water from Navy ships to victims and survivors in need; and

Whereas the coordinated effort by members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and USAID saved lives, made a crucial contribution to recovery, and set the stage for a long-term United States commitment to increased peace and security across South and Southeast Asia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the outstanding efforts in response to the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004, by members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development;

(2) recognizes that the actions of these individuals went above and beyond the call of duty; and

(3) thanks them for their service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 120.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish to begin by sending my gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon for bringing this resolution before the House.

The December 26, 2004, earthquake off the coast of Indonesia was one of the largest natural disasters on record, devastating coastal areas throughout the Indian Ocean area, particularly in Indonesia and Sri Lanka. The cost in human life now stands at nearly 300,000 dead or missing, another 1 million displaced, and many more otherwise affected.

The response by U.S. military and civilian personnel was nearly instantaneous as they moved into action to provide help to those caught in the tragedy. The logistics, airlift, and other supplies and services provided by the Department of Defense were, by all accounts, indispensable. Similarly, the humanitarian relief provided by U.S. civilian agencies, particularly the United States Agency for International Development, demonstrated the capacity and compassion of the American people who tried to aid those who were suffering.

In addition to its speed, the United States Government has been generous in its response: Nearly $150 million has already been spent and will be followed by several hundred million more dollars for ongoing recovery and reconstruction programs. The American people should also be greatly complimented for their generosity, as private donations from the United States alone are estimated to be at $1 billion.

This resolution recognizes America's military and civilian first responders to this terrible disaster and extends the appreciation of Congress to them for their work in saving lives, helping the survivors, and displaying our American virtues to our brothers and sisters beyond our shores.

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

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

I wish to thank my colleague from Michigan for joining me in cosponsoring this resolution, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), for introducing the resolution with me.

This resolution commends the action of civilian employees of the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development and the members of the Armed Forces for their response to last December's tsunami tragedy in the Indian Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to journey with a congressional delegation to the affected areas immediately in the aftermath of the disaster. As we viewed the stricken region, we were all impressed by the quality of the relief effort and the coordination between all parties. It was truly gratifying to see the governments, particularly of these four affected countries, stepping forward in some areas where we had simmering conflicts and military actions. People would put aside the hostilities to deal with those in need.

I must confess that the pictures of our military, the rapid response, spoke volumes. I had an opportunity to visit with the leadership, starting with Admiral Crowder, and other senior officers, down the chain of command, visiting with men and women on the front lines. It was clear that they were not just acting out of a professional dedication and a military ethic, but they were doing it for the profound and heartfelt desire to help people in need.

While the pictures spoke volumes of the affected people throughout that region, I think it is important that we also recognize the efforts of the civilians from the State Department and USAID who do the tireless work of diplomacy and development that form the backbone of our foreign policy. They contribute day in and day out with far less fanfare and too often less of our support.

I was struck by individual cases of Foreign Service officers. Two examples that had been brought to my attention while I was visiting was that of Richard Hanrahan and Michael Chadwick, who were junior consular officers from American embassies who were on vacation in Phuket when the disaster struck.

□ 1430

They were there with their own families and had to make sure they were safe, but then they acted to set up their own remote control command post in Phuket to ensure the safe return of Americans. They dealt with traumatized families under the most difficult of circumstances, being able to borrow cell phones and deal with the communication difficulties; dealing with really very difficult situations, going from hospital to hospital, identifying injured Americans, and reporting on the situation before others had a chance to arrive.

Having seen and heard how these people behaved in such difficult circumstances, hour after hour, day after day, using their own independent action and individual motivation is something that all of us in Congress can be proud of. Having seen the impact that the officials from the State Department and USAID, working together with our military in response to

the tsunami, highlights for us all the need to continue to enhance our diplomatic development and humanitarian capabilities.

As I heard these stories and met these people, I thought of the work that former Secretary of State Powell performed when he invested the prestige of his office, used the leverage of his position and his own experience to increase the support, ramping up the hiring of a new class of officials and making it a personal priority to make sure that the men and women in the front lines of the State Department around the world had the resources that they needed.

I hope that our new Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, will build upon his actions and as we in this Congress go through our appropriations cycle, we support her and our diplomats with the necessary funding.

We should strengthen the ability of the State Department to respond to these crises, both natural and manmade, in part to minimize the challenge for our over-stretched military who are not always going to be able to be available in force to make the contributions that we saw in the aftermath of the tsunami. Often, frankly, there are tasks better left to civilian hands.

This disaster was an illustration of the value of the services provided by many of these agencies. I think of the USAID's outstanding individuals who were there as part of the briefing, indicating how they were equipped and ready to go to help fight the problems after the tsunami, and deal with the aftermath of poverty and environmental degradation. Hopefully, their work will make these communities less vulnerable in the future, and we can invest in disaster mitigation and planning to reduce the loss of life the next time the inevitable disaster strikes.

It is the selfless commitment of these individuals in the military, the State Department, and USAID that is making a difference. At a time when our prestige, particularly in this region, as a Nation is at an all-time low, according to independent opinion surveys, the contributions in the aftermath of the tsunami is making a difference, particularly with Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim country. Two-thirds of the Indonesians are now more favorable to the United States because of what they saw, Americans responding and dealing with the aftermath of this disaster.

We should continue to invest in diplomacy and development along with our national defense, extend the kindness and compassion demonstrated by American people into a full-time commitment to those who suffer around the world. These efforts will pay dividends not just for the people in need but for our security as well.

The civilian employees of the State Department, the USAID, and our men and women in uniform went beyond the call of duty in responding to the tsunami. Through this demonstration of their professionalism, skill, creativity and commitment, they saved lives and took important steps for peace and security. I strongly urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and I would like to give a special thanks to the sponsor of this resolution, my good friend from Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Like several of my colleagues on the House International Relations Committee, I had the opportunity to meet with many of the men and women of our Armed Forces, the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development operating in the tsunami affected region.

My trip to the region began in Singapore, where I met with members of our Armed Forces who were using the Singapore Air Force base as a staging ground for missions into the hardest hit area of the tsunami, Banda Aceh, Indonesia.

They were running operations out of the base 24 hours a day thanks to the support of our Singaporean friends.

While I was at the base I met with a Marine who was injured just days before in a helicopter crash but he remained in high spirits and was eager to get back out to help the survivors of the tsunami.

Singapore has been such a strong ally and a solid supporter of our relief mission; I want to publicly thank the government and people of Singapore for their role in the assistance to the tsunami affected region.

After Singapore, I traveled to Sri Lanka and went south of Colombo to Galle, a tourist town, which was ravaged by the tsunami.

During my day in Galle, I visited a maternity hospital that had been badly damaged and is now unusable, but I met with a doctor who told me about a c-section he was performing when the wave hit the hospital.

This doctor was able to finish the surgery by flashlight and saved the mother and child. These are some of the stories we may never have heard.

As I traveled on the road back to Colombo stretching the length of the shore I saw more affects of the Tsunami, train tracks were turned into corkscrews and buildings were totally destroyed.

But within all this rubble was American Marines and USAID Disaster Assistance Relief Teams working hand in hand with the Sri Lankan's clearing destroyed homes.

I asked one of the marines about his daily activities and he told me what brought him the most joy was playing with the local children who had lost their families and homes and that just making them smile and keeping them active brought him so much fulfillment.

As those children grow up they will always remember that marine who brought a little sense of normalcy back to their lives.

Also, during a meeting with the U.S. Embassy in Colombo, I met the director of the U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, OFDA, covering South Asia, which with the help of this committee; I was able to establish this branch.

I was caught off guard when William Berger, the director of the OFDA, thanked me for establishing this office and told me that the funding I was able to secure has saved thousands of lives and will continue to.

It's a real testament to the effect our committee has on the lives of those living so far away.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 120, commending members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development in response to the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004.

In particular, I want to share with my colleagues how a professor from the Naval Postgraduate School, located in my district, assisted victims of the tsunami in Thailand. As coincidence would have it, Professor Brian Stackler was in Bangkok shortly after the tsunami when he realized that a field experiment he was planning to conduct in six months could save disaster victims' lives. Within days, he and his team were able to set up a wireless communications network near Phuket, and weeks later a broadband wireless Internet connection for more than 4,000 refugees, volunteer workers, international DNA testing and response teams, NGOs, and the media. As you can imagine, these emergency communication services were overwhelmed, so Professor Stackler and his team established voice-over Internet connections allowing computer users to speak over their microphones.

The impact of this technology was profound. It speeded up identification of victims and facilitated communication between victims and the outside world.

Professor Brian Stackler and his team are unsung heroes to thousands of victims of the tsunami and richly deserve the recognition provided by H. Res. 120.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today in the United States House of Representatives, we commend the men and women of our Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development for their services and actions in response to the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004. In particular, I would like to recognize the active-duty and reserve servicemembers of the 62nd and 446th Airlift Wings stationed in my District at McChord Air Force Base. The Airmen who deployed filled many different roles from aircrew members to maintainers and aerial port personnel and security forces. McChord's aircrews flew badly needed supplies to countries throughout the region. The C–17's unique ability to land in the most austere conditions allowed it to deliver aid where other aircraft couldn't. In particular, I would like to commend Colonel Wayne Schatz, the 62nd Airlift Wing commander, who deployed to Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, and became the Deputy Director of Mobility Forces for the entire operation. While there, he helped marshall the massive humanitarian airlift mission, directing hundreds of aircraft that delivered nearly 3,000 tons of relief supplies to countries most in need of aid.

All told, Team McChord's contributions to the relief efforts included: 1.8 million pounds of relief supplies delivered; 660+ passengers moved; and 48 relief missions flown.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of the men and women in my District who participated in this noble operation.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 120, commending the outstanding efforts of our military and civilian personnel who responded to the humanitarian crisis engendered by the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004. I commend my colleagues, Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. LEACH, for submitting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Southeast Asia in January to help assess the damage caused by the tsunami. I saw firsthand the overwhelming scale of the human tragedy that killed over 250,000 people. Without the heroic efforts of the U.S. Armed Forces personnel and the civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, the death toll would have been far worse.

These men and women worked tirelessly to help provide necessities, like drinking water, food, and medical supplies, to survivors of the tragedy. In addition, many worked to coordinate the relief efforts of donors, relief organizations, aid agencies, and governments. The civilian employees worked to identify and assist U.S. citizens who were affected by the tsunami.

Because of the courageous efforts of these Americans, I have no doubt that many lives were saved. This selfless giving in a time of crisis was beyond the call of duty. Their efforts deserve great recognition and I am proud to support this resolution commending them.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 120.

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. MCCOTTER. 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 motion will be postponed.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF YOGI BHAJAN

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) honoring the life and contributions of Yogi Bhajan, a leader of Sikhs, and expressing condolences to the Sikh community on his passing.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 34

Whereas the Sikh faith was founded in the northern section of the Republic of India in the 15th century by Guru Nanak, who preached tolerance and equality for all humans;

Whereas the Sikh faith began with a simple message of truthful living and the fundamental unity of humanity, all created by one creator who manifests existence through every religion;

Whereas the Sikh faith reaches out to people of all faiths and cultural backgrounds, encourages individuals to see beyond their differences, and to work together for world peace and harmony;

Whereas Siri Singh Sahib Bhai Sahib Harbhajan Singh Khalsa Yogiji, known as Yogi Bhajan to hundreds of thousands of people worldwide, was born Harbhajan Singh Puri on August 26, 1929, in India;

Whereas at age eight, Yogi Bhajan began yogic training, and eight years later was proclaimed by his teacher to be a master of Kundalini Yoga, which stimulates individual growth through breath, yoga postures, sound, chanting, and meditation;

Whereas during the turmoil on the partition between Pakistan and India in 1947, at the age of 18, Yogi Bhajan led his village of 7,000 people 325 miles on foot to safety in New Delhi, India, from what is now Lahore, Pakistan;

Whereas Yogi Bhajan, before emigrating to North America in 1968, served the Government of India faithfully through both civil and military service;

Whereas when Yogi Bhajan visited the United States in 1968, he recognized immediately that the experience of higher consciousness that many young people were attempting to find through drugs could be alternatively achieved through Kundalini Yoga, and in response, he began teaching Kundalini Yoga publicly, thereby breaking the centuries-old tradition of secrecy surrounding it;

Whereas in 1969, Yogi Bhajan founded ''Healthy, Happy, Holy Organization (3HO)'', a nonprofit private educational and scientific foundation dedicated to serving humanity, improving physical well-being, deepening spiritual awareness, and offering guidance on nutrition and health, interpersonal relations, child rearing, and human behavior;

Whereas under the direction and guidance of Yogi Bhajan, 3HO expanded to 300 centers in 35 countries;

Whereas in 1971, the president of the governing body of Sikh Temples in India gave Yogi Bhajan the title of Siri Singh Sahib, which made him the chief religious and administrative authority for Sikhism in the Western Hemisphere, and subsequently the Sikh seat of religious authority gave him responsibility to create a Sikh ministry in the West;

Whereas in 1971, Sikh Dharma was legally incorporated in the State of California and recognized as a tax-exempt religious organization by the United States, and in 1972, Yogi Bhajan founded the ashram Sikh Dharma in Española, New Mexico;

Whereas in 1973, Yogi Bhajan founded ''3HO SuperHealth'', a successful drug rehabilitation program that blends ancient yogic wisdom of the East with modern technology of the West;

Whereas in June 1985, Yogi Bhajan established the first ''International Peace Prayer Day Celebrations'' in New Mexico, which still draws thousands of participants annually;

Whereas Yogi Bhajan traveled the world calling for world peace and religious unity at meetings with leaders such as Pope Paul VI; Pope John Paul II; His Holiness the Dalai Lama; the President of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mikhail Gorbachev; and two Archbishops of Canterbury;

Whereas Yogi Bhajan wrote 30 books and inspired the publication of 200 other books through his teachings, founded a drug rehabilitation program, and inspired the founding of several businesses;

Whereas Sikhs and students across the world testify that Yogi Bhajan exhibited dignity, divinity, grace, commitment, courage, kindness, compassion, tolerance, wisdom, and understanding;

Whereas Yogi Bhajan taught that in times of joy and sorrow members of the community should come together and be at one with each other; and

Whereas before his passing on October 6, 2004, Yogi Bhajan requested that his passing be a time of celebration of his going home: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes that the teachings of Yogi Bhajan about Sikhism and yoga, and the businesses formed under his inspiration, improved the personal, political, spiritual, and professional relations between citizens of the United States and the citizens of India;

(2) recognizes the legendary compassion, wisdom, kindness, and courage of Yogi Bhajan, and his wealth of accomplishments on behalf of the Sikh community; and

(3) extends its condolences to Inderjit Kaur, the wife of Yogi Bhajan, his three children and five grandchildren, and to Sikh and 3HO communities around the Nation and the world upon the death on October 6, 2004, of Yogi Bhajan, an individual who was a wise teacher and mentor, an outstanding pioneer, a champion of peace, and a compassionate human being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to recognize the fine work of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for placing this resolution before us.

On October 6, 2004, Yogi Bhajan passed from this world. He had requested that his passing be a time of celebration. Thus I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 34 in order to celebrate the life of this extraordinary man.

At the age of 18 during a time of turmoil, he led his village of 7,000 people over 325 miles on foot to the safety of New Delhi, India. He served the Government of India faithfully through both civilian and military service.

When he came to the United States, he founded a nonprofit private educational, scientific foundation dedicated to serving humanity, improving physical well-being, deepening spiritual awareness, and offering guidance on nutrition and health, interpersonal relations, child rearing, and human behavior.

In 1971, the President of the Governing Body of Sikh Temples in India named him the chief religious and administrative authority for Sikhism in the Western Hemisphere, and he was given the responsibility for creating a Sikh ministry in the West.

In June of 1985, he established the first International Peace Prayer Day Celebration which draws thousands of participants annually.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that Congress join in the celebration of his passing and recognize his legendary compassion, wisdom, kindness, and courage and extend its condolences to his wife and family.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER), in commending our friend and colleague from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for the gentleman's introduction of this resolution, and his concern and leadership on Sikh-American issues. We are grateful for his work on these matters.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions made by Yogi Bhajan to Sikh-Americans and others across the globe are enormous. In addition to teaching peace through spiritual and yogic education, Yogi Bhajan applied his motivational skills to business and civil society. Most notably, he founded 3HO, an educational nonprofit organization that promotes human rights and health care education.

Given those enormous contributions, the passing of Yogi Bhajan last October was a loss not only to the Sikh-American community but to the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in the post-9/11 era, it is increasingly important to recognize the contributions and participation of our Sikh-American brethren in American society since Sikh-Americans have unfortunately been the target of many hate crimes since 9/11. Yogi Bhajan was a man who helped educate and enlighten Americans about Sikh philosophy, further enhancing this country's great diversity and tolerance of all faiths.

We extend our condolences to his family, his children and grandchildren, and to the Sikh community around the world. I strongly support the passage of this resolution and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo a sentiment put forward by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). In my district, the 11th Congressional District of Michigan, we have a substantial Sikh presence; and in the wake of September 11, I was asked by their temple to come before them and to reassure them that their fellow Americans understood Sikhism and would never stand for any type of oppression or prejudice or acts of hate being perpetrated against them.

I think in passing this resolution, we add one more accord on our part to Sikhism and its adherents and I am honored to be a part of this, as I am honored to have the friendship of the Sikh community and people like Chain Sandhu back home in my district.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of Yogi Bhajan, a leader and inspiration to more than 23 million Sikhs around the world. Born in 1929, Yogi Bhajan led his village of 7,000 people 325 miles to safety on foot when violence erupted between Pakistan and India in 1947. The 3HO organization he founded in 1969 has strengthened the spiritual and interpersonal ties of more than 300 communities in 35 countries.

The Sikh faith was founded in India in the 15th century. Today, there are more than 175,000 Sikhs living in the United States and as many as 75,000 in the New York City metropolitan area.

Like their founder Guru Nanak, Sikhs practice tolerance and equality for all humans. Unfortunately, Sikhs here in the United States find themselves the objects of just the type of discrimination and that Yogi Bhajan worked to combat. In the last 3 years, the Sikh's have been the victims of at least 62 hate crimes, 27 cases of racial profiling, and 22 incidents of employment discrimination. In a particularly public incident from my home town, a Sikh subway motorman in New York City lost his job when the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) said he could not wear his religious headgear to work.

Today, in the spirit of our commemoration of Yogi Bhajan's enormous contributions, Congress should pass the Workplace Religious Freedom Act, which would require an employer to accommodate a worker's faith unless it imposes significant difficulty or expense on the employer.

The Workplace Religious Freedom Act has the support of an incredibly diverse coalition of organizations including the National Sikh Center, Agudath Israel, the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, the National Council of Churches, the National Council of Muslim Women, and the Southern Baptist Convention.

If the Workplace Religious Freedom Act were passed, a Sikh would be able to wear a turban at work unless it posed a serious health or safety concern. And a Jew or Seventh Day Adventist could arrange not to work on Saturday, in exchange for working overtime earlier in the week.

We should take this opportunity to honor Yogi Bhajan by doing right by the community that survives him. Let's make sure the Sikh community in America lives in an America devoted to the spirit of tolerance and equality that Yogi Bhajan came to symbolize.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as the whole House of Representatives rises also, to honor the exemplary life of Harbhajan Singh Khalsa Yogiji. He died on October 7th 2004, just several weeks after his 75th birthday. Though he gained notoriety as a great yoga teacher, throughout his life he wore many hats; that of a successful business man, an author and a diplomat who bridged the boundaries of culture and religion.

The man we know as Yogi Bhajan was born Harghajan Singh Puri on August 26th, 1929 in a part of India that later became Pakistan. He spent his youth attending Catholic convent school and studying yoga from the age of eight years old. At just sixteen his teacher, Sant Sazara Singh, proclaimed him to be a Master of Kundalini Yoga. The rest of his life was punctuated by selfless leadership and teaching to people from all walks of life.

After working in the Indian government for some time, in 1968, Yogi Bhajan left India for Canada to focus on teaching yoga. This began his ascent to popularity throughout the world. After recognizing that the spiritual seekers of that day, called "hippies", were trying to find a higher consciousness via drugs, Yogi Bhajan realized that this could be found rather by practicing Kundalini Yoga. He began teaching the "3HO" way of life, meaning a healthy, happy and holy life. Soon he was in high demand. Eventually he founded the non-profit 3HO Foundation, which services humanity through Kundalini Yoga, the Science of Humanology, mediation, and a deepening of spiritual awareness. There are now 300 centers in 35 countries.

Yogi Bhajan continually merged the principles of his belief with business throughout his time on earth. He founded 3HO Superhealth, which has become a highly successful drugless drug rehabilitation program. He furthermore wrote books, conducted workshops, and made his teachings available to large numbers of people via videotapes. He was a tireless advocate of world peace and encouraged dialogue among world leaders, including the Dalai Lama, Pope John Paul II, Pope Paul VI and two Archbishops of Canterbury.

One of Yogi Bhajan's greatest accomplishments stemming from his efforts was the official recognition of Sikhism as a religion in the USA. Because of this, he was given the task of creating a Sikh Ministry in the West. I know that the Sikh community in my district has the utmost respect and gratitude for his labors on this behalf.

Mr. Speaker, Yogi Bhajan was a person who "walked the walk". He used the beliefs and principles he believed in sincerely and authentically to better the world, enhance his community and enlighten his fellow human being. I am proud to honor him today.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House passage of H. Con. Res. 34, honoring the life and contributions of Yogi Bhajan, a leader of Sikhs in the Western Hemisphere who passed away October 6 of last year. Yogi Bhajan was a world leader in peace and helped hundreds of thousands around the world during his ministry.

Born in India in 1929 as Harbhajan Singh Puri, Yogi Bhajan became a master of kundalini yoga by age 16, but he showed his real strength in 1947 when he lead on foot 7,000 people from his village in what is now Pakistan, over the partition and to safety as a refugee in present day India.

After a successful career in the Indian government with Customs and the IRS, Yogi Bhajan developed his commitment for his faith, Sikh Dharma, washing for four straight years each night the floor of their holiest temple, the Golden Temple.

In 1968 when Yogi Bhajan migrated to Canada and then in 1969 to the United States, he recognized the disenchantment and spiritual yearning that was felt by Western youth during the tumult of the 1960's and began to teach them the technology of Kundalini Yoga and meditation. That same year he incorporated the Healthy, Happy, Holy Organization (3HO), whose Superhealth Drug Rehabilitation centers soon garnered top awards and results from the Joint Accreditation Body for Healthcare Organizations.

Through his personal efforts, Sikh Dharma was legally incorporated and officially recognized as a religion in the U.S. in 1971. In 1971, in acknowledgement of his extraordinary impact of spreading the universal message of Sikhism, the president of the SGPC (governing body of Sikh Temples in India), Sant Charan Singh called him the Siri Singh Sahib, Chief Religious and Administrative Authority for the Western Hemisphere, and he was given the responsibility to create a Sikh Ministry in the West by the Akal Takhat, the Sikh seat of religious authority in Amritsar, India. He was honored with the title Bhai Sahib by the Akal Takhat in 1974. When he became a United States Citizen in 1976, Yogi Bhajan changed his name legally to Harbhajan Singh Khalsa Yogiji.

Under his guidance as Director of Spiritual Education, 3HO mushroomed worldwide, to 300 centers in 35 countries. In 1994 3HO became a member of the United Nations as an NGO (Non-Governmental-Organization) in Consultative Status (Roster) with the Economic and Social Council, representing women's issues, promoting human rights and providing education in alternative systems of medicine.

Loyal friend and mentor of Senators, Congressmen, and Governors regardless of political affiliation, he promoted spiritual awareness in all arenas. An ardent advocate of world peace and religious unity, the Siri Singh Sahib met with world leaders of all faiths to encourage dialogue, including Pope Paul VI, Pope John Paul II, the Dalai Lama, and two Archbishops of Canterbury. He became Co-President of the World Fellowship of Religions in 1974.

He became a trusted management consultant for 14 corporations worldwide, representing industries as diverse as health food manufacturing (KIIT-Golden Temple Foods), computer systems (Sun and Son), and security services (Akal Security). He conducted business seminars and authored several books to guide the aspiring entrepreneur as well as the seasoned executive.

He is survived by his wife, children, five grandchildren and all those in his 3HO and Sikh Dharma families.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend of mine and a man who was an incredible voice for peace—Yogi Bhajan. H. Con. Res. 34 recognizes Yogi Bhajan, the late chief religious and administrative authority for Sikhism in the West, as a wise teacher and mentor, an outstanding pioneer, a champion of peace and compassion, and extends condolences to his family and to the Sikh community on his passing.

A native of India, Yogi Bhajan introduced thousands around the world to Sikhism, a religion that carries the message of truthful living and the fundamental unity of humanity, and reaches out to people of all backgrounds to work together for world peace. When he came to the United States in 1968, Yogi Bhajan recognized immediately that the experience sought by many young people through drugs could be alternatively achieved through Kundalini yoga, which stimulates individual growth through breath, chanting, and meditation among other components. Soon after, he founded the Healthy, Happy, Holy Organization (3HO), a nonprofit private educational and scientific foundation with 300 centers in 35 countries, dedicated to improving physical well-being, deepening spiritual awareness, and offering guidance on matters of health and heart. He later also founded a successful drug rehabilitation program that blends ancient yogic wisdom of the East with modem technology of the West.

In 1971, the president of the governing body of Sikh Temples in India gave Yogi Bhajan the title of chief religious and administrative authority for Sikhism in the Western Hemisphere. That same year, the Sikh Dharma was legally incorporated and recognized as a religion in the U.S. and soon after, Yogi Bhajan founded the Sikh Dharma community in Espanola, New Mexico. This community in my district is home to at least 300 Sikh families.

Yogi Bhajan wrote 30 books and inspired 200 more through his teaching, and inspired the founding of several businesses including Akal Security Inc., one of the fastest-growing security companies in the nation. Throughout his lifetime, he traveled the world and met with world leaders such as Pope John Paul II and the Dalai Lama to discuss world peace and religious unity. He also served as informal counsel to numerous political and spiritual leaders. As the resolution states, Yogi Bhajan's teachings and the businesses formed under his inspiration, improved personal, political, spiritual and professional relations between citizens of the United States and citizens of the nation of India.

After the terrorist attacks on U.S. soil on September 11th, Yogi Bhajan reached out to Sikhs across America, encouraging and helping them to educate their fellow citizens about Sikhs, and to work with law enforcement and community leaders to help them protect Sikh populations. He established links to human rights advocates nationwide to ensure that the issue of Sikh identity was understood and respected. When a Sikh man named Balbir Singh Sodhi was murdered in Arizona five days after 9/11, Yogi Bhajan worked with community and government leaders in Arizona to help raise awareness about the Sikh community there, and to honor Balbir Singh with a major memorial event.

Yogi Bhajan passed away on October 6, 2004 at age 75 in Española, New Mexico. I had the privilege of Yogi Bhajan's friendship and support for more than 20 years. He was a dynamic, powerful person with a strong devotion to human rights, religious freedom, and good health. Whatever your faith, Yogi Bhajan had the right words, the right lesson, the right message. He spoke to us all and he inspired us. Around the world he was a powerful voice for peace. I am pleased that he will be honored by Congress today. Before he passed away, Yogi Bhajan requested that his passing be a time of celebration of his going home. It is my hope that through passing this legislation, we are helping to fulfill that wish.

I would like to thank Representatives JOE WILSON, JOE CROWLEY, and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for their strong support of this resolution, as well as Ranking Member LANTOS and Chairman HYDE of the House International Relations Committee, who were also early supporters of the bill. I also thank Senators JEFF BINGAMAN, PETE DOMENICI, and JOHN CORNYN who are sponsoring the Senate companion. Lastly, I thank members of the Sikh community in my district for their work in carrying on the memory of Yogi Bhajan.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and would like to thank my good friend from New Mexico, Mr. UDALL, for introducing this resolution.

As the former Co-Chair of the Caucus on India and Indian Americans along with my colleague Mr. WILSON from South Carolina, we worked with TOM UDALL at the end of the 108th Congress to recognize the contributions that Yogi Bhajan (YO-gee BUH-jin) made to India and to the United States.

Due to the time constraints of the end of the session work, we were unable to bring this before committee, but I am grateful we now have the opportunity to honor a man whose words and deeds affected countless people all over the world.

During his life, Yogi Bhajan introduced thousands around the world to Sikhism, a religion that carries the message of truthful living and fundamental unity of humanity and reaches out to people of all backgrounds to work together.

Yogi Bhajan also applied his grass-roots approach to peace in the business and non-profit organizations he founded.

He was a trusted management consultant for 14 corporations worldwide, representing service industries as diverse as health food manufacturing), computer systems and security services.

This resolution recognizes a wise teacher and mentor, an outstanding pioneer, a champion of peace and compassionate human being, and extends condolences on his passing.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution honoring Yogi Bhajan.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 34, honoring the life and contributions of Yogi Bhajan. Yogi Bhajan was an extraordinary man of compassion, wisdom and kindness whose teachings have provided immeasurable benefits spiritually, culturally and politically to millions here in the United States and around the world. A master of Kundalini yoga, his love of humanity

was so strong that he violated the tradition of secrecy surrounding this practice to bring the healing power of yoga to the troubled American youth of the 1960's by providing a healthy alternative to the drug culture.

Yogi Bhajan worked tirelessly throughout his life to spread the message that "it is our birthright to be happy, healthy, and holy." He established a Sikh Ministry in the West and motivated thousands to embrace the Sikh way of life. He founded 3HO Superhealth, a drug rehabilitation program based on yogic wisdom and modern technology, a program that has now expanded worldwide. His books, the organizations he founded, and the thousands of teachers he trained will serve as his legacy.

One overriding message of Yogi Bhajan's teaching is that we are all one people—Sikhs, Christians, Jews, Buddhists—and in my opinion his life stands as a shining example of how an unconditional love of humanity can contribute greatly to the health and well-being of us all.

Mr. Speaker, Yogi Bhajan requested before his death that his passing be a time of celebration of his going home. I am proud to join my colleagues here in celebrating the life and contributions of Yogi Bhajan, and celebrate his going home.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Yogi Bhajan, a leader, and friend to me, the State of New Mexico and many others ranging from America to his native country of India. Yogi died peacefully in his sleep at age 75 surrounded by his family in Espanola, New Mexico.

Upon his arrival to America in the 1960's, Yogi immigrated to northern New Mexico and founded the Sikh Dharma in Espanola.

By 1971 Sikh Dharma was officially recognized as a religion in America due to Yogi's determined efforts. Through Yogi Bhajan's non-profit 3H, Healthy, Happy, Holy Organization, he touched the lives of millions throughout the world.

Yogi's name has been a staple throughout New Mexico for decades through his many business endeavors throughout the State. Among his many businesses, Akal Security, founded in 1980 by the Sikh Dharma, now thrives in multiple States and throughout the country by providing security to numerous military installations as well as private corporations throughout the world.

Over 200 books have been written based on his teachings, as well as CD's, videos, paintings, and sculptures. Yogi wrote over 30 books including The Teachings of Yogi Bhaian, Furmaan Khalsa, Masters Touch, and Mind and Its 81 Facets.

Yogi Bhajan believed "It is a birthright to be healthy, happy, and holy" and lived his life accordingly. He will be missed but Yogi Bhajan left a legacy in New Mexico, America, and the world that will not be forgotten.

Mr. McCOTTER. 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. McCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 34.

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. McCOTTER. 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 motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 136 DIRECTING ATTORNEY GENERAL AND SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY TO TRANSMIT DOCUMENTS RELATING TO SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS AND BACKGROUND CHECKS RELATING TO GRANTING ACCESS TO WHITE HOUSE OF JAMES D. GUCKERT (ALSO KNOWN AS JEFF GANNON)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–30) on the resolution (H. Res. 136) directing the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of those officials relating to the security investigations and background checks relating to granting access to the White House of James D. Guckert (also known as Jeff Gannon), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 298

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 298.

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

There was no objection.

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:

H. Res. 108, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 120, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Con. Res. 34, by the yeas and nays.

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

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF ZURAB ZHVANIA, PRIME MINISTER OF REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 108.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 108, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie	Cannon	Doyle
Ackerman	Cantor	Drake
Aderholt	Capito	Dreier
Akin	Capps	Duncan
Allen	Capuano	Edwards
Andrews	Cardin	Emanuel
Baca	Cardoza	Emerson
Bachus	Carnahan	Engel
Baker	Carson	English (PA)
Baldwin	Carter	Eshoo
Barrett (SC)	Case	Etheridge
Barrow	Castle	Everett
Bartlett (MD)	Chabot	Farr
Barton (TX)	Chandler	Feeney
Bass	Chocola	Filner
Bean	Clay	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Beauprez	Cleaver	Flake
Becerra	Clyburn	Foley
Berkley	Cole (OK)	Forbes
Berman	Conaway	Ford
Berry	Conyers	Fortenberry
Biggert	Cooper	Fossella
Bilirakis	Cox	Foxx
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Cubin	Gallegly
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Garrett (NJ)
Blunt	Cummings	Gerlach
Boehlert	Cunningham	Gibbons
Bonilla	Davis (AL)	Gilchrest
Bonner	Davis (CA)	Gillmor
Bono	Davis (FL)	Gingrey
Boozman	Davis (IL)	Gohmert
Boren	Davis (KY)	Gonzalez
Boswell	Davis (TN)	Goode
Boucher	Davis, Jo Ann	Goodlatte
Boustany	Davis, Tom	Gordon
Boyd	Deal (GA)	Graves
Bradley (NH)	DeFazio	Green (WI)
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Green, Al
Brady (TX)	Delahunt	Green, Gene
Brown (SC)	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Brown, Corrine	DeLay	Gutknecht
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Dent	Hall
Burgess	Diaz-Balart, L.	Harman
Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Harris
Butterfield	Dicks	Hart
Buyer	Dingell	Hastings (FL)
Camp	Doggett	Hastings (WA)
	Doolittle	Hayes

Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
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
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—32

Alexander
Baird
Boehner
Brown (OH)
Calvert
Coble
Costa
Costello
Culberson
Ehlers
Evans
Fattah
Ferguson
Granger
Grijalva
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lewis (KY)
Millender-McDonald
Neugebauer
Payne
Platts
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Scott (VA)
Shimkus
Souder
Waters
Watson
Young (FL)

□ 1855

Ms. MCKINNEY changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING OUTSTANDING EFFORTS OF ARMED FORCES AND EMPLOYEES OF STATE DEPARTMENT AND USAID IN RESPONSE TO EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI OF DECEMBER 26, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 120.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 120, 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 401, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—401

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
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
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—33

Alexander
Baird
Berman
Brown (OH)
Calvert
Coble
Conyers
Costello
Ehlers
Fattah
Ferguson
Granger
Harman
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Keller
Kirk
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Millender-McDonald
Neugebauer
Payne
Rangel
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Shimkus
Souder
Stupak
Waters
Watson
Young (FL)

□ 1904

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF YOGI BHAJAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 34.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 34, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
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
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Barrow

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander
Baird
Brown (OH)
Calvert
Coble
Costello
Ehlers
Fattah
Ferguson
Gohmert
Granger
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Lewis (KY)
Millender-McDonald
Neugebauer
Payne
Rangel
Renzi
Scott (VA)
Shimkus
Souder
Waters
Watson
Young (FL)

□ 1922

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) 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.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF HIS HOLINESS POPE JOHN PAUL II AND EXPRESSING PROFOUND SORROW ON HIS DEATH

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time to consider in the House a resolution honoring the life and achievements of His Holiness Pope John Paul II and expressing profound sorrow on his death; the resolution shall be considered as read; the resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and the preamble to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 867

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 867.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 23

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 23.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING WILLIAM C. MARTIN FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO HIS COMMUNITY, HIS UNIVERSITY AND HIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a dear friend of mine, Mr. William C. Martin. This month Mr. Martin will be receiving the Sixth Biannual Humanitarian Award from the Jewish Federation of Washtenaw County, an organization in my district. Bill's integrity, modesty and selfless devotion to the betterment of society make him an embodiment of the ideals represented by this award.

He has used his success as a businessman and influence as a community leader to help those in need. When he was still an MBA student at the University of Michigan, he took on the challenge of helping unemployed, and seemingly unemployable, men find jobs in the community.

Bill Martin's reputation of honor and integrity has led others to look to him in times of difficulty. When he was asked to become the University of Michigan's athletic director at a time when the department needed reform, he not only agreed, he insisted on doing so at no salary. He succeeded in helping turn things around so effectively that he was asked to remain in that position in a permanent capacity, where he remains today.

When the United States Olympic Committee, on whose board Bill served from 1992 to 2003, was shaken by scandal, he agreed to serve as president and help the organization set a better course.

Bill Martin is one of those rare individuals who combines altruism, honesty and leadership to effect positive change on the local, State and national levels. His genuine and giving nature truly represents the principles by which all our Nation's citizens should strive to live.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOSEPH P. RODDY OF ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, my remarks today are to pay tribute to the life of a valued public servant and mentor, the Honorable Joseph P. Roddy of St. Louis, Missouri.

Joe Roddy was associated with Presidents, Congressmen, governors and mayors for decades. He lived his life committed to his faith, his family, his Democratic Party and his beloved constituents. He never lost sight of his belief that elected officials were to serve, and the public was to be served.

Mr. Roddy led his life by example and was a mentor and help to many. Whether it was advising a young candidate for office or helping a neighborhood family in need, no job was too big or too small for Joe Roddy.

Mr. Roddy was active in the Democratic Party for 60 years, particularly in the 17th ward where he was born. He founded the 17th ward FDR Club in 1954.

Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of support by family, friends and the community make it evident to all what an extraordinary person and public servant Mr. Roddy was. He was married to his wife, Lue Roddy, for 50 years. They have four children, Mary, Joe, Daniel and Mark, and have seven grandchildren.

My prayers are with his family, friends and community today as we honor his remarkable life.

Joe Roddy was associated with many Presidents, Congressmen, Governors and Mayors for decades. He lived his life committed to his faith, his family, his Democratic party and his beloved constituents. He never lost sight of his belief that elected officials were to serve, and the public was to be served.

Mr. Roddy led his life by example and was a mentor and help to many. Whether it was advising a young candidate for office or helping a neighborhood family in need, no job was too big or too small for Joe Roddy.

Mr. Roddy was active in the Democratic Party for over 60 years, particularly in the 17th ward where he was born. He founded the 17th Ward F.D.R. Club in 1954, where he was a block secretary, treasurer, alderman, committeeman, and campaign coordinator of the ward organization. In addition to these activities in the 17th ward, he was campaign treasurer for the St. Louis Democratic Central Committee for 14 years, chairman of the 3rd Congressional district for six years, and chairman of the St. Louis City Democratic Central Committee for two years. He was a delegate to four Democratic national conventions and five Missouri Democratic state conventions. In 1994, he received the Harry S. Truman Award from the St. Louis City Democratic Central Committee, the highest award given to a St. Louis City Democrat. Because of his work for the Democratic Party, he was often referred to as "Mr. Democrat." Mr. Roddy also served as Circuit Clerk of the City of St. Louis and was Administrator-Clerk of the City of St. Louis Courts, where he retired in May 1993 after 40 years as a St. Louis City office holder.

As alderman of the 17th ward, Mr. Roddy sponsored and guided to passage one of the first municipal laws in the United States that treated alcoholism as a sickness instead of a crime. He championed the rights of the poor and led a drive that brought surplus food from the U.S. government to 64,000 impoverished people in the city of St. Louis. Mr. Roddy was instrumental in passing civil rights ordinances in the 1950s such as the Public Accommodation Law, Open Housing Law, and the Fair Employment Act. Mr. Roddy was a main figure in a Federal court case that resulted in the Missouri legislative districts being redrawn to conform to the one man-one vote United States Supreme Court decision that demanded equal representation for legislative districts.

As circuit clerk, Mr. Roddy was the first to invest the funds of the court for interest, which contributed to the general fund of the city of St. Louis.

Mr. Roddy was also active in many civic, business, and church groups in addition to his political associations including the Washington University Medical Center Redevelopment Corporation Advisory Committee, the Adult Rehabilitation Center of the Salvation Army Advisory Committee, and the Knights of Columbus.

He was a strong supporter of organized labor. In his early days of employment, he was a member of the Hotel Workers Union, Post Office Clerk Union-Local 8, and Teamsters Local 688. He was the only citywide office holder ever to have by consent agreement employed union members in his office.

He attended kindergarten at Adams School, went from first grade to eighth grade at St. Cronan's School, and won a four-year scholastic scholarship to St. Louis University High School where he graduated with first honors. He also attended Saint Louis University.

He was preceded in death by his parents, Joseph J. Roddy and Ann Flood Roddy, his brother Paul, and his four sisters Mildred Kutrip, Anita Kenkel, Sister Ann Julia Roddy, CSF and Bride Neiman.

Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of support by friends, family, and the community make it evident to all what an extraordinary person and public servant Mr. Roddy was. He was married to his wife, Lucille "Lue" Baumann Bey Roddy for 50 years. They have four children—Mary, married to Michael Sawyer; Joseph D., married to Lisa Roddy; Daniel, married to Patrica Roddy; and Mark Roddy. Joe and Lue have seven grandchildren: Steven, William and Kathleen Sawyer; Christina and Nicholas Roddy; and Joseph Patrick and Brendan Stuart Roddy. My prayers are with his family, friends, and community today, as we honor his remarkable life.

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.

COMMEMORATING GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, during our absence from session over the Easter recess, a momentous date passed which merits our observance. Greek Independence Day commemorates and celebrates the Greek people's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire on March 25, 1821.

From this day, until the Treaty of Constantinople officially recognized Greek independence, the Greek people waged a valiant and victorious struggle for their freedom.

The Ottoman Empire's oppression and occupation of Greece evolved over the course of the 14th and 15th centuries. Yet during these centuries, Greek patriots arose to oppose and overthrow the Ottomans' dominion, and in 1814 emerged the secretly formed Friendly Society, which proved a herald of Hellenic liberty.

Then 7 years later, on March 25, 1821, the Orthodox Metropolitan Germanos of Patras proclaimed a national uprising, and simultaneous uprisings arose throughout Greece. Initially this courageous movement liberated many areas of Greece, but the Ottoman Empire rapidly and ruthlessly responded with innumerable acts of brutality, including the massacre of entire Greek communities.

Such Ottoman barbarism contrasted ill with Greek heroism and inspired many nations and citizens to rally to the Greek cause. Thus, in 1827, the British and French fleets delivered a crushing blow to the Ottoman fleet at Navarino, and in 1828, 10,000 French soldiers landed in the Peloponnese to end the Ottoman scourge of Greece.

It was then, and after the horror of war had ebbed and ended, the Convention of May 11, 1832, recognized Greece as a sovereign state, and, again, the Treaty of Constantinople recognized Greek independence from Ottoman rule in July of 1832.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is both fitting and fair for we Americans as a free people to commemorate and celebrate the date of May 25, the date Greece, the Cradle of Democracy, was once again made free.

So, too, Mr. Speaker, let us reflect upon the reality that no treaty, no mere scrap of paper, could ever accomplish more than to simply state the obviousness of Greek freedom, which has always endured for time immemorial, despite whatever oppression encountered.

Indeed, did not the pen of the British poet and doomed martyr to the cause of Greek independence and freedom, Lord Byron, write a testament to the Greek people's inherent love of liberty when he wrote:

The Sword, the Banner, and the Field,
Glory and Greece, around me see!
The Spartan, borne upon his shield,
Was never more free.

And may Greece, Mr. Speaker, ever be free.

□ 1930

SMART SECURITY AND THE NONMILITARY APPROACH

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Pope John Paul II has passed away. I talk about him tonight because we can learn a lesson from the way he lived his life. I did not agree with a lot of what the Pope believed in, but I agree with the way he fought against that which he believed was worth fighting.

When Pope John Paul II came into office, the Soviet Union was a dominant world power and communism was a dominant ideology. John Paul II, who grew up in Poland, knew firsthand the atrocities that were often committed in the name of communism. He fought against the evils of communism by speaking out and putting international pressures on countries like the Soviet Union, Hungary, and Poland. These countries understood the threat that they faced in this Pope, one strong-willed man, who knew firsthand the perils of the communist system. In 1989, the Soviet Union fell, partially as a result of the Pope's actions.

Then, as now, the world faced a major conflict of ideologies. Instead of communism, the major threat to our generation is Islamic extremism perpetrated by radical groups like al Qaeda. And then, as now, the Pope believed that the proper response was to apply international pressure to alleviate a bad situation.

But instead of applying international pressure and utilizing multilateral diplomacy to fight terrorism, the response by the Bush administration was to send 150,000 troops into Iraq to ''liberate'' the country. Liberate the country from what, exactly? One bad leader named Saddam Hussein? Make no mistake: the invasion of a country that never posed a threat to the United States, never harbored weapons of mass destruction, and never maintained links to groups like al Qaeda is the greatest misstep to occur during George W. Bush's Presidency.

One of the saddest parts about the war in Iraq is the drastic toll it has taken on the people of the United States. This war has cost the lives of more than 1,500 American soldiers. It has caused nearly 12,000 to be gravely wounded. The war has also killed tens of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians.

And the financial cost of the war has been no less burdensome. When the Senate approves the latest $81.4 billion supplemental spending bill, Congress will have appropriated over $200 billion for the war in Iraq in just over 2 years. With no end in sight, President Bush has even claimed that the thousands of troops will remain in the country for years to come, the total cost of the war could be as much as $800 billion by the time we finish blundering in the Middle East. How many will be dead or wounded by the time this war is done?

Despite the President's solemn promise to fight terrorism, the Bush administration has overwhelmingly concentrated America's resources on developing bigger and more expensive weapons at the expense of other more suitable security tools which will truly keep Americans safe. If our country has any hope of defeating terrorist groups like al Qaeda, we need to utilize the most important weapons in our arsenal, not bigger and more dangerous guns and bombs, but international diplomacy, nonmilitary security, and nonproliferation efforts.

That is why I have developed a SMART Security Resolution for the 21st Century. SMART security is a sensible, multilateral American response to terrorism, and it is just what we need to secure America for the future. SMART security emphasizes the nonmilitary approach over the military approach, considering war as an option only when all other alternatives have been totally exhausted.

If we went to war every time we had a problem with another country's leader, there would be nothing left of the United States. Imagine if we had bombed the Soviet Union in the 1970s during the Cold War. It would have been the start of World War III.

It is time we left Iraq. This needs to be done sooner, not later; and it is time we started relying on the smarter approach. This is the only way to resolve the complex while, at the same time, keeping our men and women in the military safe. Let us support a smarter approach to the 21st century, an approach that I call SMART security.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to celebrate Greek Independence Day and its strong ties that bind the nation of Greece and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, 184 years ago, the people of Greece began a journey that would mark a symbolic rebirth of democracy in the land where those principles to human dignity were first espoused.

They rebelled against more than 400 years of Turkish oppression. The revolution of 1821 brought independence to Greece and emboldened those who still

sought freedom across the world. I commemorate Greek Independence Day each year for the same reasons we celebrate our 4th of July. It proved that a united people, through sheer will and perseverance, can prevail against tyranny. Both our nations share an illustrious history and defense of this cherished ideal.

The concept of democracy was first conceived by the ancient Athenians more than 2,500 years ago. Men such as Aristotle, Socrates, Plato, and Euripides developed the then-unique notion that men could, if left to their own devices, lead themselves rather than be subject to the will of a sovereign.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said, ''One man with courage is a majority.'' Jefferson and the rest of the Founding Fathers looked back to the teachings of ancient Greek philosophers for inspiration as they sought to craft the Declaration of Independence. On March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras embodied the spirit of those words when he raised the flag of freedom and was the first to declare Greece free.

News of the Greek revolution was met with widespread feelings of compassion in the United States. Several American Presidents, including James Monroe and John Quincy Adams, conveyed their support for the revolution through their annual messages to Congress.

Various Members of Congress also showed a keen interest in the Greeks' struggle for autonomy. Henry Clay, who in 1825 became Secretary of State, was a champion of Greece's fight for independence.

After 7 years of fighting, the Greeks finally got their independence. Unfortunately, many people were killed in the struggle for freedom. We all know that the price of liberty can be very high. History is replete with the names of the millions who have sacrificed for it.

This year's celebration of Greek Independence Day is especially fitting in light of the current wave of political and social movements around the world in the name of democracy. International events in recent months have brought stunning news of political upheaval and dramatic changes from the Middle East, Africa, and Eastern Europe. Most notably, through peaceful demonstrations, Syria lost its political stronghold on Lebanon. Ukraine elected Viktor Yushchenko as its new President, and Iraq held its first democratic elections. The common theme among all of these movements has been democracy.

However, at a time of democratic celebration, the divided Republic of Cyprus remains a sore spot. Sadly, Turkey still illegally occupies Cyprus, as it has since its invasion in 1974. Despite sincere efforts by the United Nations and the United States, a fair plan was not presented to the people of Cyprus on April 24, 2004. Many people, including the Greek-Cypriots themselves, regret that the plan presented to them did not allow both communities to respond positively. It is one thing for others to comment on the terms and conditions for settlement; but it is the Cypriots, the Cypriots who must live with whatever plan that would be adopted. Finding a fair resolution for Cyprus will help stabilize a region marked more often by conflict than accord. I urge our government to remain committed to finding a peaceful settlement for Cyprus.

Although the ties between Greece and America go back hundreds of years, the fruit of this bond is visible today. During the early 1900s, one out of four Greek males immigrated to the United States. Today there are close to 3 million Greek Americans. I am especially proud of my fellow Greek Americans who have made contributions to our society in the fields of medicine, science, business, law, and politics, among other areas. In the words of a notable British poet, Percy Shelley, he said, ''We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art have their roots in Greece.''

Mr. Speaker, on this 184th birthday of Greek independence, we celebrate the triumph of the human spirit and the strength of man's will. Today we commemorate the reaffirmation of the democratic heritage that our two nations share so closely. Lastly, this occasion also serves to remind us, Mr. Speaker, that we must never take for granted the right to determine our own fate.

Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to celebrate Greek Independence Day and the strong ties that bind the nation of Greece and the United States.

One hundred and eighty-four years ago, the people of Greece began a journey that would mark the symbolic rebirth of democracy in the land where those principles to human dignity were first espoused.

They rebelled against more than 400 years of Turkish oppression. The revolution of 1821 brought independence to Greece and emboldened those who still sought freedom across the world. I commemorate Greek Independence Day each year for the same reasons we celebrate our Fourth of July. It provided that a united people, through sheer will and perseverance, can prevail against tyranny. Both our nations share an illustrious history in defense of this cherished ideal.

The concept of democracy was first conceived by the ancient Athenians more than 2,500 years ago. Men such as Aristotle, Socrates, Plato, and Euripides developed the then-unique notion that men could, if left to their own devices, lead themselves rather than be subject to the will of a sovereign. It was Aristotle who said: ''If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost.'' It was this concept that our Founding Fathers drew heavily upon in forming our representative government.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said that, ''One man with courage is a majority.'' Jefferson, and the rest of the Founding Fathers, looked back to the teachings of ancient Greek philosophers for inspiration as they sought to craft the Declaration of Independence. On March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras embodied the spirit of those words when he raised the flag of freedom and was the first to declare Greece free.

Revolutions embody a sense of heroism, bringing forth the greatness of the human spirit. Encouraged by the American Revolution, the Greeks began their rebellion after four centuries of Turkish oppression, facing what appeared to be insurmountable odds. Both nations faced the prospect of having to defeat an empire to obtain liberty. Although many lives were sacrificed at the altar of freedom, the Greek people rallied around the battle cry ''Eleftheria I Thanatos'' ''liberty or death,'' mirroring the words of American Patriot Patrick Henry who said: ''Give me liberty or give me death.'' These words personified the Greek patriots' unmitigated desire to be free.

Not surprisingly, the Greek Commander-in-Chief Petros Mavromichalis appealed to the citizens of America, ''Having formed the resolution to live or die, we are drawn toward you by a just sympathy since it is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode. . . . Hence, honoring her name, we invoke yours at the same time, trusting that in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you.''

News of the Greek revolution was met with widespread feelings of compassion in the United States. Several American Presidents, including James Monroe and John Quincy Adams, conveyed their support for the revolution through their annual messages to Congress. William Harrison, our ninth president, expressed his belief in freedom for Greece, saying: ''We must send our free will offering. 'The Star-spangled Banner' must wave in the Aegean . . . a messenger of fraternity and friendship to Greece.''

Various Members of Congress also showed a keen interest in the Greeks' struggle for autonomy. Henry Clay, who in 1825 became Secretary of State, was a champion of Greece's fight for independence. Among the most vocal was Daniel Webster from Massachusetts, who frequently roused the sympathetic interest of his colleagues and other Americans in the Greek revolution.

Many Americans sympathized with the ''Philhellenic'' cause and sent the Greeks supplies, food, and medicine; anything that could help maintain and boost the moral of the Greeks. In fact, many traveled to Greece to join the revolution in the fight for freedom.

After seven years of fighting, the Greeks finally got their independence. Unfortunately, many people were killed in the struggle for freedom. We all know that the price of liberty can be very high—history is replete with the names of the millions who have sacrificed for it. Many great scholars throughout history warned that we maintain democracy only at a great costs. The freedom we enjoy today is due to a large degree to the sacrifices made by men and women in the past—in Greece, in America, and all over the world.

Freedom is America's heart. It is central to our being, and from the beginning we have recognized that freedom is not just an American right. It is a God-given right to every citizen of the world. The lessons the Greeks and our colonial forefathers taught us provide hope and inspiration to victims of persecution throughout the world today.

This year's celebration of Greek Independence Day is especially fitting in light of the current wave of political and social movements around the world in the name of democracy. International events in recent months have brought stunning news of political upheaval and dramatic changes from the Middle East, Africa and Eastern Europe. Most notably, through peaceful demonstrations, Syria lost its political stronghold on Lebanon, Ukraine elected Viktor Yushchenko as its new president and Iraq held its first democratic elections. The common theme between all of these movements has been democracy.

However, at a time of democratic celebration, the divided Republic of Cyprus remains a sore spot. Sadly, Turkey still illegally occupies Cyprus, as it has since its invasion in 1974. Despite sincere efforts by the United Nations and the United States, a fair plan was not presented to the people of Cyprus on April 24, 2004. Many people—including the Greek-Cypriots themselves—regret that the plan presented to them did not allow both communities to respond positively. It is one thing for others to comment on the terms and conditions for settlement, but it is the Cypriots who must live with whatever plan would be adopted. Finding a fair resolution for Cyprus will help stabilize a region marked more often by conflict than accord. I urge our government to remain committed to finding a peaceful settlement for Cyprus.

I believe these principles of which my colleagues and I have spoken about today are not uniquely Greek or American. They are our promise to the world and they form a legacy that we all cherish and have responsibility to protect and defend.

The priceless ideas of democracy and equality born in ancient Greece have strongly shaped the American national identity. We continue to give hope and inspiration to millions around the world who yearn to live in a free society like ours. We enjoy our freedom only because we have been willing to fight and die for it, just like our forefathers and the valiant Greeks in 1821. Greece set the example for us and we have set the example for countless others.

Although the ties between Greece and America go back hundreds of years, the fruit of this bond is visible today. During the early 1900s one out of four Greek males immigrated to the United States. Today there are close to three million Greek-Americans. I am especially proud of my fellow Greek-Americans who have made contributions to our society in the fields of medicine, science, business, law and politics, among other areas. In the words of a notable British poet, Percy Shelley, ''We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece.''

Mr. Speaker, on this 184th birthday of Greek Independence we celebrate the triumph of the human spirit and the strength of man's will. Today we commemorate the reaffirmation of the democratic heritage that our two nations share so closely. Lastly, this occasion also serves to remind us that we must never take for granted the right to determine our own fate.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to pay tribute on Greek Independence Day to one of the United States' most important allies and one which is regarded with such deep affection by millions of Americans of all ethnic origins.

Western civilization as we know it today owes the deepest debt and, indeed, its very origins, to the Greek nation. Greek philosophy, sculpture, and theater set standards to which today's practitioners still aspire. And, as the cradle of democracy, Athens is the spiritual ancestor of our own Republic and, in many respects, its role model.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Greek independence is one of the inspiring stories of our time. It is the tale of the revival of an ancient and great people through sheer commitment, sacrifice, and love of freedom and heritage. Transmitted through the generations, the ideals of the ancient Greeks inspired their revolutionary descendants in the nineteenth century, and great and gallant stalwarts of the War of Independence such as Theodore Kolokotronis and Rigas Velestinlis wrote of their belief in the rights of man.

The histories of the United States and Greece have been intimately intertwined ever since the beginning of modern Greek sovereignty. The cause of Greek independence evoked sympathy throughout the Western world. Well known is Lord Byron, whose uncompromising commitment to Greece was epitomized by his declaration ''In for a penny, in for a pound.'' Less renowned but no less committed were the many American Philhellenes, who repaid their debt to Greek culture by crossing the ocean to fight for Greek liberation. I am pleased that these American citizens have been honored with a monument in Athens.

Mr. Speaker, Greek citizens also crossed the ocean in the other direction, emigrating to the United States, where they enjoyed great success and shared their prosperity with their kinfolk in their original homeland. They have served as a bridge of understanding between our two nations, and they have refreshed America with their spirit, their patriotism, and their hard work. Today, some five million Americans claim Greek ancestry, with understandable pride.

Our close relations with Greece became even closer after World War II. The Truman Doctrine helped save Greece from communism, indeed helped save it for the Western and democratic world, and the Marshall Plan helped in Greece's economic regeneration. In 1952, Greece joined NATO, formalizing the deep, mutual commitment of Greece and the rest of the Western world to protecting freedom.

In more recent times, Mr. Speaker, Greece has been one of the world's amazing success stories. A full-fledged member of the European Union for nearly a quarter-century, Greece has become increasingly prosperous; it whipped chronic inflation and joined the ''Euro currency zone.'' Its once unsettled domestic politics—including the sad chapter of military rule from 1967–74—has long since given way to an incontestably stable, yet still colorful, democracy. The Greek people cherish democracy not only as their contribution to world civilization but as a system which they achieved only through enormous sacrifice and commitment in modern times.

Greece remains one of our critical strategic partners in today's post-cold war world. We cooperate closely in promoting peace and stability in the Balkans. Economic ties with Greece are vital to virtually every Balkan state. Athens has been a firm supporter of a just, lasting, and democratic settlement of the Cyprus issue. More than 1,300 Greek troops took part in Operation Enduring Freedom and helped liberate Afghanistan from Taliban tyranny. And I'm sure everybody in this body applauds Greece's historic and courageous effort to resolve differences with its neighbor Turkey, punctuated by its strong backing last year for Turkey's successful bid to open accession talks for EU membership.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Greek people on the 184th anniversary of their independence and in thanking them for their substantial contributions to world civilization and especially to our nation.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to honor a great American ally and an inspiration to people striving for freedom throughout the whole world—Greece.

Today the House observes the 184th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire. This anniversary not only represents a triumph for the nation of Greece but a triumph for all Western democratic nations. The ancient city-states of Greece created many of the fundamental elements that have shaped our modern culture such as logic, mathematics, the empirical method of scientific discovery, politics, and the philosophical ideals that were embraced by our Founding Fathers, especially the motion of democracy and self-governance.

In a perplexing world where terrorism and war confront our nation, it is comforting to know that we can count on the nation of Greece for support. Greece remains one of our staunchest allies. Greece was one of the first nations to express solidarity for the United States after 9/11 and since then has been in the forefront of the War on Terror.

I join Greek Americans in my district of Pittsburgh Pennsylvania and throughout the world in celebrating a proud nation with a rich long heritage in inspiring and influencing men and women around the world. I am proud to stand here today to recognize and honor Greece on this the 184th Anniversary of its independence.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join millions of Greeks and Greek-Americans in celebration of the 184th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Through it was 184 years ago this day that the Greek people fought for their unquestioned freedom, the Greek tradition of liberty and self-governance extends back thousands of years. The city-states of that storied peninsula were truly the forefathers of our democratic lineage. Our own founders drew upon the teachings and experiences of the ancient Greeks in their pursuit of individual freedom.

There is no area of human thought that does not pay homage to the enduring contributions of Greece. Our greatest masters of mathematics, literature, science, art, architecture, theatre and philosophy all trace their intellectual heritage through its people. It is without question that the ancient Greeks were responsible for bringing light on what was an otherwise dark world.

In two centuries, we have watched as a new democracy has been reforged where the very idea of democracy was born. The Greek people have also helped build America as well. Greek-American communities continue to add to the richness and tradition of many of America's cities, not least of all, in my own district in New York City. Our shared values of freedom and individual excellence have made Greek-Americans an important part of the quilt of American society.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion in which we celebrate Greeks independence, let us all remember the great debt we owe to the civilization that has given so much of itself to become the foundation of all democracies. By carrying on the great tradition of democracy, let us remember and honor the legacy of ancient Greece, as we stand with our Greek friends and allies of today.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Greeks Independence Day.

March 25, 2005 marked the 184th anniversary of the revolution that freed the people of Greece from the Ottoman Empire. Today, I extend my solidarity in commemoration of this celebration of independence and democracy.

As the cradle of western civilization, we are deeply indebted to the nation of Greece and the Greek people for their wisdom and commitment to the ideals of freedom and democracy. Our own democracy was created from the blue prints of ancient Greece.

The contribution of Greeks to the arts, sciences, and political fields are felt profoundly to this day. It is through Greek experiences and insight that the ideals of self-governance were shaped. In modern times, the Greek people have reaffirmed their commitment to the goals of their proud past. As a member of the European Union, Greece has constantly championed democratic principles and been an important advocate for freedom fighters throughout the world.

I congratulate the people of Greece for their vital contributions to our world, in both ancient and modern times, as we celebrate Greek Independence Day.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 2005 has been designated "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy." I am pleased to join my colleagues in recognizing the unique contribution of Greece and of Greek-Americans.

Ancient Greeks created a form of government that got people involved in the task of governing themselves. Our founding fathers, as ratified in our Constitution, enshrined this principle in American law and created a system of "Grecian republics" which was based on the Hellenic belief that the authority to govern derives directly from the people. We will always owe a great intellectual debt to that rich and vibrant civilization. Today, our two countries share a great cultural affinity, are partners in the NATO alliance, and have many other ties that bind us together.

In Dallas, Texas, the warm winds of the Greek Isles are just a step away in Yiayia Sofia's Greek Village, the permanent exhibit at the Dallas Children's Museum which offers children the rare opportunity to explore a replica of a home and village square in Greece. Mr. Speaker, more than a million citizens of Greek descent live in America today, and their devotion to family, faith, community, and country has enriched me, my community in Dallas, Texas, as well as our Nation. For that I am always appreciative of the Greek beauty and culture that has enriched my entire life. I'm pleased we take time out each year to recall how we are all enriched by the art, the ideals, and the spirit of Greece.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of the 184th Anniversary of Greek Independence and to thank my colleagues, Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mrs. MALONEY, who have once again shown great leadership in their efforts to organize this special order.

On Greek Independence Day, we celebrate our special ties of friendship, history, and shared values with Greece. In doing so, we not only honor such an important day in Greek history, but also the strong and unique relationship that exists today between the United States and Greece.

Our two nations have enjoyed close relations since the people of Greece declared their independence on March 25, 1821. Our country has welcomed generations of Greek immigrants, and we are grateful for how they have enhanced our culture and contributed to our country in a variety of fields, including philosophy, architecture, politics and the arts. I am so proud to have a thriving community of Hellenic-Americans in the 9th District of New Jersey. I salute them and their ancestors' struggle for freedom on the anniversary of Greek Independence Day and I commend them for their tremendous contributions to the very fabric of our community.

For nearly 200 years, the American and Greek peoples have shared a profound commitment to democratic principles, and have worked to create societies built on these principles. The United States and Greece have stood together in every major struggle for freedom and democracy and now they continue to work together in the fight against terrorism. Greece continues to be a valuable military partner to the United States, as is evident through their support of both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, and an important member of both NATO and the European Union.

I am so pleased to have this opportunity to toast the Greek people and celebrate Greek culture once again. It is an honor to rise and commemorate the 184th Greek Independence Day. On this day we celebrate more than just Greece's independence, we celebrate Greece as an important military ally and longstanding friend of the United States.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud recognition of the 184th anniversary of Greek Independence. On this special day for Greece, we commemorate the strength and determination of its people to restore their democratic roots and identity.

The political philosophies of both the United States and Greece have been challenged by oppressive powers, and both nations have proudly defended their right to self-government and individual freedoms. Greece endured eleven long years of war to succeed in gaining independence from the Ottoman Empire. American and Hellenic cultures greatly respect this tradition of independence and recognize the importance of democratic principles.

The United States and Greece have always enjoyed a friendship and alliance in international and cultural endeavors. Hellenic principles resonate in our culture and politics, since the United States was founded on the principles of democracy developed thousands of years ago in the city-states of ancient Greece. The beauty of Greek architecture can even be found while taking a walk through our beloved Capitol building. Likewise, our country's influence on Greece can be seen in their first Constitution, which was based on our Declaration of Independence and the principles behind the American Revolution.

On a cultural level, I would like to commend Greece on the great success of the Olympic Games in Athens last August. Since Greece resurrected the Olympics in 1896, they have symbolized peace and excellence for people around the world. The Olympics show that great athletic skill and spirited competition can bring nations together despite their differences. Greece served as a gracious host of the Games, and the 25th Summer Olympics proved again to the world how Hellenic ideals such as equality and friendship have stood the test of time and continue to flourish at a global level. Hellenic culture, whether through its development of democratic government or its espousal of friendly competition, encourages people to come together amicably even during the most difficult of times.

Mr. Speaker, it would be hard to imagine the United States of America, or the world for that matter, without the great contributions of Greece. I will continue to work in Congress to support Hellenic causes, and I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating Greece on the anniversary of its independence.

I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating this anniversary.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues here in the United States Congress in celebration of the 184th anniversary of Greece's Independence Day. We would not be standing in this very building were it not for the influences of ancient Greek architecture and ancient Greek notions of freedom, democracy, and independence.

On the anniversary of Greek independence, we honor the achievements and contributions of the Greek people and the Greek state, and salute a proud nation that has accomplished so much in history, science, philosophy, mathematics, literature, and art. But by far the most notable of all their achievements is the notion of democracy. Our own founding fathers incorporated the ancient Greek's political experience and philosophy when they formed our representative democracy. In 1821, the Greeks continued this tradition by revolting against nearly 400 years of repressive rule by the Ottoman Empire and began their journey toward independence.

Greek concepts of government and freedom have had an immense and inestimable influence on the world. The world witnessed this as Greece, home of the first Olympics, hosted the Games once again in 2004. So March 25th marked a historic day for the world, not just for Greece alone. It is yet another day for all to celebrate the principles of democracy, freedom and self-governance.

Over the years, the United States and Greece have shown their commitment to and admiration for democratic ideals. Greece is one of only a handful of countries that stood by the United States in every major international conflict in the 20th century: World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, Desert Storm, and the Balkans. The Greek government responded to the September 11th terrorist attacks with strong political support, as well. The United States and Greece have formed a special bound based upon their shared commitment to democracy and freedom.

Today, the world needs to come together and stand on the basis of Greek principles to protect the human and religious rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. While this is an issue that concerns the Greek community, it is one that is vital to all communities. We must protect the rights of Ecumenical Patriarchate as Turkey has: refused to recognize the Ecumenical Patriarchate's international status and its significance of Orthodox Christians around the world; prevented the Orthodox Christian church from selecting bishops from anywhere in the world to become the Ecumenical Patriarch by requiring Turkish citizenship; confiscated Ecumenical properties since 2002; and levied a retroactive tax on the Balukli Hospital, a philanthropic institution run by the Ecumenical Patriarchate which treats thousands of patients a year.

We also call on Turkey to grant appropriate international recognition and ecclesiastic succession to the Ecumenical Patriarch, along with the right to train clergy of all nationalities.

Finally, the resolution calls on Turkey to respect the property rights and religious rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

From the history of democracy to the religious freedom and human rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, we share a common vision with Greece and all of her people. On this day, the United States of America and Greece stand side-by-side in our commitment to the principles of democracy, freedom, and independence. And I would like to thank the Greek people for leading the way and giving us the inspiration and strength to pursue these ideals.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on March 25th Greece celebrated its 184th year of independence. I am here tonight to praise a society that represents, in a historical sense, the origins of what we call Western culture, and, in a contemporary sense, one of the staunchest defenders of Western society and values. There are many of us in Congress, on both sides of the spectrum, who are staunchly committed to preserving and strengthening the ties between Greek and American people.

In the years since Greek independence, Americans and Greeks have grown ever closer, bound by ties of strategic and military alliance, common values of democracy, individual freedom, human rights, and close personal friendship.

The timeless values of Greek culture have endured for centuries, indeed for millennia. Four hundred years of control by the Ottoman Empire could not overcome the Greek people's determination to be free. But, I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, to this day, the Greek people must battle against oppression. For over 30 years now, Greece has stood firm in its determination to bring freedom and independence to the illegally occupied nation of Cyprus.

I also have grown increasingly concerned over the Bush administration's blatant shift in policy towards Cyprus that's become apparent since the Greek Cypriots rejected a United Nations reunification proposal offered by U.N. Secretary General Koffi Annan last year. I reject the belief that the United States Government should punish Greek Cypriots for going to the voting booth and concluding, rightly in my opinion, that the Annan Plan forced the Greek Cypriots to make far more concessions than Turkey.

I'm particularly concerned by comments made earlier this year by Secretary Rice in Turkey in which she stated: (and I quote) ''We are looking at what we can do to ease the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots because, we, like everyone else, were disappointed that the Annan plan was not adopted. We have taken some steps, direct aid for instance to Turkish Cypriots, but there are probably other things that we should look at doing.''

I shouldn't have to remind the Secretary of State that the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots derives from the ongoing occupation of the northern third of the island by Turkish troops and that our nations efforts should be concentrated on the withdrawal of these troops.

While the U.S. government should work to make the lives of Turkish-Cypriots better, it's simply unacceptable for our government to help the Turkish-Cypriot 'government' that continues to illegally rule the northern third of the island. The Bush administration simply cannot ignore well-established international law as a way to punish the Greek Cypriots for their democratic vote in opposition to the Annan Plan.

It's important that Secretary of State take a historic look at the Cyprus problem over the last 30 years when developing U.S. policy. It's important the U.S. Government not only look at the Cyprus problem through the lens of the Annan vote last year, but also from the perspective of three decades of illegal actions on the Turkish side.

I would hope that the Bush administration would then conclude that it's in the best interests of our nation to support a united democratic Cyprus, free of any Turkish occupation or any Turkish troops.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again congratulate the Greek people for 184 years of independence, and hope someday soon we can celebrate the independence of the Greek-Cypriots.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 184th anniversary of Greece's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire. Against impossible odds, the Greeks defeated one of the most powerful empires in history and gained their independence.

In March 1821, after 400 years of Ottoman rule, Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the traditional Greek flag at the monastery of Agia Lavras, inciting his countrymen to rise against the Ottoman army. The Bishop timed this act of revolution to coincide with the Greek Orthodox holiday celebrating the archangel Gabriel's announcement that the Virgin Mary was pregnant with the divine child. Bishop Germanos's message to his people was clear: a new spirit was about to be born in Greece.

Greek Independence Day is an appropriate time to reflect upon the strong ties between Greece and the United States. Indeed, when the Greeks of 1821 fought for independence from the Ottoman Empire, they drew inspiration from the ideals and institutions of the fledgling United States. During their War of Independence, the Greeks also received encouragement from many Americans, including Presidents James Madison and James Monroe and Representatives Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, each of whom gave memorable speeches in Congress in support of the Greek revolutionaries. Just as our defeat of the British army was remarkable, so too was the Greek triumph over the Ottoman Army, a momentous achievement in world history.

As many of my colleagues know, New York City is home to the largest Hellenic population outside of Greece and Cyprus. Western Queens, which I have the honor of representing, is often called Little Athens because of the large Hellenic population in that neighborhood.

New Yorkers celebrate Greek Independence Day with a parade on Fifth Avenue in Manhattan, along with a great many cultural events and private gatherings. These events, hosted by the Federation of Hellenic Societies and other Hellenic and Philhellenic organizations and friends, remind us of the Hellenic-American community's many contributions to our nation's history and culture.

On April 10, the President of the Federation of Hellenic Societies, Nikos Diamontidis, along with the organization's officers and board members, will join Parade Committee Chairman Dinos Rallis, Co-Chairmen Tasos Manesis and Philip Christopher and Co-Chairwoman Georgia Kaloidis in reminding New Yorkers of the glory of Greece, the joy of the Olympics and the hope of freedom and human rights for all. The Grand Marshals of this year's parade are my distinguished colleague, Senator PAUL SARBANES, his wife, Christine, Anthony Diamataris, the Editor and Publisher of the National Herald and his wife, Litsa. Adding to the day's ethnic pride will be parade emcees Nick Gregory, Anthoula Katsimatides and Petros Fourniotis.

In 2004, the Athens Olympics united the world. Today, while New Yorkers pay tribute to Greece's accomplishments, we also seek to add our hometown to the list of great Olympic host cities. It is my hope that one of Greece's most enduring contributions to world history will finally come to New York City in 2012.

As the founder and co-Chairperson of the Hellenic Caucus in Congress, I ask the nation to join me in celebrating Greece's independence. Additionally, it is my sincere pleasure to pay tribute to New York's Hellenic-American community for its many contributions to our city and nation.

''Zeto E Eleftheria!'' (Long Live Freedom!)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Greek people and their successful

struggle for independence from Ottoman occupation that began nearly 184 years ago.

The Greek intellectual exploration into the meaning of civics and citizenship sparked questions about government that are still being asked throughout the world. Greek curiosity nurtured great thinkers such as Plato and Socrates who spent their lives examining the role between the individual and the state. They posed questions like ''what is the meaning of justice?'' and ''what is the ideal republic?'' These timeless questions are still being asked in nations that are searching for a more just government and are being tested in democracies around the world.

When establishing our democratic nation, our founding fathers drew a great deal from the ancient Greeks. Our Democratic system, that is founded on the principals of popular representation, was introduced by the ancient Athenians who were the first to create a civilization based on the rule of the people. Our founding fathers continued the Greek tradition of debating how best to govern and pursued a government that would provide liberty and justice for all. Our dual experiments in democratic government will forever link the United States and Greece.

While our founding fathers relied heavily on the teachings of ancient Greeks, the Greeks based their independence movement beginning in 1821 on our fight for freedom from the British. The Greeks used our struggle for independence as inspiration during their fight from Ottoman rule. Through perseverance and determination the Greeks were able to break from tyranny and bring democracy back to its origins.

Not only can we trace our democratic government to Greece, but also the foundation of science. As some of the first philosophers, the Greeks explored the fields of mathematics, logic, astronomy, physics and biology. The Greeks focused on thinking and understanding, rather than the practical use of their findings in science. Through Aristotle's concept of a posteriori we base the foundations for the modern scientific method. The Greeks taught us that only through experimentation can one truly understand the surrounding world. Our basic understanding of the Earth came from the studies of Ancient Greeks as they questioned the sun, the moons and the stars.

Without the early studies of the Greeks, our current world would be much different. On this 184th anniversary of Greek independence and as a member of the Hellenic Caucus, I rise to honor the Greeks on their everlasting input in our society.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 184th anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

On March 25, 1821, the people of Greece launched a long, but successful revolt against 400 years of oppressive rule by the Ottoman Turks. Greece's eight year struggle for independence is a testament to the strength of the human spirit in its pursuit of freedom.

As Americans, we share with the Greeks their longstanding commitment to democracy and the rule of law. Our Nation's founding principles of freedom and democracy were influenced by ancient Greek philosophers just as the Greek revolution of 1821 was inspired by the American fight for freedom in 1776.

Our common struggles against totalitarianism and fascism have forged a bond between our nations. Greece has stood by the United States throughout modern history's major world conflicts, including World War II, the Korean War, the Cold War, and now, the war on terror.

Last summer, the Olympic Games returned to their ancient birthplace. Greece accommodated more than 10,000 athletes from 202 countries. Greece proudly displayed its culture and civilization, and hosted people of all nationalities to participate in noble athletic competition.

I am proud to represent a large and active Greek-American community in my congressional district. I have worked with my constituents to support the return of the Elgin marbles, U.S. participation in negotiations over Cyprus, the inclusion of Greece in the Visa Waiver Pilot Program, and the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to His All Holiness Patriarch Bartholomew.

I congratulate the people of Greece on their Nation's 184th anniversary of independence and freedom.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today and join the millions of my fellow Americans in commemorating Greek Independence Day which, on March 25th celebrated the 184th anniversary of the rebellion and the struggle of the Greek people against the Ottoman Empire.

What makes Greek Independence Day so special here in America is that it reminds us of the strong principles and bonds that the U.S. and Greece share. In looking into the struggles of our two nations, we realize how much our struggles have in common, and how much each country has been influenced by the other.

Greece and the United States are bound by an absolute commitment to the democratic ideals of justice and freedom and continue to be strong allies. By commemorating Greek Independence Day, we also celebrate the strength and the resolve of the human spirit that has been the inspiration of us all.

I am very pleased to place into the RECORD a statement made on this 184th anniversary of Greek independence written by one of my constituents, Constantinos Nicolaou:

STATEMENT OF MR. CONSTANTINOS NICOLAOU OF MARYLAND

The greatness of the human spirit, regardless of any efforts to suppress it, will always rise against tyranny and oppression and will start revolutions where heroism will pay any price, even the ultimate sacrifice of life, in order to gain freedom and independence.

Every time we commemorate heroism such as the one exhibited by the Greeks on March 25, 1821 and during the ensuing struggle for their freedom, we cannot help but think of our great Founding Fathers, who were so much influenced by the ancient Greeks in their struggles for freedom and the creation of what had become the freest, most democratic country in history, the United States of America.

Thomas Jefferson looked to the ancient Greek philosophers and their teachings as an inspiration in trying to create a fair, strong, democratic state. And it was not accidental that many of the Greek leaders of the 1821 revolution, turned to America for inspiration as they were embarking in their struggle for freedom.

Both nations were faced with seemingly insurmountable struggles, rising against empires to claim their rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Both nations became triumphant at the end, because of their love of freedom. The great American Patriot, Patrick Henry, proclaimed, ''Give me liberty or give me death.'' The Greek patriots went to battle proclaiming, ''Eleftheria I Thanatos'' —liberty or death.

As with the American Revolution, the Greek revolution is filled with stories of heroism and sacrifice. News of such heroism and sacrifice met with strong feelings of support by the American public and by their politicians, including President James Monroe and John Quincy Adams, who expressed their support for the Greek revolution through their annual messages to Congress. Henry Clay, our secretary of state in 1825, was very vocal in his support of Greece's fight for independence. Daniel Webster, more often than not, influenced his colleagues in looking into the Greek struggle with sympathetic interests.

It is, of course, no surprise that our Founding Fathers and other prominent Americans were supportive of the Greek struggle for independence. As mentioned, they themselves had been inspired by the ancient Greeks. Thomas Jefferson, of all the Founding Fathers, had a particular affinity for Greece, not only because of its classical republican philosophy but also because of his studies of the origins of languages. He expressed that affinity many times, as in a letter to John Brazier on August 24, 1819. In that letter, Thomas Jefferson addresses ''Mr. Pickering's Memoir of the Modern Greek,'' and the Memoirs review by Brazier. He tells Brazier, ''I had been much pleased with the memoir, and was much also with your review of it. I have little hope indeed of recovery of the ancient pronunciation of the finest of human languages, but still I rejoice to the attention the subject seems to excite with you, because it is evidence that our country begins to have a taste for something more than merely as much Greek as will pass a candidate for clerical ordination. . . . Among the values of classical learning, I estimate the luxury of learning the Greek and Roman authors in all the beauties of their originals. And why should not this innocent and elegant luxury take its preeminent stand ahead of all those addressed merely to the senses? I think myself more indebted to my father for this than for all other luxuries his cares and affections have placed within my reach.''

Jefferson expressed his empathies with Greece revolting against its Ottoman rulers. In an 1823 letter to Adamantios Coray, the Greek patriot and scholar that he had met in Paris years earlier, he stated:

''. . . You have certainly began at the right end towards preparing them [the Greek people] for the great object they are now contending for, by improving their minds and qualifying them for self-government. For this they will owe you lasting honors. Nothing is more likely to forward this object than a study of the fine models of science left by their ancestors; to whom we also are all indebted for the lights which originally led ourselves out of Gothic darkness.''

No people sympathize more feelingly than ours with the suffering of your countrymen; none offer more sincere and ardent prayers to heaven for their success. And nothing indeed but the fundamental principle of our government never to entangle us with the broils of Europe could restrain our generous youth from taking some part in this holy cause. Possessing ourselves the combined

blessing of liberty and order, we wish the same to other countries, and to none more than yours, which she first of civilized nations presented examples of what man should be.

The ties that bind America and Greece go, of course, far beyond their parallel and noble struggles for freedom. The philosophical and cultural connections, although little known to the public at large, could not be stronger or better assimilated. Such connections were born almost at the same time with the birth of our nation, if not before. In his excellent study of ''Lincoln at Gettysburg,'' Gary Wills tells us:

''America as a second Athens was an idea whose moment had come in the nineteenth century. . . . In the early 19th century, an era that became known as America's Greek Revival was taking shape. Archaeological discoveries in Greece at the time brought the ancient democracy to mind just as modern Greece began its struggle for freedom from the Turks.

''Edward Everett, President of Harvard, founder of Mount Auburn, congressman, Massachusetts's governor, minister to the Court of St. James's in London, senator, secretary of state and principal speaker at Gettysburg years later, was the leader of the Greek Revival. Harvard established its new chair of ancient Greek studies for him. While studying in Germany, Everett went to Greece, 'to walk over the battlefields where the first democracy of the West won its freedom.' He returned to America convinced that a new Athens was rising here. His appearances, 'prompted rallies for Greek independence'—a favorite cause of Everett.

''Everett's prestige influenced others, including historian George Bancroft, whose 'main interest was Greek history.'. . . Bancroft was ahead of the wave of histories that would glorify Periclean Athens in Victorian England. Direct democracy, a flawed system in republican theory, was rehabilitated, for its usefulness in the parliamentary reform movement, by British historians like George Grote. In America, a similar motion toward government by the people, not just for the republic, was signaled by an enthusiasm for Greek symbols. Barcroft became a Jacksonian Democrat when he began to apply historical skills formed on the Attic democracy to America's development. Walter Savage Landor recognized what was happening in America when he dedicated the second volume of his Pericles and Aspasia to President Andrew Jackson.''

Greece and the United States, bound by their absolute commitment to freedom and justice, have always been the strongest of the allies. Greece stood by us and fought with us in every single war or conflict since we both gained our freedom. And we always stood by Greece, and although at times we appeared to have forgotten how loyal and valuable the Greeks had been to us, our ultimate commitment to their freedom and well-being never wavered.

And as we commemorate and fight to free all people, let us remember that some other friends of ours are still agonizing and asking for our help in fighting forces of evil still occupying their land and their homes. The people of the Republic of Cyprus, Greeks and Turks and all others, should be given more active support by our great nation in their efforts to reunite the island and get rid of the occupying forces. U.S. leadership is essential, and now it is the time that we should remember that the Cypriot people are where we had been, and they are striving for what we have earned long time ago, that is, their right to freedom, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It is essential that American leadership urges Turkish and Turkish Cypriot leaders towards peace. These are the two sides that hold in their hands, to the largest extent, the peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem. A solution that undoubtedly will benefit all the people of Cyprus, but it will also benefit the nations of Greece and Turkey, will stabilize the region, and will strengthen the bonds and relationships between the United States and the countries involved in the conflict.

As we commemorate Greek Independence Day, we are celebrating the strength and the resolve of the human spirit as well as man's unbending will in the pursuit of freedom. The people of ancient Greece gave us values and ethics and showed us how to fight for freedom and democracy. Our country, more than any other country, shares those values and ethics, and in days such as this we reaffirm our common democratic heritage with the Greek people. The commemoration and celebration remind us also that we should stay forever vigilant in fighting for and protecting our freedom and our democracy, least we lose the right to determine our lives and our future.

Dionisios Solomos was the great poet who transformed in his poetry the unparalleled struggle and the sacrifices of Hellenism in the pursuit of Freedom. The Revolution so much influenced his poetry that he is considered the national poet of Greece. One of his most inspired poems, Hymn to Liberty, has almost become synonymous to that Revolution and it became Greece's National Anthem. The poem was published in 1825, along with translations in Italian, French and English.

The Revolution would have never been the same without Solomos. The enthusiasm of the fighters, as well as the international sympathy among the Philhellenes would have definitely been smaller without the Hymn to Liberty.

Probably nowhere was Solomos's vision of Liberty depicted better than here, in the United States. Here, in the Rotunda of our own Capitol Hill, we see a most wonderful painting of Liberty, with the sword in hand chasing her enemies, exactly the way Solomos envisioned her in his Hymn to Liberty. This figure was painted by another son of Greece, one who really grasped Solomos's vision of Liberty, Constantino Brumidi.

And as a tribute to the United States, Solomos envisions our country rejoicing in seeing Greece fighting for Freedom. He describes the American feelings this way:

Most heartily was gladdened
George Washington's brave land:
For the iron bonds remembered,
Her old slavery's cruel brand.

We live today in a great, free country. Our country became great, and will always be so, because the spirit and the morals that we share with Greece, as so eloquently expressed by Solomos, will always be with us.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

THE MORE WE KNOW ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN, THE LESS WE LIKE IT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess, our office sponsored a town hall meeting for constituents to voice their opinions on the administration's plan to partially privatize Social Security. It was actually held at a community college, at Houston Community College Northeast, that is in our district; and we had both college students and senior citizens there.

One of the things that came out of that town hall meeting is the concern that Social Security is not broke; that sure, $1.7 trillion of our national debt is, as the President says, IOUs from Social Security, and my constituents' concern is that if we are going to pay back the 40 percent of our national debt, about $7 trillion, to the many citizens of foreign countries who loan money to the United States, why on this Earth would we not pay back the Social Security trust fund that $1.7 trillion.

One thing that came out of that town hall meeting is that the more details they learned about the President's plan, the less they favor it. That might be why the administration has released so few details about their plan. What we know is the plan includes a proposal to allow taxpayers 4 percent or up to $1,000 in private savings accounts that theoretically would yield a greater return than the government bonds on which Social Security is now invested. That proposal sounds all well and good until the American people, in our district particularly, realized that the private accounts would not alleviate any of Social Security's financial challenges.

The recent Social Security Trustees Report estimated the Social Security shortfall to be $3.7 trillion over the next 75 years. But the proposal to create these private accounts or personal accounts will not help the bottom line at all. Even the President, before we broke for our Easter recess, admitted that ''personal accounts do not solve the issue.''

What the President needed to add at the end of that sentence is that the private accounts actually make the problem worse.

In the first 20 years of the President's plan, the Federal Government will have to borrow $5 trillion to make up for the additional shortfall created by these private or special accounts. And, even worse, if you use the Social Security Administration's assumption, the administration's privatization plan would exhaust the trust fund actually 11 years earlier than currently projected.

Through this particular concern, several of my constituents pointed out that the creation of private accounts is voluntary, and that is true. That is, if the folks think that the market is too risky, they do not have to open that private account, and that is true. Private accounts are 100 percent voluntary.

But what folks have often heard is that the plan also includes the proposal to change the way the benefits are calculated. This element of that plan, called price indexing, would help pay for the private accounts and reduce the Social Security shortfall. But at the end of the day, the price indexing would result in a cut of guaranteed benefits for all beneficiaries, regardless of whether they choose to enroll in a private or personal account. It would cut everyone's.

So under the administration's plan, the private account is voluntary, but the cut in guaranteed benefits is mandatory.

Here is how price indexing works. Currently, benefits are tied to wages, which rise higher than prices, giving us an increased standard of living each year. Under the administration's plan, the benefit calculation would be tied to prices and not wages. Under this calculation, Social Security benefits that seniors would receive would replace a smaller portion of their paycheck before retirement. Currently, Social Security benefits make up 42 percent of the average wage earner's salary. Under price indexing, however, Social Security will only replace 27 percent of wages for someone retiring in 2042.

The picture is even worse for our children and grandchildren. I am proud to have a granddaughter who was born on February 1 of this year. In 2075 when she is 70 years old, her Social Security benefits would only be 20 percent of her wages if we allow this element of the administration's plan to take effect.

So in other words, price indexing lowers what our seniors get in their cost-of-living increase, and they already get so little compared to the cost increases with Medicare that they are having to pay. It is extremely important that the younger generation gets the straight story about how this plan will affect them. According to a poll commissioned by Rock the Vote, once young people learn about the trade-offs that come from private accounts, they will overwhelmingly oppose this risky proposal.

Among 18- to 39-year-olds, 63 percent oppose private accounts if it means that the Federal debt will have to increase to pay current benefits.

□ 1945

Seventy percent of 18- to 39-year-olds oppose private accounts if they mean cuts in guaranteed benefits the private accounts will not cover.

Sixty-five percent of those 18- to 39-year-olds oppose private accounts if it means cuts in guaranteed benefits for all beneficiaries regardless of their participation in the private accounts.

With the effect of the administration's plan being a $5 trillion addition to our national debt, a 46 percent cut in guaranteed benefits for all, this proposal does not sound like a good one for anyone, including the constituents that I represent.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.) Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise again tonight to talk about an issue that most Americans, particularly seniors, are more than aware of, and that is the high cost of prescription drugs, but, more importantly, the difference between what we pay in the United States and what people around the rest of the industrialized world pay for the same drugs. And what I have here with me tonight is a chart which shows prices of five of the most commonly prescribed prescription drugs, and what consumers pay for those drugs in London, and in Athens, and in the United States.

And let us look at the first drug, Lipitor, 30 tablets, 10 milligrams, and more importantly every single tablet of Lipitor is made in Ireland. Okay. So it is all imported somewhere.

Lipitor in London, for 30 tablets, effectively a month's supply, is $40.88. In Athens it is $55.65. In the United States it is $76.41. And let me add that over the last year, we would have expected the prices, the differentials, to be diminished, because what we have seen is the decline in the American dollar of over 20 percent. But that is not really what has been happening. Let us look at some of the others.

Nexium, $42.23 in London, $57 in Athens, but $138 in the United States. Prevacid, $32 in London, $39 in Athens, $139.15 in the United States. If you take these drugs, Zoloft, Zyrtec, Prevacid, all of them, you add them up for a month's supply of those five drugs in London, $195.95 American; in Athens, $231.04 in American dollars. But here in United States, those five drugs total $507.96.

Now, we have heard a lot of debate, and my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), just recently talked about Social Security, what we should or should not do about Social Security. Frankly I think we need to get serious about reforming Social Security, because I think the system is unfair to our kids.

But the system that we have with Medicare and with prescription drugs is unfair to everybody. And while we have a problem coming out at us relative to the cost of Social Security and the generational unfairness that particularly our kids are going to face, the problem with Medicare is much larger.

And unfortunately, in my view, a year ago we passed a bill. We were told that it would cost no more than $400 billion, which is still an enormous amount of money, to provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Now we are told that the cost of that could be over a trillion dollars over the next 10 years. And that is only part of the bad news.

I think even worse news is that every single penny of that new entitlement cost will have to be paid by our kids, because it will have to be borrowed. What we really need to do, one of my favorite Presidents was President Ronald Reagan, and he said it best: Markets are more powerful than armies. We need to use the magic of the marketplace to help bring down the cost of prescription drugs in the United States.

The reason we see these big differences essentially is this: Americans are held captive. And if you have a captive market, there is no question that any free market company is going to use monopolistic practices. The net result is Americans are paying two to three times more for many of the drugs that they have to take to save their lives. This is wrong, and we can do something about it.

Many of my colleagues say, well, shame on the pharmaceutical industry. Well, they did not really make the rules. Now, they are certainly doing all they can to defend these rules that hold Americans captive, but this year Americans will spend over $200 billion on prescription drugs.

Shame on us if we do not change the rules so that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world market prices. I am asking all of my colleagues to cosponsor the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2005. We have over 70 sponsors now in the House; we have a growing list of sponsors in the Senate. You can get information on my Website at gil.house.gov.

But really we should be willing to subsidize people in sub-Saharan Africa in terms of the cost of prescription drugs. We should not be required to subsidize the starving Swiss. Please join me in sponsoring the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2005.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

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

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, the President was on the road again today with yet another tightly controlled scripted, so-called town hall, before a carefully screened, invitation audience to tout to his plan to privatize Social Security.

Now, that is not unusual; in fact, the scripted town halls are all so similar that they can save the taxpayers a lot of money if he just stayed at Camp David or Crawford, Texas, and they just replayed the recordings of his earlier scripted, rehearsed town halls.

But the President did say today something extraordinary, in Parkersburg, West Virginia, and suggested something unconscionable. The President said, ''There is no trust fund.'' And then he went on to suggest that our Nation might not honor its debt to Social Security. This is what the President said does not exist.

Let me read from this. This is a Social Security Trust Fund bond, considered the best investments in the world, U.S. Treasury Bond. This is the most privileged of Treasury bonds issued to Social Security, redeemable at any time at full face value, unlike any other bond that they issue. These are the most privileged of their bonds. The President says it is nothing but an IOU. Well, here is what it says: This bond is incontestable in the hands of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. The bond is supported by the full faith and credit of the United States. And the United States is pledged to the payment of the bond with respect to both principal and interest.

The President questions that? He is questioning whether we are going to repay our most privileged debt to Social Security. We have $7.9 trillion of debt. He is adding to it at a record rate, borrowing $1.3 million a minute. Who is he saying we are going to repay and not repay?

Are we going to repay the Chinese but not the Social Security Trust Fund? Are we going to repay President Bush, he happens to have some U.S. Treasury Bonds in his personal portfolio, but not the Social Security Trust Fund? Are we going to repay other wealthy investors around the world and in the U.S., but not the Social Security Trust Fund? We are going to selectively default on our debt.

Suggesting something like that, if the bond markets believed the President, the dollar would drop to near zero tomorrow, and there would be an economic catastrophe, but they do not believe him. They know this is just politics and rhetoric on his part. There is no intention of the Government of the United States defaulting on its debt.

This year Social Security will collect $170 billion more than it needs to pay Social Security benefits, and they are invested in the trust fund. If what the President said is true, there is no trust fund, and we are not going to honor it, then Congress and the President are perpetrating a fraud of extraordinary magnitude on the working people of America, extorting through taxes $170 billion more than they need to pay current benefits that this President has no intention of repaying. That is unbelievable.

Every minute, every minute, this President and this Congress are borrowing $320,000 of Social Security taxes and spending it on something else. And the President says he is replacing it with worthless IOUs; they are not bonds, they are not investments. He questions whether they will be repaid. He questions the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America and its willingness, our willingness, to meet our obligations and our debt.

If what the President says is true, then we ought to give the working people of America, instead of the rich people of America, the biggest tax cut in history. Reduce the Social Security tax, which falls more heavily on working people. More working Americans pay more in Social Security taxes than they do income taxes to the Federal Government.

If he has no intention of repaying that $170 billion that he is borrowing this year of excess Social Security taxes, then we should not collect it under false pretenses. We should give people a big tax break. That would stimulate small business, employment, and put a lot of money in the pockets of working people. I am not advocating that.

But if he does not repay it, he should be advocating it, and instead of trying to switch the game and having an irrelevant debate over a so-called privatization plan which actually makes the funding problems of Social Security worse and would require another few trillion dollars of borrowing, in which I guess people would get these worthless bonds that the President questions.

Now, who is going to buy those worthless bonds? How is he going to continue to run the Government of the United States borrowing $1.3 million a minute if the bonds of this country are worthless?

This is an extraordinary and reckless statement for the elected President of the United States to make.

GOOD WORK OF OUR ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, over the break I had the opportunity to spend some time in the Middle East. And just this past week I have returned from Israel, Jordan, Iraq, visiting with our men and women in uniform, and talking with them about their impressions of how we are doing in the war on terrorism, talking with them about what they see as their strengths and the weaknesses and what we can be doing better.

And, you know, the progress is really remarkable. These men and women in uniform are really remarkable. I had last traveled to Iraq in October 2003, and at that time the coalition forces had removed Saddam Hussein's regime, and the Coalition Provisional Authority governed the nation, and there was still a lot of unrest on the horizon. That unrest is still there, but progress is being made.

Today we have an elected government in Iraq. It is representing Iraq's ethnic and religious factions, and they have peacefully reached an agreement to name a Kurd to the Presidency. There are two Vice Presidents; one is a Shiite, the other a Sunni. They have also agreed that the Prime Minister is a Shiite.

The naysayers said that successful elections would be all but impossible. They said that the people did not want democracy, that they did not understand democracy. But on election day, each and every one of us, everybody on the face of this Earth, saw the long lines, they saw people braving potential terrorist attacks, and in the words of one Iraqi, a Nation was born in front of a watching world. I think that is very true.

They did that. They took those risks in order to vote. The result is a democratic government. And, yes, it is shaky, but it is free, and it is elected, and they are proving the naysayers wrong. They are taking those baby steps towards freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that many things have changed in Iraq since October of 2003, but, from my observation, one thing that has remained consistent and true through thick and thin is our military men and women, the Armed Forces. These folks in uniform have not faltered, not for an instant, in their dedication to this mission. They have demonstrated an unparalleled level of commitment toward reshaping the nation, the Middle East, and the terrorist network that runs through that region of the world.

Over the last couple of days, I have spent some time on the telephone calling their families, letting them know how proud of them, how much I appreciate their sacrifice, how much I appreciate the families and the support that they are giving their loved ones in uniform. I am also letting them know how much our constituents in the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee appreciate them. You know, and America needs to know, that the Iraqi people are appreciative as well.

Following Iraq, I was able to speak with a small business owner, an Iraqi woman who had traveled to America about a year ago and shadowed me for a day. And she thanks the American military, and because of the freedom that our men and women in uniform have helped to deliver there on the ground, her Iraqi sisters are now elected officials. Imagine that. A woman in Iraq, many women in Iraq who are holding elected office. It is change. It is a step forward.

□ 2000

While we were in Israel, we talked peace, not just a distant hope for peace generations from now, but of a long-term agreement and soon. This is because of our steady and dedicated commitment to involvement in the Middle East.

In Iraq, we reviewed the Iraqi military training with General Petraeus, who had been the commanding general at Fort Campbell. This American-Iraqi military training is going to help give that nation the protection, the ability to protect from the insurgents who are there every day, growing weaker; but they are there. It will help the Iraqis take responsibility for their security. We have got about 150,000 Iraqis that are trained; and some of our big Tennesseeans, the 278th regiment from east Tennessee, they are working hard, and they are helping train many of the Iraqis.

In Jordan, we visited with the Iraqi police training facility. We have got about 50,000 Iraqis who are now trained, carrying on the work of the police force in Iraq.

When you are there in Iraq on the ground, you cannot help but notice the green fields and the sense that order is taking place to their daily lives, not only in government but also in business.

The progress made in Iraq is sending shockwaves throughout the Middle East. We have seen the Lebanese people resist the Syrian domination of their government. In Saudi Arabia and Egypt, there is movement. It is slow, but there is movement towards democracy.

None of this would have been possible without our military men and women, and it is that change that is going to destroy terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I just stand today to commend the men and women in uniform, to say a special thanks to our Tennesseeans who are serving, and I know that America joins me in thanking them and their families for their sacrifice, their bravery, and their dedication.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget deficit is one of the gravest problems that our Nation faces. It is one of the largest it has ever been. It is $412 billion this past year. It is likely to continue at that size for the foreseeable future.

$412 billion is a whole lot of money, but the truth is that the real budget deficit is even higher than that because, due to the Social Security surplus of about $155 billion this last year, that is used by the administration to disguise the true size of the deficit. So that means the true deficit is not $412 billion, even though that is a near record setter. The true deficit this last year was $567 billion.

We have a real problem in America because each annual deficit turns into debt, debt that we have to pay interest on. We have no choice about that because America has never defaulted and will never default on its obligations.

Those interest costs add up. It took the first 204 years of our Nation's history to get us the first $1 trillion in debt, 204 years to do that; but now we add another $1 trillion every 2 or 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, we do that because our Nation is simply not paying its bills today. It is too easy to spend money that we do not have, too easy to spend money that we are borrowing increasingly from dangerous countries like China. We are borrowing $1.3 million a minute, over $1 billion a day; and, Mr. Speaker, that adds up to a terrible debt burden for our children and grandchildren.

We have got to do something about that. It is sad but true that it is unlikely that the Congress this year will even have a budget. We passed one in the House of Representatives and the Senate passed one, but the two are so different they are probably irreconcilable.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker, last year we did not have a budget either. So how is our Nation, the greatest nation in the history of the world, going to proceed without a budget, meanwhile running some of the largest deficits in American history, adding, as I said earlier, $1 trillion to our children's and grandchildren's debt every year or two now?

Well, most Americans are not informed about this, and that is an outrage because what the leadership of this House has done is they eliminated any votes on raising the debt ceiling. That used to be a way that the American public could tell when the debt was being increased dramatically, when we bumped up against that debt ceiling. Now there are few, if any, recorded votes on that. No news to report. It just happens automatically.

Mr. Speaker, everybody talks about spending cuts as a way to get out of the deficit hole. That is a great idea; but, Mr. Speaker, it is unlikely that a body of 435 in this House and 100 in the Senate is going to come up with spending cuts. We need Presidential leadership, and that has been conspicuously lacking for the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush is the first President in the United States since James Garfield never to have vetoed a bill. Not one single piece of legislation has President Bush vetoed, the first President since Garfield, who served back in 1881; and poor Garfield was only in office for 6 months before he died. We are now in the 5th year of the Bush Presidency, and he has yet to veto a bill.

To give President Bush credit, he says he really needs the line item veto, the special narrower form of veto that would enable him to cut individual programs out of larger bills. That would be a wonderful thing for the President to have, but the Supreme Court has ruled it is unconstitutional. It would take at least 2 or 3 years to pass a constitutional amendment. Meanwhile, we would have another President.

But what the President has not acknowledged is he has got rescission power which is just about as good as the line item veto power; and guess what, just like the real veto, he has never used the rescission power either.

President Clinton used rescission power 163 times, and he won 111 of those cuts; but President Bush, in his 5 years as President, has never asked for a rescission power. Period.

Well, that is an outrage. So not only are we not seeing Presidential leadership on the veto, we are not seeing Presidential leadership regarding rescission power either.

I think the American people need to ask. We want Presidential leadership and he has provided excellent leadership in a number of areas, but regarding our Federal budget deficit, there has been almost no leadership.

We need to start a clock saying when is the President going to finally veto a bill and try to discipline a Congress that likes to spend money too much? When is the President going to rescind spending and start disciplining Congress? The American people deserve to know the answer.

STANDING BEHIND OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN HARM'S WAY

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to read just a few paragraphs from an article written by Mona Charen, who is a well-known journalist here in Washington, DC, and around this Nation. The title of her article: ''Is the Marine Corps P.C.?'' PC meaning political correct.

''Second Lieutenant Ilario Pantano was making a six-figure income as an energy trader with Goldman Sachs in New York when the World Trade Center was attacked. Pantano had friends who worked in the Twin Towers and friends among the firefighters who perished trying to save them.

''This Marine veteran had already served his country in the first Gulf War, set aside his career, which also included work in film and television, kissed his wife and two children goodbye, and headed to Quantico, Virginia, for officer training school.''

I continue Ms. Charen's comments in her article: ''A Marine Corps colleague asked, 'How many guys do you know who would drop 100 grand a year to go sleep in fighting holes in the nasty mud and dust for, what, 25 grand a year?'

''There are a few, and the rest of us owe them more than we can possibly express, which is why it is shocking to learn that Pantano may now be facing murder charges.''

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am on the floor. I want to read from part of a resolution, H. Res. 167, which I introduced the day before we left for Easter:

''On April 15th, 2004, Second Lieutenant Pantano led a platoon in Mahmudiyah, Iraq, that apprehended two Iraqis who were suspected insurgents.

''Second Lieutenant Pantano ordered the suspected insurgents to be detained, then ordered them to search their own vehicle in the event that it contained explosives.

''The vehicle's seats were not bolted down, a tactic commonly used by insurgents to retrieve weapons, and nails and bolts were found in the trunk of the vehicle, items commonly found in improvised explosive devices.

''In response to threatening movements by the suspected insurgents, Second Lieutenant Pantano took action in self-defense that resulted in their deaths.

''Accusations that Second Lieutenant Pantano's actions were something other than self-defense did not surface until almost 2 months after the incident.

''In his Combat Fitness Report dated August 5, 2004, nearly 4 months after the incident, Second Lieutenant Pantano's superior officers gave the following evaluation of his performance from March through July, 2004.''

I am just going to read a couple of these, Mr. Speaker. One, ''He is a Marine who 'leads from the front, always, and balances his aggressive style with true concern for the welfare of his Marines.'

''He was 'ready for increased responsibility,' and was a soldier who the Marine Corps should 'retain, promote and assign to challenging assignments.' ''

Now, ''Therefore be it,'' Mr. Speaker, this is the close of my resolution, ''Second Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, United States Marine Corps, was defending the cause of freedom, democracy, and liberty in his actions of April 15, 2004, that resulted in the deaths of two suspected Iraqi insurgents and that subsequently have given rise to certain charges against him.

''The United States Government should dismiss all charges against Second Lieutenant Ilario Pantano arising from the actions referred to in paragraph (1).''

I hope my colleagues that may be listening tonight will join me or at least look on our Web site or call our office and ask about this resolution, H. Res. 167. I can also say, Mr. Speaker, that his mother, who I have spoken to three times, who is a wonderful lady, has set up a Web site called www.defendthedefenders.com.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, last Friday I went down to Wilmington, North Carolina, where the American Legion was holding a barbecue and a fish fry to help Lieutenant Pantano with his defense. I have never met such a fine young man in all my entire life. He's 29 years old, a beautiful wife and two children. I met them and I hope that my colleagues here tonight and those in the office will look at this resolution, H. Res. 167. We need to stand behind our men and women who are in harm's way in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking the good Lord in heaven to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and I ask the good Lord in heaven to please bless the United States of America and to help us find peace in this world, and May God please, please bless America.

TRIBUTE TO POPE JOHN PAUL II

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who embodied the values of compassion and selflessness.

Serving for the past 26 years as the spiritual and emotional beacon of the Catholic Church, John Paul II exhibited charisma, character, and conviction when carrying his divine message to millions of people across the world.

He passed away this past Saturday at the age of 84 after a courageous struggle.

I join millions of mourning people across the world in honoring his remarkable life and recognizing his wondrous achievements.

Many great men and women have devoted themselves to a single cause or to a group of people. Pope John Paul devoted his efforts to all humanity around the world.

When he was elected Pope on October 16, 1978, he was well aware of the problems occurring not only in the Catholic Church but throughout the world. Communism had a grip on many areas, including his beloved homeland of Poland.

John Paul II had a social and political vision of what the world should be and dedicated himself to changing the reality that we knew.

He inspired incredible change, leading with unwavering faith and exceptional sincerity. His duty to the church was purposeful and his love for mankind was unconditional.

He undertook the goals of sewing the schisms of Christianity, healing the wounds of the Christian-Judeo relationship, and creating a legacy for the world to follow. He left his imprint on all faiths, as well as the scholar world.

As a devoted Catholic, I am honored and privileged to recognize such a special and loved person.

□ 2015

He was my inspirational compass and guided my faith through his unyielding dedication to the tenet of integrity and morality.

Mr. Speaker, today I mourn the passing of Pope John Paul II, but salute and express sincere admiration in his unparalleled life and lasting legacy, and I wrote a poem that I would like to dedicate to John Paul II that's called ''The Spirit of Life Is.''

To live is to believe. To see is to believe. To express is to believe. To feel is to believe. To respect is to believe. To forgive is to believe. To have hope is to believe. To love is to believe. For if you possess these values, you truly can enter the Kingdom of Heaven, and the spirit of life will be within you. For you truly have touched the life of the world around us in making it a better place for humanity, changing the course of history. Your legacy will live in the lives of those who truly believe.''

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY. Tonight Republican Members of Congress will be talking about Medicare. Now, as we are getting into this, what I want to make sure that we first look at here is that many talk about is the Federal Government doing much with regard to health care? And Medicare, Medicaid, veterans benefits, and other programs that the Federal Government pays for consume a

massive amount of the Federal budget. And I wanted to point out, just to begin with, if we can look at this, that about 45 percent of all mandatory spending, all mandatory spending we spend, is on health care, and about 15 percent of all discretionary spending is spent on health care.

If we look at mandatory spending here in health care, we see that the section here which is Medicare is $297 billion, or about 24 percent overall; Social Security disability is in this category here, too, about 6 percent; State Children's Health Insurance Programs, about $5 billion or 4 percent; and Medicaid is $176 billion, or about 14 percent of overall mandatory spending.

So we see that for those seniors and disabled who receive the benefits of Medicare is a large part of the Federal budget and one that has a history of providing good benefits for our seniors; benefits we are proud of, benefits we are pleased to continue to offer them.

But tonight we are going to talk about a number of things happening in Medicare. Some of these will be issues that are staying with Medicare; some will be some positive changes, areas that are growing; some of the new parts that have to do with prescription drug benefits; some some actions on waste, fraud, and abuse; some on new programs that deal with prevention and new physicals for Medicare; and many, many other parts of this we will be talking about tonight.

The overall purpose here is that as we look at the amount of money we spend and the services that we provide, it is Congress' responsibility to be constantly reviewing this and saying can we do it better to provide quality health care that is accessible for our seniors in America? And those who are not seniors yet recognize that about 2.9 percent of wages, half from you and half from your employer, goes to fund Medicare. Thus, every taxpayer is concerned with how this money is spent and what quality is associated with it.

Now, being the first speaker tonight, I want to talk a little bit about one area that I am introducing a bill on to improve Medicare, although it provides a lot of services in many areas of health care. One of those that I believe we need to see some changes in is in mental health coverage.

As a practicing psychologist myself for many years, I recognize that when you integrate the care of mental illness in with other aspects of medical care, it actually is something that reduces the cost of health care and improves health overall.

Let me describe to you now what Medicare does in all this. Currently Medicare beneficiaries pay about a 20 percent copayment for all outpatient health services except for mental health providers, where they have to pay a higher copayment of 50 percent.

According to the National Institutes of Mental Health, nearly 2 million Americans over the age of 65 suffer from depression. The 1999 Surgeon General's Report on Mental Illness found that 20 percent of Americans 55 and older experience mental disorders that are not considered a normal part of aging, such as anxiety, alcoholism, and various other disorders. As many as one in two residents of nursing facilities are at risk for depression.

A June 2002 MED–PAC report, that is the Medicare Payment Advisory Committee that recommends changes to Congress, stated that ''Medicare beneficiaries are apparently having difficulty in obtaining needed mental health services. Despite the availability of proven treatments, one recent analysis found that of those beneficiaries over 65 with need of treatment, 63 percent did not receive it.'' And it goes on to say, ''Beneficiaries face a 50 percent coinsurance for most outpatient mental health services compared with 20 percent for most other outpatient services. Equalizing cost-sharing for outpatient mental health and other outpatient care would reduce the financial barrier to mental health care and provide parity to beneficiaries with mental disorders and those with other illnesses with a small increase in Medicare spending. This change would also simplify Medicare's cost-sharing structure.''

Now, here I am talking about the cost of Medicare and talking about something here which on the surface would appear that we are proposing more spending. And oftentimes when proposals come before Congress, they are scored in terms of what the increased spending would be, but not necessarily scored or reviewed in terms of what the savings would come from this.

Let me describe what happens when you have untreated mental illness. Patients suffering from untreated depression, for example, use health care services more often; pay one and a half to two times more for health care costs that they accrue. They also tend to have increased lengths of hospital stays. Untreated depressed parents tend to have decreased adherence to life-style changes needed for health improvement. Depression also complicates the treatment of those with heart disease. And those with increased psychological stress or depression have increased platelet reactivity to thrombosis or blood clotting, which can complicate heart disease.

Now, as a result of this, I have introduced the Medicare Mental Health Copayment Equity Act to reduce the copayment for mental health services to seniors on Medicare to match the standard 20 percent rate. With such a high amount of seniors afflicted with mental illness, that discriminatory Medicare copayment rate must end.

When we look at ways such as integrating the care for our seniors with something that afflicts so many, such as mental illness and depression, by using such innovative approaches, we can actually save cost and provide better care for our seniors in America.

Now, in addition to some of these things we can look at improving, and we will be talking more about them tonight, a number of aspects, it is important to also recognize that Congress is also being a watchdog of some problem areas for Medicare. What happens sometimes is people see this as a system that they can abuse. Whether it is providers or patients or others, they see this as a way they can get health care that perhaps is not needed, or we have a mechanism that sometimes, quite frankly, just pays too much.

To talk about this issue tonight, I will call upon my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), and she will be discussing waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicare, and I yield to her now.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania.

You know, for most seniors Medicare is their only form of health care. Congress must make absolutely certain that not one penny of it is wasted and not one penny is given to those who only want to defraud the system. When Members of Congress voted for the Medicare Prescription Drug Improvement and Modernization Act last year, we voted in favor of important measures to combat waste, fraud, and abuse.

Under the MMA, which I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania supported, the HHS Secretary was directed to conduct a demonstration of recovery audit contractors in at least two States for 3 years to identify under- or overpayments. This demonstration project allows HHS to identify more efficient ways of working with States on Medicare waste.

The MMA also opened the durable medical equipment industry to competitive bidding. And why did we do that? To ensure that Medicare, that our taxpayers, get the best prices on equipment that patients use. Additionally, the MMA ended overreimbursements for prescriptions and administering costs by replacing the average wholesale price system with a more accurate and verifiable average sales price system.

More importantly, for those of us who worked in favor of the Medicare Modernization Act, we voted in favor of making health care fraud a crime, a serious crime. We voted in favor of punishing those who defraud this precious program. Instead of just slapping them on the wrist, there will be serious penalties. These criminals are defrauding our most vulnerable and our elderly seniors, and they should be very strictly punished.

These measures were very important steps, but more are still needed. The

most conservative estimates suggest that waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare system is somewhere around $33 billion a year. That is billion with a ''B.'' Scam artists, however, are using innovative and cunning ways to con Medicare every year. Many use computers to scour the Internet to find holes in Medicare and Medicaid payout systems.

The scam artists register also as providers and then file a slew of claims through the payment system to determine which claims would be automatically approved by Medicare and Medicaid computers. Once these claims are determined, the cons just sit back and they wait for the payments.

Others set up fake medical storefronts. In one case, actually in my home State of Florida, a ''provider office'' was found to be nothing more than a couple of post office boxes, cell phone, and a beeper. The owner vanished when he caught on that Medicare officials were onto him, but not before he collected $2.1 million in payments. They are still looking for him.

Today the Heritage Foundation released their study about waste in various Federal agencies, and guess what? They pointed to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid, CMS, because of their paying excessive prices for medical supplies and care. They pointed out that in so many instances they paid thousands, not just hundreds of times but thousands of a percent, more than what the VA pays for the very, very same service.

And my colleagues, I am sure, saw this in today's Congress Daily. There is a story in here about how the new chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations is settling in, and that the staff director of that committee is mandating that they go after agencies. And he said, ''The first rule is: There aren't any good government programs anyplace. They are chock-full of fraud, waste and abuse; frittering away millions in appropriated funds. Believe it, focus on it, find it and report on it.'' Obviously, Congress is getting very serious about waste, fraud and abuse in our system, and every Member of this body, I am sure, are very, very grateful for it.

Protecting Medicare against predators should be a bipartisan issue. The last time I checked, there were no Rs or Ds in the word ''solution.'' Guaranteeing the solvency of Medicare has to be a priority of Congress, and we have to begin by ensuring that every penny going to Medicare is being spent on legitimate Medicare benefits. If both sides of the aisle do not work together to protect Medicare, the legacy of this program diminishes with every penny that is lost.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and the other Members of Congress who are serious about making sure that the Medicare system is a sound system and one that provides necessary health care for our most vulnerable, our seniors.

□ 2030

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), and could the gentlewoman repeat how much waste, fraud and abuse is estimated? I believe it is over $20 billion a year.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I do not want to misquote. It is $33 billion. The most conservative estimates suggest that waste, fraud and abuse in Medicare is somewhere around $33 billion per year.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, what we have to make sure is understanding in a budget that is approaching $300 billion for Medicare overall, and when people are concerned is it providing enough coverage, the issues that the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) brought forth is an area where every senior and their family member can help deal with the spiraling cost of health care.

I have a chart here, and notice how health care costs are spiraling up. Notice the growth in terms of Federal outlays and how much it has climbed over the years. It is quite dramatic. The area of waste, fraud and abuse has grown with it. I would like to advise that one of the messages that we as Members of Congress need to get out to constituents is understand how we can help our constituents find and report waste, fraud and abuse.

Sometimes Medicare fraud is purposely billing for services never provided, billing Medicare and another insurer for services someone never received, for equipment because you received equipment different from what you are billed for, and using another person's Medicare card to get medical care, supplies or equipment, and billing Medicare for home medical equipment after it has been returned.

I have heard of constituents who have reported these kinds of things, and it is important that we do this as a mechanism to save government money, save taxpayer money, and make sure that money goes towards care. People also need to be suspicious. Anytime a provider tells you a test is free, they only need your Medicare number for their records, and the provider may state that the cost to the person with Medicare is free, be wary if tests are being provided and the patient is told they are free, make sure you understand why they are being done and what they are. Or if the provider says Medicare wants you to have the item or service, Medicare does not recommend services, it is up to the physician and health care provider to recommend services. Or if someone says I know how to get Medicare to pay for it, again, the questions family members and Medicare recipients should be asking is I want to know what I really need, and do not be afraid to get other opinions.

Sometimes people say the more tests you have, the cheaper they are; or the equipment or service is free, it will not cost you anything. But be aware, and Members need to educate their constituents that anytime someone is offering that, this is taxpayer money being spent on services that may or may not be needed. And it is important that we encourage Americans to review that and determine if it is medically necessary.

There are ways that you can prevent Medicare abuse, and there are ways you can report this: by contacting the inspector general of Medicare, by looking at the Medicare Web sites to report specific information. It is a way that every American citizen can be a watchdog and can lead to cost savings for Medicare and make sure that care goes to patients.

I would like to turn toward the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), an orthopedic surgeon, a good friend to the health care caucus and one who has been very diligent in dealing with health care costs. He will be addressing patient choice and satisfaction with the Medicare program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here and talk to an issue near and dear to our hearts. As we talk about the challenges that we have with Medicare, as with many programs, what we are attempting to do is to lay out the issue before us and to make certain that we retain those aspects of the program which are so very important and provide for greater health, higher quality health for our seniors, and that we do so in a way that listens to principles. I am fond of going back and talking about principles because I think unless you understand what principles you want to institute, you can get off the mark.

The principles that I like to talk about when I am speaking about Medicare is that we have the highest quality of care that is available, that the cost for that care be absolutely reasonable, that people are not being gouged and you do not have the problems with the waste, fraud and abuse that has been talked about.

And finally, what is incredibly important for Medicare, patient choice. That is patients get to choose who is taking care of them and where they are being treated. Let me just chat a little bit about some of the challenges that we have before us and why we are in the kind of situation we are in.

This chart may look familiar because it is a chart that we have used to demonstrate some of the challenges that our Nation has as it relates to other

systems, the Social Security, for example. But the demographic changes that are occurring in our society right now, the aging of our population, that really is the main reason that we have got these challenges within the Medicare system.

As Members see here, today's workers are providing the moneys for the Medicare system, those individuals who are the recipients. So you need a lot of workers to provide the resources with which to care for our seniors. In 1950, there were 16 workers for every retiree or every senior. This year, there are 3.3 workers for every senior retiree. In a few number of years, there will be two workers for every retiree.

What that means for Medicare is we have an aging population and fewer resources with which to support that population's health care. I think it is important to appreciate that principle. Remember that principle of highest quality, reasonable cost, and choice for patient, and the demographics of our society, the aging of our population, is driving some of the decisions that we make that may violate some of those principles.

What is going on with the cost of health care? The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) had a poster up before that talked about and showed the increasing line of money being spent for health care. That will continue of necessity because of the aging of the population.

One of the problems that we have with Medicare, though, is it is an inflexible system. A number of years ago, we, the Congress, instituted a program called ARBORS, Resource-Based, Relative-Value System, which means we as a Nation will decide how much money we are going to spend on health care for seniors; and regardless of the amount of money that is needed or regardless of the amount of care that is going to be provided, we are not going to violate that. We are going to have a pool of money and pay for the care needed out of that pool. If there is a lot more care that needs to be provided, we have challenges in our system. Remember, we wanted highest quality care, reasonable cost, and choice for patients.

What we have now is a system that oftentimes is being held together just by the altruism of the individuals involved in providing that care, the doctors and hospitals at home, those individuals who are being asked to do more with less, and oftentimes are being asked to do a whole lot more with a whole lot less.

The system we have worked well when there were a lot of workers. However, now when we have fewer workers in this pay-as-you-go system, it becomes more difficult to hold that system together. It is an inflexible system. It is not able to juggle or change with the changes in our society. I want to use as an example of that the debate that has been going on over the last couple of years about a prescription drug plan or a prescription drug benefit in Medicare.

When Medicare was instituted in the mid-1960s, medications, drugs and pharmaceuticals, were not necessarily that extremely important for the care of disease because there were not a whole lot of variants in the type of medications that we had. Oftentimes the treatment for a disease or an illness was in the hospital, which is why Medicare built up as a system that provided primarily for hospital insurance, for hospital care, and provided coverage for the physician as well; but did not have a drug component to it, did not have a prescription drug benefit within the system.

Over a relatively short period of time after the mid-1960s, the explosion in our technology and in our ability to have medications that truly affected the outcome of illness and provided a higher quality of care, and remember one of our principles is that high quality of care, medications just flourished. But the Medicare system stayed absolutely the same. Through the 1980s and 1990s as so many medications were discovered and have been utilized to save people's lives, Medicare was stuck in the mud not providing any prescription drug coverage.

So the President to his great credit put this issue on the table, and in 2003 a Medicare prescription drug plan was introduced. That is important because we have moved now to a health care system that relies a whole lot more on medications than it did in the past.

My purpose in bringing that issue up is that it took us 40 years to get to a point where we had a system that provided for prescription drug coverage. That is a program, a Medicare program, that I believe is inflexible and does not have the kind of capability to change with the needs of patients. One of our principles is patient choice. Patients ought to be able to choose who is taking care of them, where they are being cared for, and what kind of care they are receiving. That brings me to the final point I would like to make.

I think as we move through this discussion, it is imperative that we make certain that the highest quality of care that is being delivered at reasonable cost, those principles, also have the principle of patient choice. When I was a practicing physician, I knew that the important things that patients would talk to me about, if they did not tell me what their wishes and desires were, I could not respond adequately to the kinds of needs that they had. That is patient choice. In an inflexible system, in a Medicare system that is inflexible, it is not possible for patients to be able to exercise their choice.

I believe as we go through this discussion and make certain that we retain a Medicare system that will provide the highest quality of care at the most reasonable cost available, but with patient choice, patient choice is what is so incredibly important, as we allow and provide for patients to be able to have the access to the care that they so need.

Some improvements have been discussed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) has talked about a proposal that I think has great merit. I just hope as we go through this discussion that we do not end up in the political name-calling and demagoguery that has been so wont to happen in other issues that we have talked about here. I think if we just stick to the principles of highest quality of care at a reasonable cost and make certain that one of those principles has to be that patients have choice, choice about who is taking care of them, where they are being cared for and the kind of treatment that they are receiving, that we will end up with a program that will be flexible and that will be much more responsive to patients' needs, which in the end is what it is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for the opportunity to participate in this incredibly important and vital issue that means so much to so many Americans.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for his important information about other areas of care. As we continue on this evening, I want to turn to one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL), who is an expert on Medicare. He wants to talk about the need to address premium cost and recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Speaker, we come together in this body to talk about a very important topic, our Nation's Medicare program. Medicare has served our country's seniors well. However, this is a program that is in serious need of strengthening and improvement.

I was privileged to serve as the executive director of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare. We spent an entire year looking at the Nation's Medicare program, and we heard from dozens of witnesses. We had countless hearings. I can summarize the challenges facing the program in three ways.

First, we have a Medicare program by any measure that is facing a huge financial challenge, a program that is going to go bankrupt, quite frankly, unless we do something differently.

□ 2045

We can measure that as a share of the GDP, we can look at the ratio of workers to retirees, we can look at that as a share of payroll taxes, or we

can look at the life of the trust funds. Quite simply, we have got a Medicare program today that goes from about four workers per retiree, it is going to eventually be at about two workers per retiree, a trust fund that will not last even long enough for the baby boomers to not only finish retiring, but to finish utilizing their health care services.

So the first challenge facing the Medicare program is increasingly we have got a program that is facing solvency challenges. Secondly, we have got a program that, as it is defined today, does not truly cover adequately the health care needs of our Nation's seniors, our parents, our grandparents. We have got a program that covers about half the health care costs of our parents and grandparents. We have got a program that until next year does not really even begin to cover prescription drugs, does not provide an adequate long-term care benefit; a program that charges over a $800 deductible every episode, every time our parents go to the hospital; a program that until recently did not cover many preventive care benefits and still lags behind the private sector in terms of what is considered first-class medical care; a program that has no real meaningful catastrophic stop loss coverage; in other words, a program that looks largely like the 1960s insurance product it was modeled after. In the private insurance world, we no longer get our physician insurance separate from our hospital coverage. Yet that is exactly what Medicare continues to do today.

So the second challenge facing our program is that it is a program that does not adequately cover the health care needs, does not adequately provide a modern benefits package for our Nation's seniors. We can see that by the fact that 89 percent of our Nation's seniors have something other than just plain Medicare fee-for-service alone. Eighty-nine percent have either some kind of wraparound coverage, supplemental coverage, Medicaid, private HMO coverage, have something in addition to just plain old vanilla Medicare fee-for-service coverage.

The third challenge facing our program is it is a program that has not been run all that efficiently. You can look at that by comparing Medicare's growth rates to the private insurance world, to the other Federal programs that we run, by looking at the billions of dollars, not millions but billions of dollars, we waste every year.

We all have our favorite stories. I know my colleagues have heard from their constituents, and we have heard, about the equipment that Medicare will rent but not purchase even when it would be more cost-effective to buy it. We have heard about the times that Medicare would pay for a patient to go to a physician's office to receive an injectable medication, but would not pay for that same patient to receive those drugs orally. We have heard about Medicare not paying for preventive care, not paying for more cost-effective outpatient-based care. Year after year Congress tries to put a Band-Aid and tries to improve the program and tries to catch up with the latest medical technology, but inevitably we are always a little bit behind what people are getting below the age of 65.

So we have got three challenges being faced by our Medicare program: First, a program that, by any account, faces severe financial challenges; secondly, a program that does not adequately cover the benefits that our seniors deserve and need; and then finally, third, a program that is not all that efficient compared to other programs.

The good news in all of this is that Medicare has done a remarkably good job taking care of our parents and grandparents. We do not need to throw the Medicare program out. Rather, we need to improve it, strengthen it, and get it ready for this next century, get it ready for the baby boomers that are beginning to enter this program.

How do we do that? I would like my colleagues to remember just two numbers that came up during the Commission's deliberations and just two numbers that stand out to me in all the hours of testimony that I listened to. The first number is this: The CEO of the Mayo Clinic testified to our Commission. He said, We count 130,000 pages of rules and regulations. There has been some dispute. Everybody agrees there are tens of thousands of pages of rules and regulations. It does not really matter if you believe it is 130,000, or whether you believe it is 20-, 30-, 40,000. The bottom line is this: Tens of thousands of pages of rules and regulations telling the Mayo Clinic, telling physicians, telling hospitals how they must provide care.

I do not know about you, but to me this debate really comes down to who do we want in control of our health care. I would much rather my physician, my health care provider, working with me to make those decisions. No matter how well-intentioned, I do not want a bureaucrat making my health care decisions for me.

The American Hospital Association talks about the fact they have documented nurses in many hospital settings spend an hour filling out paperwork for every hour they provide care. At the same time, we have a shortage in this country of about 100,000 nursing vacancies, 100,000 vacancies we cannot fill today, and that number is only going to increase, and we are drowning our health care professionals in paperwork.

The second number I ask this body to remember is that we heard from an economist testifying to our Commission basically in the Medicare program that we are trying to set 10,000 prices across 3,000 counties. We call them parishes in my home State of Louisiana. But the bottom line is this: 10,000 prices in 3,000 counties. We do not buy anything else in the Federal Government that way. It makes no sense that that is how we buy medical services. The problem is sometimes we will be too high, and sometimes we will be too low. We heard so many stories about how this distorts the quality of medical care that our parents receive. This distorts their access to services.

We have all heard the complaints from physicians about the inequities of the sustainable growth rate reductions they are going to face. We heard about physicians leaving the Medicare practice. We have heard the stories of patients, we heard it in the Medicare Commission, about patients going to the hospital. We had a patient that told us a doctor wanted to perform a procedure on him. He was in the emergency room thinking he was about to die of a heart attack. Once the physician found out he was in Medicare, the physician said, I don't need to do that service anymore. It turns out Medicare would not pay for that procedure. Not only that, Medicare would not let him pay for that procedure or his private insurance pay for that procedure. I think most of us, if we were in the emergency room, would not want a bureaucrat to make that decision. We would want our physician to make that decision.

That really is the question facing us when it comes to the future of Medicare: Who do we want making our health care decisions? Do we want our physicians working with us, or do we want bureaucrats? It is as simple as that.

The Federal Government runs a different health care program. We run a health care program that has over 300 plans competing to provide coverage. We run a health care program that has had lower inflation rates; a health care program with incredible approval ratings, over 85, 90 percent approval ratings; a health care plan that does provide adequate prescription drugs, is not going insolvent. It is a very simple plan. Members of Congress are allowed to participate. Federal employees, the very employees that design and operate Medicare, are allowed to participate. The simple concept behind the Federal employees' plan is this: We give people choice. The Federal Government pays the majority of the premiums. If somebody wants to buy a little more expensive plan, they pay a little bit more. If they want to buy a more efficient plan, their premiums go down.

We tried this in Medicare some years ago, except Congress said private plans were not allowed to reduce their cost below the government plan. That makes no sense. If a private plan is more cost-effective, of course they should be allowed to lower their prices. Why in the world would we not want

our parents and our grandparents to be able to lower their premiums? Fortunately we fixed that, but we have got a lot more fixing to do.

I was pleased today to learn from CMS, I know many of us were, that our seniors, over 90 percent of Medicare beneficiaries next year may have more choices of how they get their health care, may actually have a choice of how they get their health care plans. For those that want to stay in Medicare, they can continue to do that. Nothing has changed. But the good news is more and more of our parents and grandparents are getting more choices.

I know my time is running out, and we are limited in our time tonight, but I think if we remember one thing about the Medicare debate, it is simply this: We must give our parents, we must give our grandparents more choices.

We had a bipartisan Medicare Commission that was chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) of this body, cochaired by former Senator Breaux of my home State of Louisiana. We came up with good bipartisan findings contained in the cochairman's report. The bottom line is this: If you remember nothing else but all the numbers and all the facts and all the details, Medicare has done a good job. To make sure it continues to do a good job for our parents and grandparents, let us not be scared of giving them the kind of choices they had before they became the age of 65. If we do that simple thing, not only will it be good for them, it will help us balance our budget, and it will slow down that growth by getting rid of some of those inefficiencies.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana not only for the depth of his knowledge in Medicare, but his service before to our country. Certainly if we are able to implement some of the changes he has spoken about so eloquently tonight in changing not only the waste, fraud and abuse, but making Medicare work more effectively, we can make it last longer.

The points made here about when we think about Social Security hitting its financial demise sometime around 2042, when they talk about Medicare, if we do not make some changes to improve the system, again that is what we are talking about, improving the system, it may face its own demise in 2024, some 20 years ahead of Social Security, not because the difference in more people retiring at faster rates and less money going in, but because of the waste, fraud and abuse that is in the system and because of inefficiencies.

It is so important that we work together in a bipartisan way to improve the efficiency of Social Security so that money goes to care for our seniors in ways that we need to make sure they get that care.

I would like to turn to another one of my colleagues for the wrap-up in our session tonight, and that is the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who is no stranger to speaking on health care issues. He and I chair this conference team on dealing with health care issues. He is as dedicated as they come to working on this.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my cochair on this team, for yielding.

Once again we are bringing to our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the issue of health care. This is something that we have committed to do, those of us who are in the health care field and interested, as our previous speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL), who worked in the administration prior to being elected to Congress from the great State of Louisiana and specifically worked within the Medicare system.

There are a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, on our side of the aisle who understand the issue of health care. It is disturbing to me as a physician/Member when I hear the other side in the Social Security debate, as we hear some of these Special Orders in the evening from the other side criticizing the President, criticizing the Republican leadership, the Republican majority for wanting to make some meaningful changes to a 70-year-old system that needs to be brought into the 21st century. Of course, I am talking about Social Security.

But we are hearing from the other side, and I hear this in my district. A lot of times it seems like they encourage people to come to these listening sessions or town hall meetings and say, why are you Republicans so concerned about Social Security when you are not doing anything about Medicare? What they fail to tell these good folks in our districts, usually seniors, that in December of 2003, we historically passed the Medicare Modernization and, yes, Prescription Drug Act, Part D of Medicare, and really made some significant, meaningful changes to this program. Admittedly, Medicare, and Medicaid as well, are very expensive programs, and as our seniors are living longer and, of course, putting more of a strain on the Social Security system, the same thing is happening in Medicare. But to suggest that we in the majority or this President has ignored meaningful changes, modernization indeed, in just this past December of 2003, trying to address that problem, and for us to say that we have done nothing, and to try to divert our attention away now from trying to do the same thing to bring Social Security into the 21st century, I think, is a paper tiger on their side of the aisle.

What we have done, and I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for putting this special hour together tonight, besides the prescription drug part, which is significant, and I will not spend my time talking about that, but I want to talk a little bit about the modernization part of Medicare in that historic 2003 bill.

Medicare was a little later coming to us than Social Security. Social Security came along in 1935, 1936, and it was not until 1965 that the Medicare bill as part of Social Security was offered to our seniors. It has been a great program, but at its outset it was all about episodic care. Part A was hospital treatment, nursing home, a little bit of home health care; and Part B, of course, the optional part, the premium-based part of Medicare, was for the provider services, the physician or outpatient hospital procedures, durable medical equipment, certain drugs, as the gentleman from Louisiana pointed out earlier, but only those that are administered by an injection, not something that you could get by a prescription.

The original Medicare, and as the argument against it, again, from the other side of the aisle back a year and a half ago, was they are about to take away Medicare as you know it. Well, thank God if we did that. Thank God, and thank the Republican majority, because now instead of treating people when they have a heart attack, when they fall over at home in the shower having had a stroke because their high blood pressure was never treated, never even recognized until it is too late, and then you get into the really, really expensive part of health care, that long-term hospital stay, that ambulance trip to the emergency room, that nursing home stay until you have exhausted all of your benefits, and all of a sudden you end up destitute and covered by Medicaid, no senior wants to be in that situation.

But what we did in the modernization part, most of the attention, yes, was the prescription drug benefit, the optional Part D benefit that was finally delivered by this President, finally fulfilled, a promise that had been made and broken really by so many previous Congresses and administrations.

□ 2100

But the modernization part, if my colleague will further yield, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk about that because we never got the opportunity to just go to the doctor and have a physical exam. As I said, it was always if one has got chest pain, if they got a nose bleed, if they have a stroke, then they get covered under Medicare.

But with the modernization program that we passed in December of 2003, when a person turns 65 and first becomes eligible for Medicare, now Medicare will pay for a complete, a complete head-to-toe thorough physical examination by a primary health care provider, a family practitioner or a general internist; and these are the diagnosticians. A lot of times people will

refer to those specialists as diagnosticians; and, indeed, they are. They are the real medical sleuths that can detect disease before the patient has any idea that something is going amiss in their body. I am talking about a slight elevation of blood sugar or a slight elevation of blood pressure or maybe a person is getting a little short of breath and that internist or primary care doctor knows that they need some specific tests to rule out things like coronary artery disease or to institute some prescription medication.

Those physical examinations in the past were not covered under Medicare. It seems ridiculous, but back when we started the system, nobody really thought that that was that important, just as they did not think that prescription medication was so important. But we know now today that if we can detect these diseases as they are starting before the patient has had a significant complication, to treat it, to treat it, as we say, medically with, yes, prescription drugs, that now these seniors can finally afford, and those that are at or near the Federal poverty level, they can literally get prescription medications to treat one of these diseases at its inception by paying $1 or $3 or maybe at the maximum a $5 co-pay for a prescription that may have cost hundreds of dollars if they did not have this benefit.

So I am very pleased to be here tonight as part of this hour, this Special Order, with my colleagues, many of them health care providers, to remind our colleagues on both sides of the aisle what we have already done in regard to trying to fix the Medicare program and in the process, of course, to provide much greater care, a better standard of care, 21st-century medicine, to our seniors who deserve that and have been waiting really so long for it.

They get that entry-level physical examination so that some of these catastrophic things do not happen to them, and if they choose in January of 2006 to have signed up for the optional part D, as 96 percent have signed up for the optional part B, the doctor part, then I think we are going to see some cost-shifting in this program.

Yes, it is an expensive program. And certainly the prescription drug part is going to be a big expensive number. I do not know exactly what it is, but what I do know is that the number crunchers, whether it is within the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services or whether it is the Congressional Budget Office or the Office of Management and Budget from the administration that have given us a number, and we heard $400 billion over 10 years and then we heard $520 billion over 10 years, and now we are hearing 750 or 950. I do not know.

But I do know this, that no credit is given for the possibility, the distinct possibility, that because of the prescription drug benefit, because of the initial complete physical when a senior turns 65, because of the multiple screening tests that are now paid for under Medicare on an annual or every-2-year basis, and I am talking about cholesterol screening, I am talking about pap smears for women to detect early cervical cancer or ovarian cancer, I am talking about colon cancer screening, Flexible Sigmoid tests or colonoscopies, I am talking about osteoporosis screening, doing all of these things, bringing Medicare into the 21st century is going to prevent some of these catastrophic, very expensive things from occurring.

So while we are spending a little bit more money on that and maybe a lot more money finally offering a prescription drug part, we are going to save money on hospitalizations. We are going to save money on fewer days in a nursing home. We are going to prevent people from ending up with a stroke, and, yes, indeed, maybe being in a vegetative state for 15 or 20 years, and we just talked about that last week in the Congress and know how expensive that kind of care is.

So really what we have done, and I am going to close with this, Mr. Speaker, and yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), but what we have done in modernizing Medicare and not ignoring it, as the other side would suggest, is we have done the right thing, we have done the compassionate thing for our seniors, and we have done the cost-effective thing.

And I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for yielding to me tonight during this hour and for our continuing to do these health care initiatives on a regular basis.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the good doctor from Georgia for his comments, as well as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) for their comments tonight.

And noting that what we have discussed tonight as we recognize that Medicare is a program that albeit is expensive in terms of what it costs the Federal Government and taxpayers to pay for it, we believe it is worthwhile to protect and ensure the health and health care of our elderly; but we also have to note here, as even the best of programs can use better care, in this case the best of care, what we want to make sure that Members do on both sides of the aisle is work towards eliminating waste, fraud and abuse, updating the Medicare program to make sure it is providing that high-quality care, recognizing that there have been changes in how health care is provided since the 1960s when this program began, and we need to make those things work better.

We need to apply some of the changes that were recommended by the Commission on the Future of Medicare. We need to make sure that care is integrated together with examples of what I presented before, with such things as mental health care integrated with other aspects of care; making sure that we improve the system so that we have electronic prescribing that we would reduce the many medical errors that occur, reduce the about 16 million errors that occur on prescriptions every year that are written in part because we still use an old system of paper and pencil where someone may misspell a word or not be able to review it correctly or a physician cannot possibly know all the medications the patient is on, all of those things to be corrected with the major moves that were in the Medicare bill that we voted on a couple of years ago, but will begin to take effect in January of next year.

These are positive changes that I believe will help reduce the thousands of deaths, the millions of errors that occur with prescription drugs, and work for the betterment of health care in America to save lives, to save money, and to improve that.

RENEWABLE FUELS

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

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in a dialogue with my colleagues about the policy choices that we must make in the coming weeks and months to address the energy needs and challenges that our country will face in the years and decades to come.

I believe that renewable fuels must play a central role in this debate and in the policy decisions that we in Congress will make this year. I have a strong interest in renewable fuels for several reasons. My home State of South Dakota is a major corn-producing State and one of the top five ethanol-producing States in the Nation. South Dakota alone has the capacity to produce more than 450 million gallons of clean renewable ethanol every year. This fact, of course, gives me a natural interest in renewable fuel production. That, however, is not the only reason I care about ethanol. And each of us who serves in Congress should care about renewable fuels as well.

Renewable fuels provide benefits to the economy, especially those in economically challenged rural years. They benefit the environment, and they enhance our national security. For all of these reasons, Congress should care about renewable fuels, and renewable

fuels should be a major component in our Nation's long-term energy policy.

I sought this opportunity to address the House tonight to share with my colleagues important information about renewable fuels and to dispel some myths about ethanol along the way. Ethyl alcohol, or ethanol, is essentially pure grain ethanol that man has been making for centuries by fermenting and distilling simple sugars.

Today, ethanol is a fuel produced from crops such as corn, grain sorghum, wheat, sugar, and other agricultural feedstocks. Most fuel ethanol produced in the United States is derived from corn, and the industry uses a lot of it. The latest figures indicate that more than 10 percent of the U.S. corn crop is utilized to produce ethanol. Because ethanol is produced from crops or plants that harness the power of the sun, it is truly a renewable fuel. We have consistently increased our use of corn to produce ethanol every year in the United States. We are doing so because the demand for ethanol is growing and consumers are realizing its value.

The ethanol industry is growing despite the many myths that have intervened at various points in the historical development of ethanol that misrepresent the technological advancements and the state of the industry today. Some of this misinformation, or disinformation, has been promoted by opponents of the ethanol industry, and some myths have even been propagated by those in academia.

One of the most persistent ethanol myths refers to its energy balance. This myth suggests that the process used to create a gallon of ethanol consumes more energy than that gallon of ethanol contains. And despite overwhelming and irrefutable evidence to the contrary, this unfortunate fallacy persists. But the facts are clear, whether produced from corn or other grains or from biomass materials like wood waste, ethanol production has become an extremely energy-efficient process. Remarkable technological advances have occurred in both agriculture and ethanol production in recent years that have made this possible.

Farming practices today are vastly improved from what they were just a few decades ago. Gasoline-powered farm machinery has been entirely replaced by more efficient diesel engines, and the machinery has become larger. This means that farmers can produce more grain with less fuel. Some farmers today utilize global positioning satellites and no-till farming methods that also greatly increase yields and reduce the fertilizer and chemical use on fields.

The industry also has developed corn varieties that enable farmers to produce significantly larger yields on the same piece of ground. Ethanol plants are located in predominantly rural areas, close to the cornfields, and the trucks and trains that move the corn from the farm to the marketplace also become more efficient.

The technology used in ethanol plants also has greatly advanced in recent years. The industry itself has developed advanced enzymes that break down the starches in corn much more efficiently than in the past. Ethanol plants now employ molecular sieves that remove moisture from ethanol much more efficiently than old methods. They also utilize efficient natural gas burners to fuel the fermentation process.

All of these developments have significantly improved the efficiency of both corn and ethanol production and the net energy balance of the process. This efficiency is confirmed by a 2004 analysis completed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Argonne National Laboratory, a U.S. Department of Energy laboratory operated by the University of Chicago.

□ 2115

These entities analyzed ethanol's entire production cycle and concluded that ethanol yields 167 percent of the fossil energy that is used to grow, harvest and refine the grain and transport the ethanol to gasoline terminals for distribution. Ethanol also can be produced from cellulose feedstocks, such as rice straw, corn stover and sugarcane residue. As we improve the technology necessary to utilize these feedstocks, ethanol will achieve an even more favorable net energy balance.

Some have, unfortunately, propagated the myth that ethanol increases the cost of gasoline. But when you examine the facts, you see that the exact opposite is true. Ethanol expands U.S. fuel supplies, competes with fossil fuels in the marketplace, and reduces the overall gasoline prices paid by the driving public.

Like many of you, I was back in my home district over the Easter work period talking to South Dakotans. We are all well aware of what the price of gasoline has done in the past few months and how it affects our constituents. The price of ethanol, however, is largely unaffected by world oil prices, and it has not experienced the increases in price that petroleum has.

Today the net cost of ethanol to refiners is below the average wholesale price of gasoline in the United States. This means that blending ethanol into the gasoline supply actually reduces the cost of gasoline by displacing high-octane petroleum components. In fact, earlier today I checked on the gas prices in my hometown of Brookings, South Dakota. Premium gasoline at the BP gas station along Interstate 29 in Brookings is selling for $2.45 a gallon. Regular gas is going for $2.35. By contrast, E–85, which is a blend of 85 percent ethanol and 15 percent gasoline, is selling for $1.88, 57 cents per gallon cheaper than premium petroleum.

American auto companies are beginning to recognize the value of ethanol as well. General Motors recently provided an E–85-capable Chevrolet vehicle to the Governor of South Dakota as part of a campaign to promote ethanol and E–85-capable vehicles. This is part of a campaign by GM and the Governor's Ethanol Coalition designed to increase awareness of ethanol and flexible fuel vehicles and to promote the increased use of E–85 as a renewable alternative transportation fuel.

U.S. ethanol plants have produced record amounts of ethanol over the last 6 years to meet the increased demand. Without ethanol our country would be even more reliant on foreign imports of oil, and the pain at the pump would be much more severe.

In the end the ethanol industry is not resting. Over the last 25 years, 81 new ethanol plants have been built, and 16 additional plants are under construction today. In that same time period, not a single new U.S. refinery has been built, and scores have been closed. While we must address refining capacity issues as part of a balanced national energy policy as well, ethanol can play an increasing role in meeting growing demand.

The chart I put up now reflects the historic development within the United States of fuel ethanol production beginning in 1980 through 2004, reflecting the point that I mentioned about how the ethanol industry is growing to meet demand in large measure based upon other policies passed by this body to promote the use of this renewable energy, and, again, in light of the technology advancements that I mentioned previously.

A recent economic analysis entitled Ethanol and Gasoline Prices, by economist John Urbanchuk, found that ethanol production adds critical supply to the U.S. gasoline market. Without ethanol, gasoline demand would further outpace domestic supply and result in a major price spike.

Specifically, the report found if gasoline is at $2 per gallon, gasoline prices would increase 14.6 percent, or 29.2 cents per gallon, without ethanol in the short term. Without ethanol, gasoline prices would increase 3.7 percent, or 7.6 cents per gallon, in the long term once refiners build new capacity or secure alternative sources of supply.

Ethanol use will boost U.S. gasoline supplies by more than 3.3 billion gallons in 2005, as they did in 2004. Without ethanol, refiners would be forced to import an additional 217,000 barrels per day of high octane, clean-burning, gasoline-blending components.

There is a reason that these numbers are so large. We already use a lot of ethanol in this country. It would probably surprise many in this body to

know that today more than 30 percent of all gasoline sold in this country is blended with ethanol. Even more surprising to many, ethanol has already been seamlessly incorporated into the vehicle fuel markets in States like California, New York and Connecticut. This is because these States have to add oxygenates to their fuel to meet clean air standards, but have banned the use of a popular oxygenate called methyl tertiary butyl ether, or MTBE, because it is a known pollutant. And California is not alone. MTBE is already banned or being phased out in at least 20 States, and many more States are considering such a ban. This has forced these States to adopt the use of an alternative oxygenate, ethanol.

The California Energy Commission has repeatedly confirmed that ethanol used in that State actually costs refiners less than the gasoline with which it is blended. The U.S. Energy Information Administration has found no price impact from the recent switch from MTBE to ethanol. Even the chief economist of the American Petroleum Institute stated last year that his organization has not seen a major price impact from State MTBE bans and the resulting switch to ethanol.

As you can see, ethanol has the potential to become a more significant portion of our energy portfolio in this country today, and Congress should enact policies that recognize its value and promote even greater use in the future.

Renewable fuels benefit more than just fuel supplies and gasoline prices. The increased use of ethanol has bolstered struggling rural economies across the Plains States. A 2002 study of the ethanol industry found that with an approximate cost of $60 million for 1 year of construction, an ethanol plant expands the local economic base by $110 million each year. Ethanol production generates an additional $19.6 million in household income annually. Tax revenue for local and State governments increases by at least $1.2 million per year. The ethanol industry operations and spending for new construction added $1.3 billion of tax revenue for the Federal Government and $1.2 billion for State and local governments during 2004.

As you can see by the next map, ethanol production facilities today are located in many regions of the country, but they are concentrated throughout the Midwest and the Great Plains, and the Midwest and the Great Plains constitute a region of the country that has faced many economic challenges in recent years.

It is important to note that many of these facilities have been funded or are owned by local farmers, who use them to increase the value of their corn and profit from the sale of the ethanol and allow them to get a greater percentage of the processing part of the chain of production, rather than just the cost of the commodity, of the corn, that is brought to the facilities.

As I mentioned, increased ethanol use and the corresponding increase in the localized demand for corn raises the prices that family farmers receive for their crop. This in turn lowers Federal farm program costs and saves taxpayers money.

In 2004, USDA estimated that ethanol production reduced farm program costs by $3.2 billion. The combination of spending for ethanol plant production and capital spending for new plants under construction added more than $25.1 billion to gross output in the United States economy in 2004.

As you can see from the following chart, we are utilizing an ever-increasing amount of corn to produce ethanol in the country. This increasing amount of corn utilization also reflects an increase in the percentage of corn going to ethanol production, as the following chart demonstrates.

Rather than spending billions of dollars in oil revenues to politically unstable foreign countries around the world, we should be promoting the increased use of this home-grown fuel source that benefits farmers, families and small communities across South Dakota, and clearly this chart here that demonstrates the impact on corn-producing States like South Dakota and throughout the Great Plains and the Midwest, the economic impact, as earlier charts have shown, is evident.

Ethanol is one of the best tools we have to combat pollution caused by motor vehicle emissions. Ethanol contains 35 percent oxygen. Adding oxygen to fuel greatly enhances its combustion, which in turn reduces harmful tailpipe emissions.

Adding ethanol also displaces high toxic gasoline components, such as benzene, a known carcinogen. Ethanol is nontoxic, water-soluble and quickly biodegradable. It will not cause the groundwater pollution problems that have been linked to MTBEs.

Ethanol reduces particulate emissions, especially fine particulates that pose health risks to susceptible populations, including children, seniors and those with respiratory ailments.

Importantly, ethanol is a renewable fuel. The ethanol production process represents a carbon cycle, where plants absorb carbon dioxide during growth, recycling the carbon released during fuel combustion.

The use of ethanol-blended fuels reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 12 to 19 percent compared with conventional gasoline, according to the Argonne National Laboratory. In fact, Argonne states that ethanol use in the United States in 2004 reduced greenhouse gas emissions by more than 7 million tons, equivalent to removing the annual emissions of more than 1 million automobiles from the road.

Ethanol is widely used in Federal clean fuel programs required by the Clean Air Act, including winter oxygenated fuels and reformulated gasoline, or RFG programs, in cities that exceed public health standards for carbon monoxide and ozone pollution. The American Lung Association of Metropolitan Chicago credits ethanol-blended RFG with reducing smog-forming emissions by an amazing 25 percent since 1990.

It should be noted that when ethanol is blended with gasoline, it slightly raises the volatility of the fuel, which can lead to increased evaporation for certain emissions, particularly in warmer weather. But as is often the case, that is only half of the story. Blending ethanol and gasoline also dramatically reduces carbon monoxide tailpipe emissions. According to the National Research Council, carbon monoxide emissions are responsible for as much as 20 percent of smog formation.

Additionally, ethanol-blended fuels reduce the tailpipe emissions of volatile organic compounds which also can pollute the atmosphere. Thus, the use of ethanol plays an important role in smog reduction, and on balance is considerably friendlier to the environment than petroleum.

A recent study found that fuel blended with just 10 percent ethanol greatly reduces vehicle emissions. The use of E–10 results in a 50 percent reduction in tailpipe fine particulate matter emissions, up to a 30 percent reduction in carbon monoxide emissions, a 13 percent reduction in the amount of toxins emitted, and a 21 percent reduction in the potency of these toxins. Because of its demonstrated benefits to our water and air quality in this country, Congress should enact policies that promote the increased use of clean-burning ethanol as part of a broad national energy policy.

Ethanol also can provide significant benefits in the area of energy security. Over the past several years, we have become increasingly dependent on imported petroleum to meet our energy needs. The U.S. imports about two-thirds of its oil, and some experts predict our dependence upon foreign crude oil could climb to 70 percent in the years to come. Much of this oil will come from the Middle East. Fears of additional terrorist attacks have added a risk premium to world oil prices. At the same time, developing nations such as China and India have increased their demand for oil. As a result, world oil prices are on the rise.

Just last week a study released by investment bank Goldman Sachs declared that markets have entered what they describe as a ''superspike period'' that could enact 1970s-style price surges that drive oil prices as high as $105 a barrel. If this occurs, it will have an even more devastating impact on

farmers and ranchers, small business owners, working families, commuters, transportation companies and airlines, and the overall impacts on the national economy will worsen.

As a domestic renewable source of energy, ethanol can reduce our dependence on foreign oil and increase the United States' ability to control its own security and economic future by increasing the availability of domestic fuel supplies.

As I just noted, the U.S. imports 64 percent of its petroleum needs today. By 2025, the Energy Information Administration predicts the U.S. will import 77 percent of its petroleum.

World demand for oil will continue to increase, particularly in response to the emerging economies in China, India and Brazil. If, as predicted, U.S. domestic oil production fails to keep pace, petroleum could become so expensive that we will be forced to look for other sources of energy and new technologies to deal with these challenges.

□ 2130

Renewable fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel can be part of meeting these goals. They are grown here at home and are virtually infinite renewable sources. Increasing production here at home, especially from renewable sources, will make us a safer and more secure Nation.

Creating a viable renewable fuels industry in the United States must be a central component of our comprehensive national energy policy. The ethanol industry has shown that it is capable of providing a significant contribution to our Nation's energy needs. It is incumbent upon Congress to implement policies that promote the development and production of ethanol and other renewable fuels.

The ethanol industry is growing, as I have mentioned, to meet the demands of the marketplace for clean renewable fuels. And as this table shows, many States have responded to that call, as other States look to ethanol production as an increasing component of economic development. This table indicates current ethanol production capability and facilities and also reflects those currently under construction, and the overall amount of production capacity that the ethanol can withstand with current facilities and those that are in the planning stages and under construction today.

So in addition to the over-3.6 billion gallons of current production capacity, existing ethanol plants undergoing expansion and the 16 new plants under construction will add an additional nearly 750 million gallons of production capacity.

This continued expansion in ethanol production is necessary to meet the growing demand for alternatives to MTBE. The Federal ethanol program is providing economic stimulus to rural America, adding jobs, reducing the United States dependence on imported energy, reducing our bloated trade imbalance, and lowering auto emissions in our Nation's cities. All of these benefits accrue while consumers realize lower fuel prices at the pump for gasoline blended with ethanol.

In the coming weeks, this body will be debating and hopefully passing a comprehensive energy policy that will address the long-term energy needs of the country. Because of the obvious and proven benefits that domestically produced ethanol and biodiesel provide, our national energy policy should encourage the increased production of renewable fuels across the country.

Although the energy bill that the House passed last year did contain a renewable fuels standard, it was not adequate to meet the needs of the growing industry and adequately incentivize renewable fuels production. For that reason, in the upcoming days, I will be joining with a bipartisan group of colleagues in introducing the Fuels Security Act of 2005. This legislation, identical to a bill introduced in the Senate a few weeks ago, recognizes the benefits of ethanol and biodiesel and would promote their production in a realistic and economically viable way. It would provide benefits to rural America, benefits to our national energy security, and benefits to the environment without disrupting fuel supplies or increasing the cost of motor vehicle fuel.

Specifically, our bill will accomplish several things. It sets forth a phase-in for renewable fuel volumes over 7 years, beginning with a 4 billion gallon requirement in 2006 and ending with 8 billion gallons in 2012. It contains an escalation clause that would allow for increases in the renewable fuels requirement beyond 2012. It creates a credit program for refiners, blenders, or importers who exceed minimum obligations, thus allowing them to trade these credits with other refiners and minimize market disruptions.

Importantly, our approach does this in a way that would not enable excess credits to overhang the market and enable refiners to stymie the goals of the renewable fuels standard. It promotes the production of non-corn ethanol by crediting 1 gallon of cellulosis biomass ethanol to be equal to 2.5 gallons of corn-derived ethanol. It authorizes the EPA, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy, to waive the renewable fuels mandate for any State that would experience severe economic or environmental harm from the mandate, or where there is inadequate domestic supply to meet the requirement. And it eliminates the 2 percent oxygenate requirement for reformulated gasoline under the Clean Air Act and ensures that fuel performance standards and toxic emissions limits under the Clean Air Act continue to be met.

Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable approach to promoting these fuels, and it will provide benefits to our country for years to come.

I now want to turn time over to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Nebraska, who serves with me on the Committee on Agriculture who has been a leading proponent of ethanol production in the State of Nebraska and throughout the Great Plains to the benefit of the country. So I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. She has done an excellent job of describing some of the benefits of the ethanol industry. I wish to join her and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and others in introducing the Fuels Security Act, which will be introduced in the House next week.

Mr. Speaker, in 2004, the United States produced 3.6 billion gallons of ethanol. A couple, 3 years ago, that would have been an unheard of amount. At that time we were producing less than 2 billion gallons of ethanol per year. Yet this year, 1 year later, in 2005, that 3.6 billion will go to 4.5 billion gallons. So the ethanol industry is really ramping up. There are a lot of new ethanol plants out there and a tremendous amount of product that is being produced. Roughly one-third of the fuels in the United States today are blended with ethanol. So we have gone from maybe 5 or 10 percent, roughly 30 percent, a tremendous increase.

There are currently 20 States that are now producing ethanol. At one time, it was assumed that ethanol was the product of only two or three or four corn-producing States. Now we see ethanol plants in places like California, Kentucky, and other States around the country. Eventually, I would hazard a guess that probably all 50 States at some point will produce ethanol.

The thing that we need to realize is that ethanol can be produced from almost any type of biomass. It does not have to be corn; it does not have to be sorghum. It can be switch grass, in some cases it can be garbage, it can be a lot of things that we are trying to get rid of. So we think that the industry is something that can definitely be a tremendous benefit to the Nation as time goes on.

As the gentlewoman from South Dakota mentioned, the ethanol industry significantly reduces the price of gasoline. I think almost every American today is feeling the impact of high fuel prices. So based on $2 a gallon, and almost all of us realize that it is more like $2.22, but if it is based on $2 per gallon, if you took the ethanol industry out of the picture, gasoline would go up 29 cents. So a $2 gallon of gas would be $2.29. So if you are paying $2.20 in your home community, that

means that if ethanol went away, you would be paying roughly $2.51, $2.52 a gallon; something like that. So ethanol produces a benefit for everyone; whether you burn ethanol in your tank or not, it is important to the economy.

As was mentioned earlier, refiners would have to import an additional 217,000 barrels of high-grade fuel per day if ethanol disappeared. That would be very, very expensive. As my colleagues know, just normal petroleum is $56, $57 a barrel, and high-grade would be even higher than that. Currently, imports of petroleum are a major drag on our economy. Probably the number one thing holding our economy back is the amount of money that we are spending on petroleum from other nations. We are importing roughly 55 percent of our petroleum, and so ethanol moves us away from that. It is not the whole answer, but it certainly is a very significant part of improving the economy.

Currently, ethanol uses roughly 11 or 12 percent of the U.S. corn crop. Last year, we had a record crop of 12 billion bushels. Now, if we had not had ethanol using up about 11 or 12 percent, we would have had a tremendous hit in our prices. As it was, corn went from $2.60, to $2.70 a bushel down to about $1.85, $1.90 at the low. But if it was not for ethanol, we would have seen that down around $1.50, $1.40, because ethanol adds about 25 cents to 50 cents per bushel for the farmer, and we think this is tremendously important to the farm economy. As we will see here in a minute, this has an impact on the farm payments that are laid out by the average taxpayer. So as the corn price goes down, farm payments go up. And when farm payments go up, the taxpayer is hit harder. So again, ethanol certainly is good for the taxpayer.

As has been mentioned previously by the gentlewoman from South Dakota, the environment certainly benefits from the ethanol industry. I believe that she did mention that tailpipe emissions are decreased by roughly 50 percent. Carbon dioxide emissions, which are very harmful to the ozone and the environment, are reduced by roughly 30 percent; and it is estimated that greenhouse gases are reduced by something like 7 million tons, so 7 million tons come out of the atmosphere because of ethanol; and we think that is a tremendous benefit.

As was mentioned earlier, at one point, we had a 2 percent oxygenate requirement for our fuel. So the oxygenate requirement was met by two different fuels. MTBE provided a little bit more than 1 percent of that 2 percent, and ethanol provided about eight-tenths of 1 percent. MTBE has been proven to pollute ground water, so roughly 20 States have now outlawed MTBE; and as a result, something has to fill that void and that is where ethanol has come in to play.

At the outset, many people said ethanol will never be able to produce enough gallons to fill that void, but there has been a ripple. We have found that ethanol has been transported to California, to New York, other places where it was assumed that it could never be adequate to fill the demand, and we have seen that supply filled very adequately.

As was mentioned, the legislation we are proposing removes the 2 percent oxygenate requirement, which has been very burdensome in some areas, and we think that that flexibility will be very helpful to them. The economy, of course, benefits. We would assume that something like 150,000 new jobs will be added each year because of the ethanol industry; and over the course of this bill, between 2005 and 2012, roughly 243,000 new jobs would be created. It will add roughly $200 billion to the gross domestic product between 2004 and 2012, and the biggest thing that I see right now as far as trade is the thing that is causing a huge trade deficit is basically our imports of petroleum products.

So the ethanol industry reduces that trade deficit by about $5 billion a year and between 2004 and 2012, it will cut that trade deficit about $64 billion. So that is a huge impact on our economy.

So we are doing better with ethanol. But we can do better yet, because Brazil currently mandates 25 percent of their petroleum come from ethanol. Of course, Brazil also is a major exporter to other countries of ethanol. As was mentioned earlier, we currently, I think in Nebraska, which I represent a big part of that State, we have 5 E–85 stations which are stations that pump 85 percent ethanol. And those gallons are roughly 40 to 50 percent, or 40 to 50 cents cheaper per gallon than standard gasoline. As time goes on, we are going to see more and more of this occurring.

The other thing that I might mention is that the ethanol industry has a by-product. Besides ethanol, you are producing usually feed for animals from the by-product, but the thing that many people do not realize is the spin-offs from the ethanol industry are going to be huge. Some of the by-products that we are going to have, Creatine, which is a muscle-building substance which is safe, can be used, can be made from some of the residue. Biodegradable plastic in the wet milling plants are being created. So I think as time goes on, biotechnology is going to be important, and we will see a huge benefit from the overall ethanol industry.

I might also mention that biodiesel is going to be a major part of the legislation that we are introducing. And, of course, that usually uses soybeans in production. But biodiesel is going to make diesel fuel cheaper, more efficient, and will cause much less wear and tear on diesel engines. So we think these things are all very important.

□ 2145

I am going to now turn to just a couple of visuals. As was mentioned earlier, one thing that so often people do not understand about ethanol is the assumption that it takes a lot of energy to produce ethanol. But what we see here is that for every unit of energy that goes into the manufacture of ethanol, you get 1.4 units of energy out.

And so what that means is that in order to run a tractor to plant the crop, to run a combine to harvest the crop, to run the refinery to make the ethanol, if you are going to pump some water out of the ground to irrigate, these are all of those energy costs which are usually petroleum fuels, which we would have to do with gasoline, or diesel or propane or whatever.

So you get a net gain of four-tenths of a Btu. And in contrast, if you look at a gallon of gasoline, for every unit of energy that you use, you use 1 Btu, you get eight-tenths of a Btu back after you have processed and refined the gasoline. So you lose energy. It is a net loss instead of a net gain.

If it is MTBE that you are after, you get actually only .67 Btus back from 1 Btu of energy. So the reason for that, again, as was mentioned earlier, is that here we are harnessing the sun, it is renewable fuel, and so that gain that you get is from solar energy that is converted into fuel. And we think that is an interesting thing, it is an economy, and it certainly benefits the environment as well.

Just a few other facts and I will point out here before I yield back. The ethanol energy will add roughly $51 billion to farm income over 10 years. And Mr. KING and Ms. HERSETH and I all come from ag States, and the farm economy is struggling in most cases. Some people are doing pretty well, but a lot of people are marginal. In the State of Nebraska at one time we had 135 million farmers. Today we have roughly 48 million. And so all of those people have gone out of business because it is simply not very profitable. So when you find a value-added product that will add $51 billion to farm economy, this is something that we think is very, very important.

We mentioned that it will reduce government farm payments. Many people in urban areas do not like to see some parts of the farm bill. They do not like to see the price supports. Well, what has happened here is because the ethanol industry raises the cost of corn, the price of corn, by 25 to 50 cents a bushel, that means that as those prices get higher, there is less farm payments, because you do not have to make up the loan deficiency payments. So as a result there is the benefit of about $5.9 billion in less tax dollars in the farm bill over the course of 10 years.

We mentioned that it reduces the trade deficit by roughly $34 billion, and

that is over a period of time, and significantly reduces air pollution. As we mentioned, 7 million tons of greenhouse gases would be reduced each year. So some of this is a little redundant, but it does not hurt to repeat it.

I am sure that Mr. KING will say a few of these things over. But we feel that we have a good piece of legislation here. And I would like to thank the gentlelady for being part of this, for hosting this this evening, and for her part in introducing the legislation.

Mr. KING also has been certainly a very strong proponent of renewable fuels. And so we hope to work together, and we hope to convince enough of our colleagues, many of whom are from urban areas, and many of whom have been imbued with the idea that ethanol is sort of a giveaway to the rural States, that this really is a win-win, this is something that is good for all of us, and it is certainly good for the country.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for sharing his insights as it relates to the state of the ethanol industry today, its capacity to meet our national energy needs, particularly in pointing out not only the use and the importance of the byproducts generated from ethanol production, and making specific note of how the legislation we intend to introduce affects biodiesel production as well, and encouraging our colleagues from urban areas to take a renewed look at ethanol.

I now would like to yield as much as 18 minutes or as much as he would like to consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who clearly has been a leading advocate as well as introduced other important legislation in this Congress and in prior terms important to renewable energy and to ethanol.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from South Dakota especially for asking for this floor time tonight and bringing us together to talk about this important issue of ethanol.

And while I have the opportunity to say a few words here, while my esteemed colleague from Nebraska is in the Chamber this evening, I wanted to take the opportunity to point out that one of the byproducts in biodiesel is a glycerin product, and the closest thing I can identify on the market is Cornhusker's hand lotion. We will have millions of gallons of that as we produce our biodiesel, and we will be looking for some more markets, because I am not sure that there are enough hands to consume all of that Cornhusker's lotion.

But I think that expresses some of the bipartisan nature that we have in this. It is a regional issue very much as well. Us in the Corn Belt have led on renewable fuels, and the ethanol industry had to go through a lot of growing pains to establish an industry.

I happen to have yesterday shaken the hand of the individual, and he is in the Iowa Senate, his name is State Senator Thurman Gaskill. It was his birthday yesterday; he turned 70 years old. He is the man that actually pumped the first gallon of ethanol in this country. And it was a unique circumstance to be there to eat a treat, to celebrate his birthday, and shake the hand that pumped that first gallon of ethanol in the United States of America. It has been a long, hard slog to get here, where with the industry in ethanol. They have blazed the trail for biodiesel.

As I have watched this come together, and I have watched the leaders in the industry have this vision that said we can take this corn product, and we can turn it into a fuel product that is clean, and it is safe, and it is kind to our air and our water, and it is kind to our engines. And as I listened to many of the stories that come out when people were concerned about the impact on their motors, and there was some old motors that had rubber products in there that did break down with ethanol, that is essentially a thing of the past. And those objections and complaints pretty much drifted past the wayside.

But I have some things that I would like to go through to address some of this, and as the coach said, most has been said; I will probably say a few over again. But it does pay to repeat some of them.

In the past 20 years, Iowa has led the biofuels industry to become one of the most important players in the search for renewable, home-grown energy resources. And if I described the district that I represent, it is roughly the western third of Iowa. And if you would draw a line there from, say, go to the South Dakota-Iowa border, and then go through counties over to the east, and from there on that Minnesota border draw a line straight down to Missouri, that roughly western third of Iowa would get most of the district that I represent.

In that district there are 32 counties, and those 32 counties, among them are six operating, functional ethanol plants, most of them with 40-million-gallon-a-year annual capacity or above. Some have grown up more than that.

And in addition to that, we have at least one other ethanol plant that is under construction in Denison, Iowa, which is right within about 2 miles of where I grew up. That product will be up—that plant will be up and on line fairly soon. We have three others that are on the drawing board.

And while I have this opportunity to say so, I think that the plant in Denison is unique in its character. It sits just down the river a little ways from the original Iowa Beef Packer's plant that is still up and running, and that was built in 1961. And there they will be producing ethanol. They will be able to ship it by rail or by truck. There is already a grain facility there that the producers are used to bringing grain to with large storage capacity. And the unique nature of this plant is it has gas, it has water, it has rail. It has an airport there within just a little over a mile of the ethanol plant.

I pointed out on the day that we did the ground-breaking ceremony to the amazing energy plant there in Denison, as I looked at the board of directors all sitting there under the tent, and I explained to them that they had made a good business decision, and I was not sure that they realized how good that business decision actually was, because you have the corn there, and you have all of the things that I have described, it is all of the components that you would want for an ideal location as well as plenty of corn around the region, but additionally they are going to be producing a dry distiller's grain that some used to think was a byproduct, but certainly it is a very, very valuable animal feed product. And I advised them that they didn't need to load that dry distiller's grain out on trucks and haul it off and market it somewhere to some of the other feeders. I suggested that they just set up an auger and put in a row of feed bunks, and line those bunks up on up river, and within about a half a mile they could bring those calves in, and they could start feeding those preconditioned calves right there at the ethanol plant, and they could just kind of walk sideways a little ways, and the more they gained, the further away they would get from the plant. And eventually they would fatten out at about 1,200 pounds, and they could walk across the road right into the beef plant. The best place in the world that you can put an ethanol plant.

And I would add, though, that when you go into those plants that are up and running, and the efficiency is there, the cleanliness, the state-of-the-art technology, that art technology that used to belong, that technology that used to belong in the hands of ADM and Cargill, and they certainly have that technology as well, But it is being developed by good engineering companies in the Midwest, companies that are working with farmers and producers and keeping that capital and invest it back into the hands of the people that have to make a living off of the land.

But the efficiency that is there, as the energy efficiency, and it used to be the argument made that we would burn more energy producing ethanol than we actually produced, and that equation went the other way a long time ago. And we are up to about 2¾ gallons of ethanol out of every bushel of corn, and then take the dry distiller's grain, and then ship that out and feed that to

livestock without really a net loss in that feed value.

It is really something to see when you see a line-up of trucks coming into an up-and-running ethanol plant, and they are coming in dumping grain, and they dump that grain in the pit, it goes up, and it goes on up to be produced into ethanol. And there are other trucks lined up in the other lane loading out dry distiller's grain, corn coming in, turned into ethanol, ethanol out on the rail, dried distiller's grain going out sitting right beside it, some coming in with corn, others hauling dried distiller's grain out. It is efficient. It is almost the perfect symbiotic relationship for a corn producer to see that kind of production go on.

And so there in the district, the day that I went up to do the ground-breaking ceremony in Sioux County at the Little Sioux Corn Processors, it was a chilly day, and we went up there and turned over a spade of dirt and celebrated the beginning of a new value-added operation up there.

And when I left I drove south, down through Buffalo Ridge. And there, in Buena Vista County, there were, at that time, there were 259 wind chargers standing there on the ridge. Today there are at least 359 in that same region. And then just a little further south, there is the ethanol plant at Galva. And as the crow flies, I believe it is 18 miles, two ethanol plants, 359 wind chargers.

We have become, in western Iowa and in much of the Corn Belt, an energy export center, something that was not conceived of 10 years ago, not visualized 6 or 7 years ago, but today is a reality. And, in fact, in the district that I represent, these 32 counties, those six up-and-running plants, the one more under construction, and it looks like three more likely can go, we will be, within 2 years, to that position where we can say we have built all of the ethanol production that we have the corn to supply, another astonishing accomplishment.

And as I watch the biodiesel come behind this, the biodiesel that has looked at the trail that is blazed by the ethanol producers, those people like Thurman Gaskill that pumped that first gallon of ethanol, and they see that pattern, that path that has been set by ethanol, and because of that, biodiesel is stepping in that path and they are following it.

And, in fact, here just a few weeks ago, I had the privilege to be at the kick-off ceremony for the fund-raising drive to build the biodiesel plant at Wall Lake, Iowa, and that happens to be about 8 or 9 miles from where I live as the crow flies. And there were maybe 100 to 150 people, and I thought they all came to have a little lunch and hear a presentation. And I was asked to give a speech, and I gave one. Had I known how much investors were sitting in the room ready to invest in the capital fund drive, I would have shortened my speech up and gotten out of the way.

They began their capital fund drive that day with a significant response, and in 9 days raised the capital necessary to get the biodiesel plant off the ground and get it rolling. And it will be producing biodiesel out of soybeans and off of animal fat. And that is a byproduct that can be put to better use.

So the biodiesel, remember, has a lot of versatility in it as well. We all know that America can no longer afford to depend on oil that flows from unstable sources and unreliable partners. Oil has reached almost $60 a barrel, and with world demand for oil increasing at an explosive rate, it is likely we may never see low oil prices again.

□ 2200

Clearly, this Nation is too dependent on foreign sources of oil, and even a brief rundown of the facts is a sobering exercise.

Two-thirds of the world's known oil reserves are located in the volatile and increasingly violent Middle East, while America's domestic oil reserves have declined 20 percent over the past 15 years.

American taxpayers today spend more than $50 billion a year just to protect Middle Eastern oil supplies. This is the cost of our energy, too.

Today, the U.S. is importing more than 62 percent of its oil, and that number is expected to hit 77 percent in the next 20 years.

Yet there has not been a major new refinery built in the U.S. since the Bicentennial.

So, recently, the Renewable Fuels Association announced that January's ethanol production set an all-time record high in production. U.S. fuel ethanol reached 320 million gallons in the month of January. The previous high was 312 million, just the month before in December.

U.S. ethanol industry set an all-time monthly production record this last January now of 241,000 barrels a day, and that is an astonishing amount of production. We have a long ways to go before we get our production up to the point where we can meet the demand in this country, not just at the 10 percent rate or the 30 percent rate.

As the gentlewoman from South Dakota pointed out, we have a market out there for E–85, and E–85 uses a lot more renewable fuel; and it takes a lot more pressure off our imported oils from overseas. It is a lot better for our environment, for our air and our water; and it is something that has been my life's work in soil conservation work, water quality and air quality in preserving our resources. This is something that is good for all of us. It is good for all Americans.

It is one of those issues that when you first pick it up and look at it, it looks good, and you hear some criticism, you find the answers to that and it looks better. Each time you turn this ethanol and biodiesel, the renewable fuels package around, you can see it does more and more for us.

By the way, the balance of trade, we watched our balance of trade, that deficit number get larger in the red over the last several years. A year ago, we were looking at a minus $503 billion of balance of trade, red ink. That is how much product we purchased overseas greater than the amount we exported.

Last February 10, we got our new numbers for the balance of trade. It is now a minus $617.7 billion of more goods that we imported than we exported.

But the ethanol industry, the renewable fuels industry, but ethanol itself will change that balance of trade to the tune of $5.1 billion that will reduce the amount of foreign oil that we will have to purchase.

So this fits in very well with our economics. It fits in very well with our taxes. It fits in very well with our air and our water and our environment. It is something that is good for rural America, good for the Corn Belt, and good for the cities, especially for their air quality. It is a replacement for MTBEs.

That is something I wish we had done a long time ago. It would save this Congress a lot of grief that we will be facing in how to deal with the MTBE issues.

It is time to move forward and solve this problem. I ask for support on this bill. We will be rolling it out here next week, and I am glad to be a part of it. It is something I have a lot of energy and passion for.

I thank the gentlewoman from South Dakota for her efforts.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) very much for sharing his perspectives based on historical development of the industry, the challenges that we faced in the past and clearly the opportunities that we have today and in the future to utilize ethanol and other renewable fuels as part of a national energy policy. I appreciate as well his thoughtful insights as it relates to the investment in rural America, the impact in a positive way on rural communities, how rural America has stepped up as well to provide capital for investment in the technologies that are necessary to begin and expand and construct the ethanol facilities.

Also, the points made about the potential impact, the positive impact that ethanol production and increasingly utilizing renewable energies and our national energy policy and increasing the blend that can have on our trade balance, as well as clearly the positive environmental impact of ethanol and renewable energy.

So I want to thank again both my distinguished colleague, the gentleman

from Iowa (Mr. KING), as well as the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for their prior work and their commitment to ensuring that renewable energy is a core component of our national energy policy, demonstrating not only the regional support but the bipartisan support for the legislation that we will be introducing.

Renewable fuels such as ethanol already constitute, as we have shown, a significant portion of our Nation's energy portfolio. They reduce the cost of petroleum and are home grown, clean, efficient, and economically beneficial to rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues not to believe the myths and misinformation of the past, and to fairly evaluate or reevaluate the role of ethanol and other renewable fuels as a core component of our national energy policy.

I firmly believe that Congress must enact policies that will facilitate the positive impact of the renewable fuels industry because it will, in turn, benefit the entire country.

We will be introducing this legislation in the coming days, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important initiative, to join their colleagues such as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and a number of others who will introduce this legislation.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I have a slight cold so please forgive me, but we are back with the 30-something Hour, and I will be joined by my two colleagues from Florida here in a few minutes.

We want to continue this debate that we have been having in the United States over the past several months, a debate that the President has initiated in saying after the campaign that he wanted to have a national discussion in regards to the issue of Social Security and the Social Security solvency and where Social Security is going to be in the next few years and the kind of changes that we have to make in the country in order to deal with it.

Those of us on this side, and I think many on the other side, have very many concerns about this because Social Security, quite frankly, has been one of the most successfully administered Federal Government programs in the history of the United States of America.

We have talked over the past few months on how Social Security runs with only a 1 percent administrative cost. So there are a lot of government programs I think we all agree in this Chamber and across the country that are inefficient, that are ineffective, that maybe do not work, that maybe take too much money without getting the kind of results that we ultimately want.

Social Security is not one of those programs. Social Security has been an enormous success, and I think what is great really about Social Security in trying to advance this argument, I think why the President is having so much difficulty is that Social Security is a program that touches all of our lives.

We here in the 30-something Caucus watched our grandparents receive Social Security, and the story of my great-grandfather when Social Security was first implemented, he could not believe when he got to America that he could retire and walk down to the end of the driveway and get his Social Security check and he would have dignity in his final years.

This program has been successful, and the President is having great difficulty making an argument that we need to somehow radically change the Social Security system.

The President's proposal is to say that those of us who are in our 20s and 30s and 40s, instead of putting our percent, our 6.2 percent into the Social Security system, will be allowed to divert a certain portion of that over into some private annuity or private account that we would be allowed to set up, and there are all kinds of math involved in this in the President's proposal that lead to someone who does put money into a private account to not receive the kind of benefits that they thought they were going to get in the first place.

But the main point is this: the Social Security system, the Social Security program may need change, may need to be tweaked, but it does not need to be privatized, and the President's plan does not fix the problem. It in no way, shape, or form fixes the long-term solvency issues that Social Security has, and there are many other ways we can go about fixing this program. It is good until 2042, into 2050 and even after that you will still get 80 percent of your benefits if we do absolutely nothing.

So there is no need to get crazy. There is no need to get crazy and try to make some radical changes to this program like privatizing it and somehow jeopardize and slash benefits for our seniors and our grandparents and our parents.

I am joined by the gentlewoman who has been on all the talk shows over the past few weeks and did a fantastic job. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), and it is good to be here with you once again.

Quite honestly, it is good to be here to talk about once again an extremely important issue and that is Social Security. I can tell you that I wish that that is what we had been able to talk about for the last 2 weeks as opposed to some of the other issues we have been focused on, but I am glad we are able to refocus again.

What we have been trying to do in our 30-something Working Group over the last several months and prior to my arrival here in Congress, you and our other colleagues have done yeoman's work on getting the message out about the facts as its relates to Social Security because our generation, your friends, my friends, when you go home and you sit down and you are having coffee or you are having a beer, which we may occasionally do among our friends, and the conversation may turn to whether you think or your friends think that there is going to be Social Security there for you when you retire. Most people our age, they believe the myth that has been put out there by the President and by the leadership of the Congress. They believe that Social Security will not be there.

My colleague and I being in our 30s and we are trying to get the word out to other people our age across this country, the solvency issue to which you just referred, literally, before there is even a concern about a potential drop in benefits, is not for 37 years from now, at the earliest. More likely, 47 years when in my case, I will be 75 years old in 37 years and 85 years old in 47 years, long past retirement age, long past the point after which I would begin collecting Social Security.

So like my colleague said, we are not suggesting that there is not a problem that needs to be addressed. What we are suggesting is that there is not a crisis; that there is no need to sound the alarm bells; that we need to make sure that we approach this problem responsibly; that this is a 70-year program of success, probably the most successful program in our Nation's history, established as an iron clad safety net that no one should have to worry about it being there upon their retirement, which is why that if we are going to make changes, which we should to ensure its long-term solvency, that we take the time to do it correctly and responsibly and not rush to judgment and not make drastic changes which privatizing Social Security, I think by anyone's definition, would be drastic.

We have got to make sure that we preserve Social Security into the future, and what is ironic is that most of the talk coming from the White House and in the leadership of this body has been about privatizing Social Security, setting up private accounts, and this has just been mind-boggling to me because, like you said, privatization does nothing to deal with the solvency

issue. We could privatize Social Security, and all we would be doing is adding to our deficit and putting our Nation more in debt than we already are, and we are badly, badly in debt.

So you can go that far and still have to address Social Security solvency problems, and we need to make sure that we responsibly make changes to preserve Social Security into the future.

□ 2215

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely.

And, Mr. Speaker, when you just look at how the privatization process would be set up, you are actually taking money that would be going into the system out away from the system. And we do not even know, and the President's proposal from all the ones I have read, is that the 4 percent that I would be able to take and move into the side account, the business match will not go into the Social Security account either. So you put in your 6.2, the business puts in theirs, but if I divert 4 percent, then that is 4 percent less that the employer has to put in. So you are talking about taking out trillions of dollars. And I think if there is one point we want to make tonight, that will be it.

We brought our handy-dandy charts here. Privatization equals massive borrowing. There is only one way to fill the gap. We do not have money to plug a $2 trillion hole. And it says in the first 10 years of the plan, anywhere from $1.4 trillion to $2 trillion in borrowing, and over the next 20 years it will be $5 trillion that we will have to borrow just to plug holes in the President's plan. We are running a $400- to $500 billion trade deficit in a year, and we are going to go out and borrow $5 trillion? Where are we going to get $5 trillion to plug the hole in the Social Security plan? We are borrowing the money from foreign countries, and we are shifting the burden on to the next generation. It is irresponsible. It is lunacy. There is no reason to have to do this. So, again, push the taxes off.

Now, this is the chart I like, and Tom Manatos, from our staff, is responsible for this. This is it. The national debt, my colleagues. There are so many numbers here. And this is always changing. You can go to the United States Treasury Web site, and this ticker here will keep going and keep adding, but it is $7.7 trillion. And we are going to go out and we are going to borrow $5 trillion? This is our debt now, almost $8 trillion. And if the President gets his way and we have to implement the private accounts, we are going to go out and have to borrow $5 trillion, which is more than half the national debt that we have right now.

But here is the number you will love the most, your share of the national debt. Your share, one person sitting at home right now, if you are sitting there or if you are born today, you owe $26,000. That is what you owe because we spend more than we take in. Now, if we are going to add $5 trillion to this over the next 20 years, this number will almost double.

So when you think about a baby that is born today that owes this, and if we keep going at the rate we are going, running $500- to $600 billion annual deficits, and this number keeps going, and we are out borrowing money and paying more interest on it, and you live your whole life and this number keeps going up, and then at 18 you go out and borrow money to go to school, to get a bachelor's degree, master's degree, Ph.D., become a lawyer, you are going to borrow more money, what does this number look like? How are we providing opportunity for our children in the next generation?

We are being irresponsible here. The gentleman talked earlier here about the trade deficits and how we have to balancing those off and balancing the budget, but we are not being very kind to the next generation coming up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield once again to my colleague.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank my colleague, Mr. Speaker.

I think that statistic and those two numbers there are so illustrative. They really are. People can feel, touch, taste and understand what $26,000 means. For every single person, including an infant in this country, that is their share of the national debt.

I think people have a harder time, though, I mean none of us literally have an understanding of what $7 trillion is; $7,781,336,014,734.14. That is the national debt.

Now, what does that mean? If you are going to try to break it down into what $7 trillion is like, and there are people actually out there figuring this stuff out to try to translate that concept of a trillion dollars into more understandable bites of information, for example, if you stacked a thousand $1 bills, you took a thousand $1 bills and stacked them on top of each other, $1 million would equal 1 foot high of thousand dollar bills. That is how high.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One bill that equals $1,000 stacked. Okay.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Right. Stacked up would equal a foot. A billion dollars would equal the height of the Empire State building in New York. One trillion dollars, stacked up on top of each other, would be a thousand times the height of the Empire State Building.

So if you are trying to think about how much $7 trillion is, that is how large that number is. That is not something that almost anyone can get their arms around. And think about the unbelievable irresponsibility that that is, and that there currently appears to be almost no regard for that problem and how to deal with it, and no focus here on how we are going to get a handle on the sheer size of that number and shrinking it, and no realistic proposal; only conversations like that of privatizing Social Security, which are going to make that number ever larger. It really starts to boggle your mind.

Yet, when we go home, as we just did, and I spent the last couple of weeks at home going around my district and had town hall meetings. I had a town hall meeting in my district on Social Security, and it appeared as though there is an inverse relationship between the more the President talks about his vague outlines of a proposal and the more people hear about his vague outlines of a proposal. They are moving in opposite directions.

In fact, for our age group, which is his target audience, because he has been assuring people 55 and over they will not have to be concerned about their continued checks and the continuation of Social Security for them, and if you believe that, which I found in my district, and I have a very large population of senior citizens who are Social Security recipients, they are very, very skeptical about how a program the size of Social Security, with as monumental a change as this would be, how it is that they can be assured that a monumental change like that is not going to affect them.

So there is a healthy amount of skepticism as it is, but the target audience, which is our generation and people younger than 30 years old, the polling that has come out recently, and the Pew Research Center did a March 24 poll, which shows support for private accounts among young adults absolutely plummeting. The more young people have heard about this proposal, the less they like it. They are more than twice as likely to oppose private accounts when they have heard a lot about it. And that is illustrative of the inverse relationship between the President's canned town hall meetings, for lack of a better term. Because what we have been doing out in our districts, as Democrats, we are not ticketing our events. We are not hand-picking the audience. We are saying, come on in and talk to us about Social Security. Let us talk to you about what we hear about this proposal, and you tell us what you think.

What is going on in the President's meetings is he is saying, do you agree with me? Oh, okay, you can come in then, and booting people who do not agree with him. That is really not very democratic. It does not show a real ability or desire to actually get input. It is more my way or the highway politics, which is not the way we should be shaping this debate.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And that is not the way we did it in 1983. And everyone has been talking about this monumental national discussion and Tip O'Neill sitting down with President

Reagan and Bob Dole, and we had all the great political figures of that generation coming together to say we are going to put politics aside, and we are going to fix the problem.

And we are not here to bash the President or to bash the Republicans or to bash anybody, but we are here to say we have issues here that are going to affect the long-term interest of the country. In many districts across the country we are losing manufacturing jobs. One of the main problems we have with this whole thing is we do not have enough taxpayers working and making a good living and paying into the Social Security System. My own opinion is that is what would really help fix this long term. But we are just here to say we want to sit down and work with you.

You cannot have a national discussion if you do not include the opposition into your town hall meetings. Boy, it would be great to go to a meeting and never have anybody stand up and question any votes you have had or anything like that. We cannot get away with that in our congressional seats, nor should we be able to. And so the President needs to come to Congress and work with us. We want to help him figure this out.

Now, private accounts, for us, are off the table. That is ridiculous. That is not going to happen. But we want to work with the President

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And, Mr. Speaker, my colleague is just absolutely right on target. We are more than willing to sit down and hash out in the spirit of compromise, like the gentleman referred to what they did in 1983. But, at least in my experience, with compromise, you have to be singing off the same song sheet. You cannot start from two completely different places and define the problem in completely different ways and ultimately reach compromise.

So if the President and his supporters on this concept would come off of the concept of crisis and get to where we are and where the reality is, because every factual description, including from the Social Security trustees that just released their report 2 weeks ago, points to a problem, a problem looming on the horizon that needs to be dealt with.

So when we are singing off the same song sheets, then we will be able to move forward and talk about a compromise that will actually address the solvency question, because private accounts do not address the solvency question, they just cause more debt.

What is unbelievable about the private accounts is that the President, at least in my listening to him, has sold them as almost like it would be an addition to your Social Security benefits. But the reality of his vague plan is that you would not get your private account and your Social Security benefits. There would be a commensurate cut in your Social Security benefits in proportion to what is in your account; approximately a 46 percent cut in your Social Security benefits.

And let us not forget also that his proposal does not leave out the one-third of Social Security recipients who are not earners. You have people who are beneficiaries of Social Security recipients who have passed on and who are not earning an income. You have children and dependents, and you have the disabled community. Now, they are not able to benefit from private accounts because in order to have a private account, you actually have to have an income. So we are not even thinking about how we would address the huge pure cut that they would suffer from.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And, Mr. Speaker, when you look at when you would want to actually take out the money, our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), who was here a few weeks ago with us, had a great explanation. The stock market goes up. The stock market goes down. The stock market goes up. The stock market goes down. Well, what if you are going to retire at the wrong time? What if you were planning on retiring in 2001, 2002, and your private savings account was cut in half? Now all of a sudden you are not retiring.

Social Security grows at a steady pace and keeps up with inflation and makes sure that you would be able to maintain the kind of buying power that you would normally have, and it is stable, and it is safe, and it is guaranteed.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is why we call it Social Security.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Social Security, exactly, instead of having the up and down. And that is the kind of risk you are going to have to take on if you are going to put your money into some of these private accounts.

One point more before I pull up another slide here. Your share of the national debt is $26,000, and I think we really need to start looking in terms like this, because not only do business people always worry about what the next quarter's earnings are going to be, what is the next quarter's profits going to be, and we tend to always think what is the next election going to be like, because we get elected every 2 years, so there is no real long-term thinking. So I think it is important for us, especially during the discussions the 30-something group has, is to have this broad discussion: What does this look like to a baby born today and you add this on?

Then we have got the number here that the average college student has $20,000 of debt after going to college; plus a credit card debt, plus a car payment. So what we are trying to say here is that a baby born today has a tax on their head of at least, at least, and that is today, if the clock does not run, of at least $50,000 by the time they are 22 years old and graduating.

□ 2230

Mr. Speaker, you add in inflation and the fact college tuition is doubling, add in all of the other factors, and the bankruptcy bill, which I will not go into, we are not serving our country well and we are not serving the next generation well when we do this. I think we are being very shortsighted and selfish. It sounds good; we are going to borrow money. Wall Street is going to make a killing on the whole deal. It sounds good, and sometimes if it sounds too good to be true, most often it is.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is so right. We need to boil this down in terms that people deal with every day. When we have these conversations on the floor, I try to zero in on the impact that this proposal will have on specific groups. For example, we have some information about the impact Social Security has on children. Social Security survivor and disability benefits help 6.4 million children. We talk about welfare assistance and TANF, which is Temporary Assistance For Needy Families, funding and how important a program that is to helping sustain the lives of millions of children, but Social Security survivor and disability benefits help almost twice as many children as welfare does. That, I think, is something that people just do not realize. I did not realize it until I received this information, and that is according to our nonpartisan Congressional Research Service.

Social Security is currently the largest source of Federal funding that prevents children from falling into poverty. Social Security benefits have kept 920,000 children out of poverty, and more than one-third of families with Social Security income would be poor without these benefits.

If we look at the effects that privatization of Social Security would have on women, women comprise the majority of Social Security benefits. They represent 58 percent of all Social Security recipients at the age of 65, and women represent 71 percent of all beneficiaries by the time they are age 85. Privatization disproportionately harms women, especially because women really end up having much less because of the differences in earning potential, much less opportunity to benefit from Social Security when they are planning for retirement.

There are a number of factors that leave women even more vulnerable to this really radical proposal. Women and poverty in old age is often rooted in the reality that their lives are shaped on. We earn less money. We are at 76 cents on the dollar compared to

the same job that a man does. The reality of care giving, we are primarily responsible for caring for loved ones, both children and our older parents, and women have jobs more often that offer very few benefits. So women who have been in the workforce are far less likely to have IRAs and pensions and other outside extra benefits. Social Security for women ends up being the vast majority of the time their sole retirement benefit. So it disproportionately is pulling the rug out from under them.

I think we have to talk about how these proposed changes would impact people. What I have noticed in the time I have been here, and this is a big room and there are a lot of Members, 435 of us, and we talk about a lot of really important issues here. At a certain point, I think Members of Congress forget that the decisions that we make here affect individual people. It is really easy to forget about that. It is easy to talk about numbers in the trillions, and we forget that Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Goldstein, those are real people where our decisions hurt them. Members need to think about them sitting in their kitchens and scratching out how they are going to buy groceries, cover their medication, and pay their electricity bill.

The report that came out from the Social Security and Medicare trustees 2 weeks ago shows that the crisis we should be talking about is Medicare and the looming problem that is going to present because that is what is facing insolvency. But, of course, that problem, according to the leadership here, has been taken care of. They took care of that, according to the leadership here, in the bill that took 3 hours to twist enough arms, from what I understand, to get them to have the votes to pass it. I am not sure why in that legislation they would not have taken steps to address what appears to be the real crisis.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The fix there to save Medicare solvency was to spend an additional 500 to $600 billion, not to do anything with the cost of prescription drugs, not to allow for reimportation, not to allow the Secretary of HHS to negotiate down the drug prices with some of these drug companies.

The gentlewoman is exactly right. When I think of a crisis going on in my district right now, many of the school districts that I represent, half the kids live in poverty. That is a crisis because those kids are going to be taking from the system instead of creating wealth and paying taxes and contributing to the system. That is a crisis.

In Mahoney County, which encompasses the city of Youngstown, there are thousands of kids who have lead poisoning. There are 2,000 kids, young kids who have lead poisoning in Mahoney County at a level by which it actually affects their cognitive ability which puts you on a level of slight retardation. It is unbelievable. Those are the crises we have in the country: health, education, making sure that the poorest among us have some kind of security.

If Members went to Youngstown, Ohio, and tried to convince the residents there that the biggest crisis in the country starts in 2042, they would laugh at you.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is so right. I represent a community where it is not just the poor we are concerned about; it is the regular middle- to lower-middle class who are struggling. I have hundreds of thousands of senior citizens in south Florida who struggle every single day because Social Security for the vast majority of them is their primary source of income. They are much more focused. It is what I hear when I am stopped at a picnic or at the supermarket. They are concerned about how they are going to pay for their medication. Some of them cannot even make their co-payments. They are concerned about the increase in their premiums for Medicare that just happened.

That is the handwringing that is going on. They are not that concerned about a problem that does not face them for another 37 years. Quite honestly, in the senior citizen community, most of them realize 37 years is not something they are going to have to worry about. But 2017 is when the Medicare trustee report says is the point at which we would literally be paying out more in Medicare benefits than we are bringing in in premiums. That is a serious problem.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And to not do anything about cost for the prescriptions I think illustrates and speaks to the point better than anything else that too much money drives what is going on down here. They are not worried about Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Goldstein. Sometimes the decisions here are about who raises us a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, who would pass a $500 billion prescription drug bill that is now $700 billion, $800 billion, $900 billion, we do not even know what the real number is, and not do anything about trying to control the price of prescription drugs, and then turn around and come in and say drugs are not the issue, cost is not the issue, Social Security is the biggest crisis in the country now?

Let us not forget as we begin to start wrapping things up, we gave this administration a lot of leeway, a lot of rope with the war, with the prescription drug bill and the war that the taxpayers would not have to pay anything more than $50 billion because we would use the oil money for reconstruction and be greeted as liberators. We are going to be in and out, and all of the things we heard before the war turned out not to be true.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And the report said gross misrepresentation, grossly inaccurate facts when it comes to reports of there being weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And everyone who was telling them there were no weapons of mass destruction, they ignored them; and to now push the blame off on some bureaucrats is unfair. And that was the war. We all know that. And then the prescription drug bill started off $400 billion as we sat in this Chamber, because many of our fiscal friends on the other side of the aisle did not want to spend more than $400 billion. After the bill was signed, 2 months later, all of a sudden the real price was $500 billion and an actuary was threatened not to give the real numbers to Congress.

After the election a few months ago, we find out this is going to be closer to a trillion dollars in cost. I am saying the track record here is not good for when the administration comes forward and says trust me because we have, we have been burnt; and we are certainly not going to let this happen with the Social Security system.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman because the gentleman was here. The thing I talked about and heard about on the campaign trail last year was how we ended up with a Medicare bill that added a prescription drug benefit but did not allow, in fact prohibited, the negotiation of discounts for prescription drugs. I know that the VA, the Veterans Administration, already has that ability and drugs made available to our veterans through the VA are significantly less than they are on the private market. So maybe the gentleman can help clarify that for me because I was not here. People out in the real world do not understand that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the only answer I can come up with is the pharmaceutical companies did not want it. It is amazing because we have obviously signed numerous free trade agreements with every country. In my area we have been devastated by a lot of the agreements. All of a sudden we say if we are going to free trade everything else, let us free trade pharmaceuticals. As long as they have good safety standards, let us let them come in from Canada and drop the price down. But the kibosh was put on that.

When we look at the pharmaceutical industry had three or four lobbyists for every Member of Congress and donated $100 million to Congress over the course of that period when we were negotiating that drug bill, the money comes in here. The pharmaceutical industry did not want that. So they got what they wanted. They got that language removed or not put in. So now the Secretary of Health and Human

Services is not allowed to negotiate. Not only are we not allowed to bring drugs in from Canada, but the Secretary of HHS is not allowed to sit down with Pfizer and say Pfizer, Merck, if you want the Medicare drug contract for X drug, and of course they do, so you say we are going to talk price, just like any other business would do.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was very interesting that just last week the former Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, in a speech to the Kaiser Foundation said it was his biggest frustration in the negotiations on the Medicare prescription drug reform bill because he believed the Secretary should have that ability, that the Secretary, just like they do in the VA, should have the ability to negotiate those discounts, and it absolutely ties the hands of the Health and Human Services Secretary.

In talking about this in his speech to the Kaiser Foundation, he said, unfortunately, membership of the leadership of his party, including the President, did not agree, and he was not able to get through to them that that was an important component, to reduce those prices.

□ 2245

What we have here is we have a Social Security plan, or an outline of a plan, that is going to harm young people and hopefully not harm older people who are imminently collecting benefits or already collecting benefits.

It is hard to get young people to think about when they are going to collect Social Security. We are having town hall meetings for younger people and trying to get them to come, and talk to them about why they should think about this, because it is not looming on the horizon of their lives. And then we have Medicare. We also with our generation have a group of people who just are not thinking about whether Medicare will be there for them. They just feel like they are invincible, and there are no major health care issues for most people in our generation.

We have got to make sure that we continue to pound the drum on this issue and talk to as many people as we can, because if we do not, we will all get caught asleep at the switch. As a result, this train will run smack into a wall at the point in our lives when we do need to worry about it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The gentlewoman makes a great point about just kind of how the whole system is working right now. Basically by not having the Secretary of HHS be able to negotiate down the drug prices and by not free-trading pharmaceuticals, it is basically corporate welfare. It is basically public taxpayer, hard-earned money coming down here, and we are giving it to the pharmaceutical companies and inflated drug costs through the Medicare program. So we have corporate welfare going to the most profitable industry in the world right now. Then you give tax cuts to those people who make more than $350,000 a year so they do not have to pay. You reduce the corporate tax rate so those shareholders, and those people who benefit most from moving jobs overseas get the tax benefits there, too. And then you are cutting services here with Medicaid and food stamps and education, the Pell grant and everything that we have talked about. And now you want to go try to mess with Social Security.

So if you see what is happening down here, if you take a step back and you see the whole process, there is all this corporate welfare going to all the big major corporations, they get all the tax cuts, the people who run those companies get tax cuts, and the rich get richer, and the poor are getting poorer. They say, well, that's class warfare. Mark Shields had a great line. He said, The war's over. The rich won. There is not much there anymore. But that is the way things are going, and that is why it is so important that at the bare minimum we keep that basic Social Security system in place.

I think having discussions like we are having tonight and town hall meetings, I think it has been very successful. The response I am getting, and I know the response the gentlewoman is getting down in Florida, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), who could not be with us tonight, is getting, and all our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are getting it.

I yield to the gentlewoman for any final comments that she may like to make.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Just a couple, because I think we again need to maybe finish up by zeroing in on the impact that this proposed privatization scheme would have. The private accounts do not make up for the 46 percent cut in benefits that would be part of this proposal. A 20-year-old who enters the workforce this year would lose about $152,000 in Social Security benefits under the Bush proposal.

Social Security provides disability insurance that young families need, and there is no private insurance plan that can compete with the Social Security disability benefits that are offered. The cost of those benefits bought privately would be beyond most people's ability to pay for them. For a worker in her mid-twenties with a spouse and two children, Social Security provides the equivalent of a $350,000 disability insurance policy, again not one that most people can afford to pay out of pocket for. And suppose, God forbid, you have a young parent that dies suddenly. Social Security provides for the children who are left behind. Social Security survivors benefits will replace as much as 80 percent of the earnings for a 25-year-old average-wage worker who dies leaving two children and a young spouse. For that parent, Social Security survivors benefits are equivalent to a $403,000 life insurance policy.

What we have been trying to do in our Thirtysomething Working Group is explain to our generation what the reality would be in their lives without Social Security as a continued safety net.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely. I hope from the responses we have been getting, it sounds like some people are listening.

Thirtysomethingdems@mail.house.gov. Send us an e-mail, or you can go to the Web site, democraticleader.house.gov/thirtysomething, and join in our discussion. We will be happy to read some of the e-mails. We have been off for the last few weeks, so maybe next week we will read some.

I would also like to say before we close up, the President of the Ukraine, Victor Yushchenko, is going to be here tomorrow. If you had followed everything that was going on with the West and the Russians and the poisoning, it was like a soap opera going on. I think it is an important point for us to make, he is going to be talking to a joint session of Congress, his election and his uprising and his move to power in the Ukraine was led by young people.

We need to continue to try to encourage, not everyone has to run for office, not everyone has to be involved to the extent they make a career out of it, but it is so important when you see what is going on down here day in and day out and the lack of, I think, long-term vision. It is important because the young people are the ones who are going to be involved in the system longer than all of us are because they are younger. It is important for their voice to be heard.

I thank the gentlewoman from Florida. We missed the gentleman from Florida, but I know he will be back with us next week.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and April 6 on account of a funeral in the district.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COOPER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today and April 6.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and April 12.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOUSTANY, for 5 minutes, April 6.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, April 6 and 7.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and April 6.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, April 6 and 7.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. TRANDAHL, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1270. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 686. An act for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on March 23, 2005 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1270. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 6, 2005, 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:

1321. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiophanate-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency [OPP-2005-0011; FRL-7699-3] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1322. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mesotrione; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0049; FRL-7703-1] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1323. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0003; FRL-7695-5] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1324. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower and Personnel), Department of Defense, transmitting notification of a decision to implement performance by the Most Efficient Organization (MEO) for the Public Works Center Maintenance and Repair of Building and Structures in San Diego, CA (initiative number NC20020795); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1325. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report entitled ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Annual Report 2003-2004,'' pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5617; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1326. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Labor-Management Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS), covering OLMS activities from October 1, 2003 through September 30, 2004; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1327. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2004 Performance Report for the Animal Drug User Fee Act (ADUFA), enacted on November 18, 2003 (Pub. L. 108-199); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1328. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Arizona; Maricopa County Area; Technical Correction [AZ 135-0085; FRL-7879-3] received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1329. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Texas [R06-OAR-2004-TX-0004; FRL-7886-4] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1330. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit Section 110 State Implementation Plans for Interstate Transport for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for 8-hour Ozone and PM 2.5 [FRL-7885-7] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1331. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Oregon Visibility Protection Plan [Docket # R10-OAR-2005-OR-0002; FRL-7881-4] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1332. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Control of Total Reduced Sulfur From Kraft Pulp Mills; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule; and Correction [R01-OAR-2004-ME-0002; A-1-FRL-7884-7] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1333. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio [R05-OAR-2005-OH-0001; FRL-7886-7] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1334. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alabama: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7884-4] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1335. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tennessee: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7883-5] received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1336. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; NOx Control Program [R01-OAR-2005-ME-0001; A-1-FRL-7881-2] received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1337. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rule to Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particular Matter and Ozone (Clean Air Interstate Rule); Revisions to Acid Rain Program; Revisions to the NOx SIP Call [OAR-2003-0053-FRL-7885-9] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1338. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7888-3] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1339. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Louisiana; Correction [LA-69-2-7617c; FRL-7887-2] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1340. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 02-05 which informs of an intent to sign a Project Agreement concerning the Low Cost Swimmer Detection Sonar Network (SDSN) between the United States and Singapore, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

1341. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1342. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001; to the Committee on International Relations.

1343. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report that the Department intends to impose new foreign policy-based export controls on certain entities sanctioned by the State Department under the Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102-484), the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-178), and Section 11B(b)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, and on a specific entity, the Tula Instrument Design Bureau of Russia; to the Committee on International Relations.

1344. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's FY 2006 Cooperative Threat Reduction Annual Report, pursuant to Public Law 106–398, section 1308; to the Committee on International Relations.

1345. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with section 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313, a report prepared by the Department of State and the National Security Council on the progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period December 1, 2004 through January 30, 2005; to the Committee on International Relations.

1346. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report detailing the progress and the status of compliance with privitization requirements, pursuant to Public Law 105–33 section 11201(c) (111 Stat. 734); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1347. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-46, ''Electronic Recording Procedures and Penalties Temporary Act of 2005,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1348. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-47, ''Terrorism Prevention in Hazardous Materials Transportation Temporary Act of 2005,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1349. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-48, ''Washington Convention Center Authority Advisory Committee Continuity Temporary Amendment Act of 2005,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1350. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-49, ''Abatement of Nuisance Construction Projects Temporary Amendment Act of 2005,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management, and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's inventory of commercial and inherently governmental activities prepared in accordance with the Federal Activities Reform (FAIR)Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-270) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-76; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1352. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the Department's competitive sourcing policy and FY 2005 budget for contracting out, in accordance with Division A, Title I (P.L. 108-447) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2005, and according to the OMB Circular No. A-76; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1353. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Competitive Sourcing Official, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Inherently Governmental and Commercial Activities Inventory for FY 2004, as required by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (the FAIR ACT) and OMB Circular A-76; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1354. A letter from the Deputy Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report on the Government in the Sunshine Act for Calendar Year 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1355. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1356. A letter from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting the Office's Audit Report Register for the period ending September 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1357. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a report evaluating the financial disclosure process for employees of the executive branch and recommendations for improving that process, pursuant to Public Law 108–458; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1358. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska, Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Aleutian Islands Subarea Directed Pollock Fishery [Docket No. 041117321-5035-02; I.D. 100904D] (RIN: 0648-AS37) received March 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1359. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Species in the Rock Sole/Flathead Sole/''Other Flatfish'' Fishery Category by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 022805E] received March 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1360. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackeral, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the Quater I Fishery for Loligo Squid [Docket No. 041221358-4358-01; I.D. 021405B] received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1361. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall and Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 041202338-4338-01; I.D. 021105A] received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1362. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 030405B] received March 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1363. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels 60 Feet Length Overall and Longer Using Hook-and-line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 030905F] received March 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1364. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries. NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041126333-5040-02; I.D. 030905C] received March 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1365. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Ft. (18.3 m) LOA Using Jig or Hool-and-Line Gear in the Bogoslof Pacific Cod Exemption Area in the Bering Sea

and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 020718172-2303-02; I.D. 030905B] received March 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1366. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041202339-01; I.D. 030105F] received March 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1367. A letter from the Acting DIrector, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackeral in the Central Aleutian District [Docket No. 041202338-4338-01; I.D. 021605A] received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1368. A letter from the Director, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the ninth and final annual report on actions taken in respect to the New England fishing capacity reduction initiative, pursuant to Section 308(d)(7) of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act, as amended, covering the period December 1, 2003 through November 30, 2004; to the Committee on Resources.

1369. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Army for Project Planning and Review, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the report of the Chief of Engineers on Dallas Floodway Extension, Trinity River Basin, Texas, consistent with Section 113 of Pub. L. 108-447; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1370. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a report supporting the authorization and plans to implement the project through the normal budget process at the appropriate time, considering national priorities and the availability of funds, pursuant to Section 101(b)(20)of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, authorizing construction of the Sand Creek Watershed, Wahoo, Nebraska, ecosystem restoration project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1371. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extension of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Deadline for Storm Water Discharges for Oil and Gas Activity That Disturbs One to Five Acres [OW-2002-0068; FRL-7882-2] (RIN: 2040-AE71) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1372. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the 2004 Annual Report of the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), pursuant to Public Law 100–418, section 5131(b) (102 Stat. 1443); to the Committee on Science.

1373. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the second annual report of the President's National Hire Veterans Committee, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 4100 Note; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1374. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age And Survivors Insurance And Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2005 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age andSurvivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 109–18); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1375. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit; Interpretation [CMS-4068-F2] (RIN: 0938-AN08) received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1376. A letter from the Board Members, Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 2005 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 109–17); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

1377. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Durable Medical Equipment Regional Carrier Service Areas and Related Matters [CMS-1219-F] (RIN: 0938-AL76) received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1378. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Establishment of the Medicare Advnatage Program; Interpretation [CMS-4069-F2] (RIN: 0938-AN06) received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1379. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program: Changes to the Medicare Claims Appeal Procedure [CMS-4064-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AM73) received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on March 14, 2005 the following report was filed on March 31, 2005]

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. Report on Oversight Plans for All House Committees (Rept. 109–29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on April 5, 2005]

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 136. Resolution directing the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of those officials relating to the security investigations and background checks relating to granting access to the White House of James D. Guckert (also known as Jeff Gannon); adversely (Rept. 109–30). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1455. A bill to amend title 5 and title 3, United States Code, to include the Department of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Homeland Security in lists of executive departments and officers; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1456. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand the definition of firefighter to include apprentices and trainees, regardless of age or duty limitations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE:

H.R. 1457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for the travel expenses of a taxpayer's spouse who accompanies the taxpayer on business travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 1458. A bill to require any Federal or State court to recognize any notarization made by a notary public licensed by a State other than the State where the court is located when such notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. NEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1459. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce the proliferation of boutique fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1460. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6200 Rolling Road in Springfield, Virginia, as the ''Captain Mark Stubenhofer Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1461. A bill to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1462. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce from age 57 to age 55

the age after which the remarriage of the surviving spouse of a deceased veteran shall not result in termination of dependency and indemnity compensation otherwise payable to that surviving spouse; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 1463. A bill to designate a portion of the Federal building located at 2100 Jamieson Avenue, in Alexandria, Virginia, as the ''Justin W. Williams United States Attorney's Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 1464. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain pimientos (capsicum anuum), prepared or preserved otherwise than by vinegar or acetic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 1465. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain pimientos (capsicum anuum), prepared or preserved by vinegar or acetic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 1466. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain pimientos (capsicum anuum), prepared or preserved otherwise than by vinegar or acetic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. PORTER, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 1467. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Nevada to the Las Vegas Motor Speedway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 1468. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to replace the recapture bond provisions of the low income housing tax credit program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTER (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 1469. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior shall make full payment to each unit of general local government in which entitlement land is located as set forth in chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to individuals who make contributions to finance the non-Federal share of projects of the Army Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FARR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 1471. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to provide supportive services in permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1472. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 167 East 124th Street in New York, New York, as the ''Tito Puente Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deferral of tax on gain from the sale of telecommunications businesses in specific circumstances or a tax credit and other incentives to promote diversity of ownership in telecommunications businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 1474. A bill to designate certain functions performed at flight service stations of the Federal Aviation Administration as inherently governmental functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 1475. A bill to require door delivery of mail sent to persons residing in senior communities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 1476. A bill to amend the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 to authorize additional appropriations for the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 1477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the proper treatment of differential wage payments made to employees called to active duty in the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 1478. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide limited TRICARE program eligibility for members of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces, to provide financial support for continuation of health insurance for mobilized members of reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR):

H.R. 1479. A bill to expand rural access to broadband services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Science, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 1480. A bill to require that a conversion to contractor performance of an activity or function of the Federal Government may not result in the loss of employment of any Federal worker with a severe disability employed in that activity or function; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 1481. A bill to ensure reliability of electric service to provide for expansion of electricity transmission networks in order to support competitive electricity markets to modernize regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 1482. A bill to provide for the research and development of advanced nuclear reactor, solar energy, and wind energy technologies for the production of hydrogen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, 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. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to a home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution congratulating the public schools of Westchester Public School District 92 1/2 in Westchester, Illinois, on the occasion of the District's 75th anniversary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for further study of the neurological disorder dystonia; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Day of Silence with respect to discrimination and harassment faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H. Res. 183. A resolution honoring the life, and expressing the condolences of the House on the passing, of Pope John Paul II; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ISTOOK (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. BOREN):

H. Res. 184. A resolution recognizing a National Week of Hope in commemoration of the 10-year anniversary of the terrorist bombing in Oklahoma City; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WATT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 185. A resolution honoring Johnnie Cochran, Jr. for his service to the Nation, and expressing condolences to his family, friends, colleagues, and admirers on his death; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H. Res. 186. A resolution honoring the life's work of Pope John Paul II; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 187. A resolution expressing support for a National Week of Reflection and Tolerance; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. COX, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POMBO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BERRY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 188. A resolution recognizing and honoring firefighters for their many contributions throughout the history of the Nation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. Res. 189. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a day ought to be established to bring awareness to the issue of missing persons; to the Committee on Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Roger Paul Robert Kozik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Syan Simeonov Stoyanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Alzoubi Muhammed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Candelaria P. Roxas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Praveen SitaRama Bobba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Kenan Tas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 23: Mr. REYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. HART, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 34: Mr. TURNER and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 49: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 63: Mr. BERRY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 65: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 66: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 72: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 87: Mr. HOLT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 97: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 110: Mr. OWENS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 111: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. REYES, Mr. WELLER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 114: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 115: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 136: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 147: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. STARK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 153: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 191: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 216: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 225: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 226: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 239: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 282: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BACA, Mr. WEINER, Mr. POE, Mr. TERRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BASS, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 302: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 303: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. REYES, Mr. KIND, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, MR. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BASS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 305: Mr. GILCHREST and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 311: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COOPER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 328: Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 333: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 339: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 341: Mr. GOODE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 354: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 359: Mr. GRAVES and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 363: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 376: Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SABO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 389: Mrs. BONO. Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 416: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 438: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 463: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 468: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 489: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 500: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 503: Mr. KIRK, Ms. WATERS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 515: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 525: Mr. KIRK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 531: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 535: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. BONO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 537: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 547: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 550: Mr. STARK, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 551: Mr. FILNER, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 552: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 554: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 556: Mr. BARROW, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 558: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 559: Mr. SANDERS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 560: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 562: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 583: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 594: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 602: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 606: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 621: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 624: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 635: Ms. HART.

H.R. 663: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OWENS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 666: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 668: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 669: Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 670: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 676: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 688: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 691: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 693: Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 697: Mr. WOLF, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 698: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 699: Mr. GORDON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 708: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 740: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 742: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 748: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 754: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 761: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 764: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 771: Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 772: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FORD, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 775: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 783: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 791: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOUCHER, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 792: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 793: Mr. KIND, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 798: Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

H.R. 799: Mr. FARR and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 800: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 801: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 810: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 813: Mr. GORDON and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 819: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. VALÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 827: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 834: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 838: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 864: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 865: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 867: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 869: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 878: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 896: Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 903: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BACA, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 908: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 910: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 916: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BONNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KIND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. REYES, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 917: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 918: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 923: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 924: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 925: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 935: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 940: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 966: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 968: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. REYES, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 976: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 983: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 985: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 986: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 988: Mr. HALL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 995: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 997: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BUYER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 999: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1002: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1006: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1008: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1016: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 1020: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1026: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1029: Mr. CLAY, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1033: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1048: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 1059: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SABO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1070: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1079: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1088: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 1089: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1092: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. FEENEY.

H.R. 1097: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1103: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1105: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1106: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1107: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1114: Mr. JINDAL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 1124: Mr. GORDON and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1125: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1126: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BEAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1130: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1131: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 1136: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. VAN HOLLEN,

Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1140: Mr. TERRY and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1141: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1142: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1157: Mr. WU, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1175: Mr. GORDON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FORD, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1184: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1210: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1216: Mr. BACUS.

H.R. 1217: Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1219: Mr. BAKER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1220: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1223: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1225: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1227: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1235: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 1239: Mr. EVANS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1258: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1269: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1277: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1278: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1279: Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 1287: Mr. EVANS, Ms. BEAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1288: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BAKER, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TANNER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BASS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1290: Mr. MEEK of Florida and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1298: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1305: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1337: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1339: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 1345: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1346: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1355: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BAKER, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 1357: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1358: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1365: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOYD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1381: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 1386: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1399: Mr. FORD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1401: Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1402: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1405: Mr. WEINER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1406: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1409: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1417: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1422: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1424: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1425: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1426: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1439: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1440: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1447: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SANDERS.

H. J. Res. 5: Mr. GORDON.

H. J. Res. 10: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. J. Res. 16: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. PAUL.

H. J. Res. 19: Mr. BECERRA.

H. J. Res. 20: Mr. BECERRA.

H. J. Res. 22: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. CRAMER.

H. J. Res. 23: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HINCHEY, AND MR. CONYERS.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 37: Ms. CARSON and Mr. BERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. WALSH.

H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STARK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. GILCHREST.

H. Con. Res. 58: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 90: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 96: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. WATSON.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. NEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms, CARSON, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Con. Res. 108: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CASE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. LEVIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Flordia.

H. Res 67: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. REYES, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 76: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 84: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 90: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 120: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 121: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BACA, and Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 123: Mr. PAUL.

H. Res. 136: Mr. ALLEN.

H. Res. 145: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 164: Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 167: Mr. GOODE.

H. Res. 169: Mr. BOUCHER.

H. Res. 170: Mr. WEXLER and Ms. CARSON.

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. 298: Mr. POMBO.
H.R. 867: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.J. Res. 23: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

SENATE—*Tuesday, April 5, 2005*

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father, in whose patient hands the mighty seasons move with quiet beauty, we acknowledge today our great need for Your guidance. Lord, we are challenged by complexities that require more than human wisdom. We sometimes feel like children grasping in the darkness, lost without light.

Bless this Government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Guide its leaders to strive to possess that righteousness that exalts a nation and to inspire others to pursue truth. Enlighten the Members of this body with Your wisdom, lest the darkness of our times hide the paths of Your providence.

We commit this day to You, Lord, for You are able to do exceedingly, abundantly above all that we can ask or imagine, according to Your power, working in and through each of us. We pray this prayer in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TED STEVENS 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes under the majority leader or his designee and the second 30 minutes under the Democratic leader or his designee.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today we will have a period for morning business for up to 60 minutes. Following that hour for debate, we expect to begin consideration of the State Department authorization bill. We have not yet locked in that agreement, but I am hopeful we will be able to reach a consent agreement shortly. Chairman LUGAR is ready to proceed with the bill. We hope to make substantial progress during today's session.

Under the order last night, we have scheduled a vote for 4:45 p.m. today on the adoption of a resolution relating to Pope John Paul II. I anticipate we will have additional votes today on amendments to the State Department bill.

Also this evening, once we complete our business for the day on the State Department legislation, we will have a 70-minute period for debate on the issue of Social Security. I encourage all Members to remain for this important question-and-answer period.

I also remind our colleagues that on Wednesday, there will be a joint meeting of the House and Senate to receive an address by Ukrainian President Viktor Yushchenko. That address is scheduled for 11 a.m. Senators should be in the Senate Chamber at 10:30 so we may proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

HONORING POPE JOHN PAUL II

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, this morning, as the world has taken notice of the passing of Pope John Paul II, I rise to speak. I know the Senate today will be taking a resolution to speak to the issue of the Pope's passing.

As a person of the Roman Catholic faith myself, I thought it important and appropriate that this morning I take a few moments to speak to the greatness of this man and the contributions he made not only to enriching the faith life of those of us who practice the Roman Catholic faith, but to the people of the world as a great statesman and moral leader.

Pope John Paul was one of the remarkable people of our times. His papacy lasted 26 years, which is the third longest in the over 2,000-year history of our church. But it was during tumultuous and difficult times. Pope John Paul was prepared for this papacy, prepared for this mantle of leadership through tremendous hardships in his life. As a young person, he lost his mother very early in life, only to be followed by the very dramatic loss of his only brother, and only a very few years later the loss of his beloved father. So at a very young age, as a very young man, Pope John Paul was left alone in the world without any close family. He developed a long and strong network of friendships that he maintained all through his life, and even through the days of his papacy.

In addition, the Pope's youth was tempered by living under tyranny, by the fact that in his youth he had to be subjected to the tyrannical occupation by Germany of his Polish homeland and the persecution of people such as himself—people of faith.

In addition, once that was over and he began to seek his vocational pursuit in the priesthood, he had to do so underground, because subsequent to the German occupation and the Nazi regimes, and immediately thereafter, it was followed by the Communist takeover of Poland. Eastern Europe, as we all know, became engulfed and contained by what came to be known, in the words of Sir Winston Churchill, as the Iron Curtain, with Poland falling behind the walls of that Iron Curtain, where religion was suppressed, faith was not to be practiced openly, and where he could not attend seminary openly. He would have to do it in an underground fashion.

The Pope's preparation for his priesthood and his papacy was forged in the difficult times that he faced not only personally but also in his life as a citizen of Poland. It then fell upon him to be Pope at a time when the world was undergoing change, and at a time when the people of his beloved Poland were energized as no other in history by his papacy and his theme of ''be not afraid.'' His trip back to Poland in the early years of his papacy was punctuated by his remarkable reception by the people of Poland—people thirsty for freedom, thirsty for an opportunity to end the yoke of tyranny and communism. So the papal visit was a transcending moment in the history of Poland. As we now know, it was a transcending moment in the history of our world because it did signal the beginning of the end of Communist rule in Eastern Europe.

We know Pope John Paul worked closely with several U.S. Presidents but none more closely than President Ronald Reagan, in those crucial years when the Cold War came to a head, and when we saw the beginning of the fraying of what was a failed system, a system that had only been maintained through terror and fear. His theme of ''be not afraid'' began to be heard and responded to, and the people of Poland began that surge toward freedom, which was inevitable in all of Eastern

Europe. So the Pope's contribution there was crucial, critical, and was something that I think we all saw as a tremendous contribution.

Of course, the Pope also visited the United States on many occasions. I believe I have heard over the last several days it was the second most visited country after his beloved Poland. It was with great significance that we received him here, and it made a tremendous difference in the life of our own country. More recently, he visited Cuba 8 years ago. Cuba is an imprisoned land where there had never been a papal visit. Also, it is a country ruled under the same tyrannical communism he saw in his native Poland during his youth and he battled all during his adult life being suppressed in his ability to worship freely.

Cuba happens to be the place where I was born, where I began my life, and where the principles of the Catholic faith were taught to me early in life by my family and my church. It was in that same land that I came to understand the meaning of oppression, tyranny, and the lack of religious freedom the Pope had experienced in his youth. He and I, in different parts of the world, in a sense shared a common experience and understanding of the limitations of freedom that are sometimes placed upon people by governments that do not respect what we find so basic and so rightful, which is the right of free speech and the right of practicing one's religion freely. The Pope's trip to Cuba was a monumental thing because it helped the people to begin again to practice their faith in a more open way. His theme of ''be not afraid'' was heard by Cuba, and thousands of Cubans were for the first time expressing their faith in an open way, in a way they had not been permitted to do before, but which now they dare to do.

The Pope's visit did not have the same galvanizing political effect it had in Poland, where it also led to political change, but it did have a strong pastoral theme, a message that the people of Cuba welcomed with open arms. It also inspired the archbishop in Santiago, Cuba, the second largest city in Cuba, to speak forcefully about oppression in Cuba, the lack of religious freedom, and continuation of oppression—the kind of religious oppression I felt in my life that led me to seek freedom in the United States, with the very help of the same church the Pope came to lead, the Catholic Church. His fight against atheists and communism over the years also led him to conduct a program called Operation Peter Pan, which took 14,000 young people from Cuba to freedom in the United States. I was lucky enough to be among them, so my life began under the care of the Catholic church.

I understand fully the religious oppression the people of Cuba have suffered, which continues to this day but which the Pope made a little better. He gave them a window, an opening, a moment, for the first time in over 35 years. Christmas was celebrated in anticipation of the papal visit. Unfortunately, Cuba now has fallen back into a more repressive practice, and freedom of religion is curtailed even more today.

As we look at the Pope's life, at this moment in history, as we reflect on this remarkable man, his remarkable life, and the contributions he made, we also must continue to understand there is work still to be done. There are people in the world who still are hungry and suffer, and there are those who still lack the religious freedoms to openly practice their faith, much as the Pope in his youth was curtailed. People today in Cuba and other places around the world still yearn for that opportunity to freely worship and to do what we do. As we began our proceedings this morning, the Chaplain of the Senate offered a word of prayer.

I conclude by simply saying that we have been touched in our lives by this remarkable man, this life which has shaped the world in which we live. It is a life well lived. As he has come to the end of his journey, I hope those of us who share in his faith and in his ideals of the respect of every human life and every human being will continue to carry on the wonderful legacy he left for us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, today I join in mourning the loss of Pope John Paul II. In my lifetime, he was the first Pope I can remember who could actually be put in the category of being an evangelist.

No other Pope ever traveled as much as this Pope did, and no man ever took the Word to the different corners of the world like this man did, and that is why he is so revered around the world.

(The remarks of Mr. BURNS pertaining to the introduction of S. 696 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 600

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following morning business today the Senate begin consideration of S. 600, the State Department authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise this morning to talk about three areas of accountability as we begin discussing a range of things in the Senate this week. The issue of accountability rises on the question of the report offered to the American people and to the Congress by Judge Laurence Silberman and former Senator Chuck Robb. It deals with the question of intelligence preceding the Iraq war.

The 600-page report given us was largely a useless retelling of what we know already. I do not want to completely diminish the effort, and there are some things in that report that are interesting, but the fact is, we already know that the intelligence with respect to Iraq was dead wrong. The major question is, How was the intelligence used and for what purpose was it used?

We know what we were told prior to the Iraq war. All of us went to briefings up in the room in the Capitol where we receive top secret briefings, and we heard all kinds of language there and in the popular press by people in this administration and others who said that this was a certainty, that they knew where the weapons of mass destruction were in Iraq; it was urgent; there were unmanned aerial vehicles to deliver weapons of mass destruction; this is a slam dunk.

Now we know not only from this report but from previous reports that this intelligence was gathered, for example, with respect to one of the issues, as our Secretary of State told the world in the United Nations presentation, concerning the prospect that the Iraqis were developing a mobile chemical weapons lab to produce weapons of mass destruction. Now we discover that information came from a source named ''curve ball.'' It was a single-source piece of information. Some suspect that ''curve ball'' was a drunk, at least when he met with our intelligence folks. It says that he was suspected of having a hangover. We know that he was a fabricator.

So on the basis of a fabricator, a drunk, single source, we told the world through our Secretary of State that Iraq had mobile chemical weapons labs that threatened our country.

The aluminum tubes are another story. I am not going to go through all

the stories, but the question is, Where is the accountability? We get a 600-page report that tells us what we already know; that the intelligence with respect to Iraq was dead wrong. Where is the accountability? Where does the buck stop?

Mr. Tenet, who was the head of the CIA—and this 600-page report points certainly to him among others—was brought to the Oval Office, to the White House, and given the Medal of Freedom after he left the CIA. Where is the accountability? Is there accountability in this country for having gotten it not just wrong but, as the 600-page report says, dead wrong? Will this Congress require accountability? I think it is very important.

This 600-page report is half the story. The other part of the story is not only bad intelligence, but how was it used, and what was the purpose of using it? Go to the Woodward book, go to the O'Neill book, and one gets some hint of the connection to this.

I think this Congress is owed additional answers. I think this report was far too narrow.

Second, I want to ask about accountability with respect to an independent investigation that is going on in this town. The Washington Post report was surprising to me because I was not aware of these facts. The Washington Post did a story that said the cost of the Cisneros probe nears $21 million over 10 years. This was a probe of Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros by independent counsel David Barrett. In May of 1995, Mr. Barrett was appointed as independent counsel to investigate allegations that a then Cabinet Secretary lied to the FBI about money that he had paid to a former mistress. That was May 1995.

In September 1999, Mr. Cisneros pleaded guilty, paid a $10,000 fine, and then following that he was later pardoned by President Clinton. By then, the independent counsel had spent $10.3 million on his investigation, and since that time he has spent another $10 million-plus on the investigation.

Is there a screw loose someplace? What are they thinking about? There was an independent counsel appointed 10 years ago to investigate an alleged impropriety by a Cabinet official. The Cabinet official pleaded guilty 4 years later, was pardoned a year after that. The independent counsel is still working? He is supposed to be supervised by three Federal judges, but the fact is, they are leaking money down there.

I intend to offer an amendment to the supplemental to shut off the funding. Ten years later, $21 million, investigating the question of whether a Cabinet official lied about money paid to his mistress? He pleads guilty to it and we have a guy 10 years later still investigating it?

I think waste is a disaster in the Federal Government. Talk about waste, this is shameful, and if the three-judge panel does not have the common sense to shut this down, then the Congress, I hope, will have the common sense to shut it down. I will offer an amendment during the supplemental that shuts off the money and does it now.

The third area of accountability is this: As chairman of the Policy Committee on our side, I have held a good number of hearings on the issue of contracting in Iraq. There is massive waste, fraud, and abuse going on with respect to contracting in Iraq. All of us know there is money going out of this Congress in wholesale quantities, tens of billions of dollars.

Last year, Congress passed a bill for reconstruction money in Iraq. I did not vote for it; I voted against it. In fact, I offered an amendment to shut it down, reconstruction money to the tune of nearly $19 billion for the reconstruction of Iraq. In addition to that, we have spent nearly $160 billion to $180 billion on the war in Iraq. There is an $82 billion request before the Senate right now. That is the supplemental I was referring to earlier. This is a massive amount of money being spent with respect to the operations in Iraq and also the reconstruction in Iraq.

I will talk a bit about what we have learned. One contractor was feeding our troops and charged the American Government, the Pentagon, for feeding 42,000 troops a day. It turns out this contractor was only providing 14,000 meals a day. We are getting billed for 42,000 meals, but the contractor was only providing 14,000 meals. Someplace 28,000 meals are charged for that were never offered to our troops, or perhaps not needed.

I come from a small town, and they call that cheating in my hometown. That contractor is still the largest contractor in Iraq being paid by the U.S. taxpayer.

We had testimony from truckdrivers who were hired to move goods around Iraq, including fuel coming into Iraq by contractors. Truckdrivers testified that $85,000 brandnew trucks were left on the side of the road to be torched and looted because they had a clogged fuel pump or because they had a flat tire they could not fix. What did they do? They left the truck beside the road, just abandoned the truck. That is the kind of waste, fraud, and abuse that is going on.

We had a guy testify and show us a picture of the bags of cash that were used to give to contractors in Iraq. One contract company started business in Iraq with $450. They have been paid tens of millions of dollars now. Two of their employees, by the way, became whistleblowers and said: What we are seeing is making us sick, so we are going to tell somebody about it.

Here is what they said: These two people who started this company and are contracting with the U.S. Government—it is called the Coalition Provisional Authority that we created in Iraq; it was us, we paid for it—were providing security at an airport, and they were alleged by the employees to have taken forklift trucks off the airport property to a warehouse, repaint them blue, and then bring them back to the airport and sell them to the U.S. taxpayers through the Coalition Provisional Authority. Again, in my hometown, they call that fraud.

We had a big picture that one of the other whistleblowers had taken who worked in Iraq, and he said: We told contractors in Iraq that when it was time to get paid, just bring a big bag because we are going to give you cash. He showed us one picture of the contractor I discussed, the one with respect to the forklift trucks. He showed one picture of $2 million wrapped in Saran Wrap in bundles sitting on a table and the contractor comes with a big bag and they get their $2 million and waltz off.

This contractor, by the way, was also alleged to have created a subsidiary in the country of Lebanon for the purpose of buying and selling to and from itself so it could inflate prices and therefore further cheat the United States taxpayer.

It is unbelievable what we have learned about contracting in Iraq. One whistleblower came forward and said he was the buyer who was supposed to buy towels for U.S. soldiers. He said this is the towel I bought under orders from my superiors. The company wanted to pay almost double the price of the towel in order to have the company's name embroidered on the towel the soldiers used—unbelievable waste.

When you think of what is happening, this Congress is shoveling out tens of billions of dollars in pursuit of all of this and nobody is watching the store. You hear the stories about us paying for reconstruction of a building in Iraq—and we are doing it for thousands of buildings. We decide we are going to put an air conditioner in that building, so it is subcontracted to an Iraq subcontracting company. First it goes to the contractors who are in Iraq being paid by our Government, some of whom I have described here, and then it goes to an Iraq subcontractor, and then the subcontractor for that subcontractor, and pretty soon that air conditioner in the building became a ceiling fan and we paid for an air conditioner and the ceiling fan doesn't work. So there you are.

The question is, who in this Congress is going to decide this matters at a time when we are up to our neck in debt, the largest debt in the history of this country, with a fiscal policy that is way off track, a President who sends us a budget with the highest Federal budget deficits in history, and trade deficits that are the highest in history, a combined fiscal policy and trade deficit of over $1 trillion in the past year?

We are sinking and drowning in debt. Who is going to care about this kind of waste, fraud, and abuse, the most serious I have seen in all the years I have served in the Congress?

I raise this because it relates to accountability, accountability with respect to the use of intelligence prior to the war in Iraq, accountability with an independent counsel who spent $21 million 10 years after the fact when he was supposed to investigate a Cabinet official who lied about paying money to his mistress. This is an independent counsel who is still operating and has spent $21 million. Who is accountable for that? Who is accountable for waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq?

Harry Truman had the famous sign on his desk, ''The buck stops here.'' These days the buck doesn't seem to stop anywhere. Nobody seems to be accountable for anything.

I intend to offer another amendment. I don't know whether I will offer it on the existing bill or on the supplemental, but I will offer it again, setting up a Truman committee of sorts. In 1941, at the start of the Second World War, Harry Truman, then a Democratic Senator when a Democrat was in the White House, traveled around this country and saw waste, fraud, and abuse in military spending. He created a special committee and as a result of the investigation of that committee they unearthed massive fraud and massive waste. That was when a Democrat in the Congress did it, when a Democrat was in the White House.

These days nobody wants to raise any questions. You don't want to make any waves because we have one-party control and we don't want to talk about this, that, or the other thing. The fact is, I have never seen the kind of waste that now exists with respect to our operations in Iraq. It undercuts and undermines our soldiers' efforts, in my judgment. It cheats America's taxpayers, and it represents the worst of Government.

We ought to be able to hire contractors who will do the job without allowing waste, fraud, and abuse to represent the major impact of what we see happening in Iraq these days with respect to these contractors.

Part of this stems from greed. Part of it stems from the fact that many of these contracts in Iraq are no-bid contracts—one company. I have not mentioned Halliburton, but I could because a lot of it deals with Halliburton and KBR—not exclusively, but a lot of it. Any time somebody mentions Halliburton, somebody says: Oh, you are attacking the Vice President. Not a bit. This happened after the Vice President left Halliburton. These are of recent vintage, these activities in Iraq. It is not an attack on anybody. It is in support of the taxpayers of this country. We ought not allow this to happen. Republicans and Democrats all ought to stand on their feet and demand accountability and demand that the waste, fraud, and abuse stop—$8,000 a month to rent an SUV; $40 for a case of pop or soda—Coca-Cola.

There were 50,000 pounds of nails ordered by a contractor to Iraq. They were the wrong length, so they dumped them. If anybody wants to pick up 50,000 pounds of nails, they are laying in the sand in Iraq. It is unbelievable the waste, fraud, and abuse we hear about.

The reason I have held the hearings in the Democratic Policy Committee is nobody else will hold hearings. No one else wants to hold these contractors accountable. There are whistleblowers all over who are disgusted with what they saw, working for contractors and supervising contractors in Iraq.

I have only described a brief portion of what we learned in these hearings. We intend to conduct additional hearings. My preference would be that we not conduct these hearings in my committee. My preference would be that the authorizing committees and the relevant committees that should be assuming oversight of this would hold aggressive hearings, but they don't and they probably won't, and as a result we will continue to do this.

I am intending to offer an amendment to create a Truman-type committee here in the Congress, as we did some decades ago, to take a hard look at what is happening through that kind of committee, an investigative committee that would include Republicans and Democrats, all of whom I hope would be committed and dedicated to the task of deciding that waste, fraud, and abuse is not something that should happen on any of our watches here in the Congress.

Again, I think the key issue here is accountability. There seems to be none these days in almost any direction. I hope in all of these areas we can begin to decide there is accountability, at least here in the Congress.

I yield the floor and make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING JOHN PAUL II

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise this morning, just having returned to Washington from Colorado, to share a few comments about the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II.

My family's faith tradition—like yours, Mr. President—since time immemorial has been Roman Catholic. In Pope John Paul II, we witnessed a great spiritual leader, a conscience and a statesman.

Pope John Paul II exemplified the values and teachings of Jesus Christ in his humility, service to others, and in his struggle to have the world recognize the dignity of every human being. John Paul II lived the creed of Jesus Christ as set forth in the Book of Matthew, Chapter 23, Verses 11–12, where Jesus, speaking to the crowds and his disciples, said:

> The more lowly your service to others, the greater you are. To be the greatest, be a servant. But those who think themselves great shall be disappointed and humbled; and those who humble themselves shall be exalted.

More than 26 years ago, in the eighth round of voting, Karol Wojtyla was elected to head the Roman Catholic Church. His predecessor, Pope John Paul I, had died after only 32 days as Pope. The selection of the charismatic Polish cardinal—the first non-Italian pope in 455 years—surprised many people both inside and outside the Catholic Church.

In the quarter-century since then, Pope John Paul II continued to surprise—and challenge—not only members of my church but, indeed, the entire world to recognize and celebrate the dignity of each and every person.

But that was not all ''the Pilgrim Pope'' revolutionized. Where previous pontiffs had often seemed distant from their flocks, Pope John Paul II traveled to more nations and spoke to more people—often times in their language—than any other pontiff in the history of the Roman Catholic Church.

His first trip abroad as pontiff was to a region in crisis. Latin America, home of half the world's Roman Catholics, was ravaged not just by poverty and hunger but by violence and civil war that claimed tens of thousands of innocent lives.

His next trip was to his homeland, Poland, a land that been subjugated for decades, first by Nazism, then by communism. One journalist wrote that the pope's visit to Poland ''helped bring about such profound, irreversible changes that Poland then became a country which was clearly ceasing to be a communist country.''

John Paul also visited America during the first year of his Papacy, attracting huge crowds wherever he went. In my home State of Colorado, 1993, he came to Denver, bringing a message of substance and hope to the young people of the world. I remember that visit fondly—and recall my father's excitement after he reached over a fence to touch the Pope.

This pope is recognized—and rightly so—as a sort of patron saint for the Solidarity movement in Poland and a catalyst for the demise of communism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

But that was only part of this pope's message. He has also warned repeatedly about the shortcomings of capitalism. He reminded us all that we have an obligation to help the poor and the oppressed.

In 1998, he traveled to Cuba, strengthening a Church that is doing more and more to help that country's forgotten, and breathing life into an opposition movement that surprised the world—and that country's backward regime—with a grassroots call for reform.

In 1999, he again visited the US, reminding us of our duty to not forget the poor and oppressed and continuing his special outreach to America's young people and challenging them to fight for a better America and a better world.

And in 2000, a visibly frail Pope visited the Holy Land to mark the Millennium and in an attempt to bring Jews, Christians and Muslims together. Both Jews and Muslims and Christians welcomed him—and recognized and celebrated his visit—and applauded of optimism his words and hope.

His efforts to heal the rift between the Vatican and Jews had to be colored by his own experience with the brutality of anti-Semitism that he had witnessed. In September 1939, he saw his university in Krakow shut down and eventually saw several of his friends and classmates sent to Auschwitz after the Nazis invaded Poland.

His efforts at healing historical rifts continued, evidenced by meetings with the Archbishop of Canterbury, the highest ranking official in the Episcopal Church. Many wished he could have done more on these hurtful rifts, but no one doubted that he began to confront these challenges like no Pope has ever done in the history of our Church.

For these nearly 27 years, the Pilgrim Pope John Paul II—an accomplished poet, an intellectual and a mystic in that fine Catholic tradition—was hailed as a visionary and attacked as a relic. Within the Church itself—as in the scores of countries he visited—he was criticized by critics on both the left and the right. That is because in the Church and on each of his many trips, he brought not only comfort and hope—hope for peace in Latin America, freedom in Eastern Europe, reconciliation in the Middle East, and improvement in America—but he also brought discomfort and challenges for all of us to do better.

In 2003, the Vatican had this to say about the role of the Church in public life,

> The Church does not wish to exercise political power or to eliminate the freedom of opinion of Catholics regarding contingent questions.
>
> Instead, it intends—as is its proper function—to instruct and illuminate the consciences of the faithful, particularly those involved in political life, so that their actions may always serve the integral promotion of the human person and the common good.

None of us lived up to the challenges and prescriptions the Pope mapped out in 27 years in a perfect way. We could not because Pope John Paul II challenged all of us to do more, to be better.

Physically, the frail, stooped Pope we saw in the last weeks bore little resemblance to the athletic 58-year-old who ascended the throne of Peter nearly 27 years ago. But inwardly, he remained deeply consistent—challenging us to uphold the dignity of each and every person—and illuminated and instructed, as well as challenged and surprised the entire world.

We will miss Pope John Paul II, but his vibrant legacy lives on in each of us and in the lessons and challenges he placed before us.

I thank the President and yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Zbigniew Brzezinski, the Polish-born national security advisor to President Jimmy Carter, tells a story about how the news of Cardinal Karol Wojtyla's election as Pope was received by the communist rulers of Poland.

On that day in October 1978, Mr. Brzezinski said, a group of communist writers and party leaders were meeting in Krakow. A police colonel was speaking, complaining about the opposition of the church, when a woman ran into the room and said, ''Wojtyla has been elected Pope!''

The second secretary of the party, not realizing his microphone was still on, turned to the first secretary and said, ''My God, my God, now we will have to kiss his''—and he did not say ''ring.''

The first party secretary, understanding the enormity of the moment, replied, ''Only if he lets us.''

In neighboring Czechoslovakia, a dissident playwright was with friends when news of the new Polish Pope came. Vaclav Havel, who would go on to become the first elected president of the Czech Republic, said he and his friends literally danced with joy when they heard the news. ''We felt,'' he said, ''that he was a great and charismatic man who will open the door to an unprecedented renaissance in Christianity and through it, to human spirituality in general, and who will fundamentally influence the future destiny and political order of the world.''

More than 26 years later, those stories seem prophetic. Karol Wojtyla, Pope John Paul II, did indeed change the world.

Today, he is being mourned not only in his beloved Poland, and not only by Catholics, but by people throughout the world: Christians, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, people from every faith tradition, and many with no religious connections.

Last Friday, when it was clear the Pope was dying, a man in Havana, a self-described communist, told an Associated Press reporter, ''I don't believe in God. But if there is a God, let him send us a Pope as good as this one.''

In Istanbul, Turkey, the brother of the man who nearly killed the Pope said his brother is grieving. ''He loved the Pope,'' his brother said.

Among the places in this country where this Pope's death has left many with an aching sadness is the Five Holy Martyrs Church on the southwest side of Chicago, the historic heart of Chicago's large Polish community. More Poles live in Chicago, IL, than any other city in the world, other than Warsaw.

In October 1979, when Pope John Paul II made his first visit to America as Pope, he said Mass at the Five Holy Martyrs Church, where the Eucharist is still celebrated in Polish, on an altar in the church parking lot, surrounded by more than 17,000 people.

Today, the altar still stands in the parking lot; it is used once a year for a special commemorative Mass. A portion of 43rd Street near the Five Holy Martyrs Church has been renamed in the Pope's honor. And many who saw him still recall it as one of the greatest days of their lives.

Think of this: half the people in the world today were not even born when Karol Wojtyla became Pope John Paul II. Most people under 40 have no memory of any other Pope, and remember John Paul only as an elderly and frail man.

Those of us who are a little older, though, remember just as clearly what a strong, athletic man he was before age and Parkinson's disease began to take their toll. ''God's athlete,'' some called him, and he showed in his life how much strength he had.

He was a traditionalist and a revolutionary, a son of Poland, and a citizen of the world. He was a mystic and a man of prayer, but he was also a man of action and seemingly inexhaustible energy. Reporters decades younger who accompanied him on his travels even in recent years, said they returned home exhausted. But John Paul never stopped.

He was more than a spiritual leader; he was a major player on the world diplomatic stage.

He visited more than 100 nations and every continent except Antarctica. All told, he traveled more than three times the distance from the Earth to the Moon.

He spoke more languages than many people can name. In 1993, he visited Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—his first trip as Pope to the former Soviet Union. For that trip, he learned his 14th language, Lithuanian, which I am sure my Lithuanian-born mother was very happy to hear.

Everywhere, his message was the same. It is what he told his fellow Poles on his first visit home as Pope in 1979: ''Be not afraid.'' There is more to this life than what you can see here and now. ''The moral arc of the universe is long,'' as another great moral leader told us, ''but it bends toward justice.''

He sided always with the oppressed, the marginalized, the voiceless, the victims of war and injustice.

He was fearless and unflinching in the face of leaders of governments that suppressed human rights and crushed human hopes. He defied the Nazis who occupied Poland when he was a young man, and the communists who followed them. He showed real strength that all of us admire.

His role in ending communism in Poland and bringing about the end of the Soviet empire is well documented and rightly praised. He also helped to bring an end to apartheid by refusing to visit South Africa until that repugnant form of government was abolished.

Peace, non-violence, the sanctity of life, the dignity of work, the realization that we are all part of one human family and that every person on earth shares ''a common dignity and a common destiny,'' the belief that those who have much owe those who have less true justice, not mere charity, these are the lessons John Paul preached.

He taught us about reconciliation. He apologized for the Church for the Crusades, the Inquisition and the persecution of the Jews.

He showed us how to ask for forgiveness on his first trip home to Poland, when he visited the Nazi death camp at Auschwitz and knelt in prayer before a memorial to Holocaust victims. He showed us again on his first visit to Israel, in 2000, when he reached out his shaking hand to touch the Western Wall and leave a written prayer, a plea for forgiveness.

He showed us how to grant forgiveness when he visited the prison cell of the man who tried to kill him, and prayed with him.

He was the first Pope ever to visit a synagogue, or visit a mosque in an Islamic nation.

In his final days, he taught us another lesson: how to die with dignity.

John Paul II lived his life to try to heal the wounds that divide humanity. It is a measure of this extraordinary man's success that he has been praised in death by both Israeli Vice Premier Shimon Peres and Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas.

Karol Wojtyla had tears in his eyes when he became Pope. Many of us have tears in our eyes as he leaves the papacy and this world.

Those of us who are Catholic feel a special connection to this Pope. Many of us did not always agree with him on matters of Church teaching and practice. That is not unusual. In every family, there are disputes. But there is also great love. Even when we differed with him, we believe the Pope tried to do what he believed was right, and that is all we can ask of anyone.

During his visit to Chicago more than 25 years ago, the Pope said mass in Chicago's Grant Park. Many business closed that day to let their workers attend the mass. People stood shoulder-to-shoulder in the park.

Later that night, thousands of Chicagoans gathered at the Cardinal's mansion to sing ''good night'' to the Pope. It was late, but they weren't ready to let him go. He smiled as the crowd sang—and sang some more. Finally, with that huge smile and that big, booming voice, the Pope told them, ''Now you must go sleep.'' When no one moved, he smiled again and repeated, like a stern but loving father, ''You must go sleep.''

All these years later, many of us still wish he could have stayed with us just a little longer. But it was time for him to sleep.

So let us treasure the memory of this good man. And if we are moved to pay tribute to him, let us do our best to try to live the lessons he taught us with his own extraordinary life.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the Holy Father.

Pope John Paul II was an extraordinary ambassador for the betterment of humankind in every corner of the globe. His humanity shone through every day for two and a half decades of his papacy and his impact on the world will be everlasting.

He was a moral leader in so many of the great battles of our time. He fought Communism without violence, and he was dogged in his battles against war, injustice, and intolerance wherever he found them. He viewed the world in clear terms of good and evil, but he never once descended to demagoguery. He was a man who at once understood both the frailty and potential of the human spirit.

What other kind of man could have forgiven his would be assassin in person and prayed with him in his jail cell?

His capacity for belief in the betterment of man moved the world.

What other kind of man could overcome centuries of mistrust and conflict to establish diplomatic ties between the Vatican and the State of Israel. That was truly a bold and historic move.

As a New Yorker, I also must offer to say a special thanks to the Pope from the residents of our State and city. New York is an international city that attracts immigrants from all over the world who come with the dream of finding a better life.

While the Pope might be the most famous Pole of his time, every one of our citizens admired and often shared his pluck, his expansiveness and his optimism, qualities that make New York the greatest city on Earth. That is one of the reasons he was revered as such a hero by all New Yorkers, because the qualities that he exhibited of optimism and pluck and expansiveness are characteristics of our city as well. So every time he came here, there was a beautiful union. Like the Statue of Liberty that he quoted in his visit to Giants Stadium in 1995, his life and work was a symbol to millions on these shores and beyond that they, too, if they worked hard and stuck to their principles and moral values, could enjoy a better life.

And when terrible tragedy struck our city that awful day 4 years ago, the Pope's poignant statements reassured all New Yorkers and all Americans. He said at that time:

> May the Blessed Virgin, bring comfort and hope to all who are suffering because of the tragic terrorist attack that profoundly wounded the beloved American people in recent days. To all the sons and daughters of that great nation I now address my heartfelt thoughts and participation. May Mary receive the dead, console the survivors, sustain the families which have been especially tried and help everyone not to give in to the temptation to hatred and violence, but to commit themselves to serving justice and peace.

And he didn't stop there. After the attacks he convened an inter faith pilgrimage for peace to Assisi, the birthplace of St. Francis. He only led such a pilgrimage twice before—once during the Cold War, once during the Balkans conflict. He led leaders of Orthodox, Anglican, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, Sikh, Jain, Zoroastrian, Tenrikyo, Shinto and traditional African faiths in prayer and meditation. It was only a delegation he could have led.

Personally, I will never forget the Pope's visit to New York City in 1979. One glance at him and you saw that his nobility and his common touch combined so well in one human being was unforgettable for the millions of New Yorkers who lined the streets to greet him. People of all faiths and background mourn his passing. I join the billions of citizens around the world in a solemn prayer and remembrance of this great, wonderful, and holy man, Pope John Paul II.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I add my voice to the millions of people throughout the world as we try to put in perspective the passing of Pope John Paul II.

As has been said many times in many ways, probably more than anything what struck me the most about the Holy Father was his ability to understand what could be when other people only saw what couldn't be. He understood that communism was an oppressive system. He lived under Nazi rule, and as he had the power to bring about change, he used that power for the

good. He went back to his home country of Poland and challenged his people to expect better and to demand better. That is what he did for the world.

He tried to challenge his church, to stick to the principles of the church as he saw those principles to be. He challenged the world to do better when it came to the less fortunate. He was consistent. He saw war as a bad thing. He understood that life was sacred and that the state should not take life. He was in opposition to the death penalty. There I may disagree, an honest disagreement.

But he had a consistency about him. When we try to put his beliefs in secular terms of being liberal or conservative, we totally miss the mark of understanding the Pope. He understood the past, he changed the present, and the future will be better because of his time on Earth.

His passing has left a void in a great religion. The Catholic faith has lost a great leader. The world has lost a great voice for humanity, for decency, for love, for caring, and that voice will echo throughout the ages. As the Catholic Church embarks on picking a new Pope, I can understand the legacy that will have to be fulfilled.

The great religion called the Catholic faith is in mourning for the loss of a great leader, but all of us are in mourning for the loss of a great leader. Anyone who loves freedom, anyone who believes that there is a right and wrong when it comes to certain issues, has lost a great guidepost. I believe his legacy will be in challenging the status quo for the common good, seeing pain and hearing the cries of the oppressed when other people only heard faint noises, and having the courage of his convictions. He said, Be not afraid, and that is a lesson for us all.

He has gone to his eternal home. He deserves all the accolades he has been given. The world is better for his time on Earth.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, also part of the greatest generation is someone whom I rise to pay tribute to today and that is to Pope John Paul II. I was saddened at the passing of Pope John Paul II. The Holy Father was an inspiration to me as well as to millions around the world. His faith, his compassion, his eloquence, transcended religion or nationality. We so admired His Holiness because he stood for those who suffered, those who were oppressed, those who could not give voice through their own advocacy for human rights. He offered faith and hope and courage with his famous phrase ''be not afraid,'' as he reached out to young people to give them a moral compass that they needed—that we all need to guide our lives.

Pope John Paul was the true people's Pope. Gosh, he traveled to over 100 countries. He didn't just speak from the pulpit; he reached out and touched people. He moved into the crowds, and he spoke the language of the people, often literally because he spoke so many languages. The Pope was the father of the church, but he was also a son of Poland, my own cultural heritage. I remember when I heard the news about the new Polish Pope, the first non-Italian in over 400 years. I live down the street from the Polish parish, St. Stanislaw's in Fells Point. We felt such pride and joy. The bells rang, the tugboats tooted. We closed the streets and had a fantastic party. We were so excited.

In Baltimore we even knew him before he became Pope. He came to visit us as the cardinal from Krakow. He visited Holy Rosary Church, again one of the Catholic churches serving large numbers in the Polish community. I was so pleased to be there that day for this young, vigorous, athletic man who came from Poland to speak to us, wanting to know about our own country, speaking to us in English also about our own hopes and aspirations. But because he had grown up under Nazi fascism and lived under the boot of communism, he spoke to us about what it was like to live behind the Iron Curtain.

As you so well know, he came from the captive nations. I was so proud then to be part of the American delegation when he was Invested over 2 years later. And even then we could see the hint of things to come. There was a mass for hundreds of thousands of people in St. Peter's Square, where His Holiness gave his first blessing and spoke the Word to the people in many tongues. Before he came over to greet the diplomatic corps, he went over to a special section of children, and not just ordinary children but extraordinary children—the mentally retarded, those with birth defects, cerebral palsy. And the first touch of the Pope was to those children. I think it touched us all.

One of my best memories was taking my parents to meet the Pope at the White House when Jimmy Carter was President and Brzezinski was his National Security Adviser. I took my mother and father through the receiving line, and they had a chance to talk with him in both Polish and English. He turned and smiled with his wonderful humorous way and said: Don't forget to listen to your mother and father and to the Holy Father.

Twenty-five years later, I joined my colleagues in the Senate to present the Pope with our Congressional Medal, the highest honor we can bestow. The Pope doesn't usually accept awards, but he made an exception because we wanted to thank him for his stand for human rights and for peace and justice around the world. After the presentation and the blessing, he said to us: God bless you and God bless America.

The Pope visited this country seven different times, both as a bishop and as Pope. And during those times, he always spoke to us about the need for freedom. He knew what it was like to live under the occupation. During the dark days of communism, he led the church's support of the Solidarity movement. In 1979, after he became Pope, he made his very first visit to his own native land. In 9 days, he was seen by 13 million people, from Warsaw to Krakow to Czestochova. He touched every part of Polish society, and he encouraged them once again to be not afraid. One year later an obscure electrician working in a shipyard, named Lech Walesa, jumped over that wall. And when he jumped over the wall of the Gdansk shipyard, he took the whole world with him. That was the beginning of the end of Communism.

The Pope forged a special relationship with President Ronald Reagan, and I believe helped bring about the end of the Cold War and pulled down that Iron Curtain.

Pope John did more than any other leader of the church to reach out to different faiths. He was the first Pope to visit a synagogue. He was the first Pope to visit a mosque. He reached out to Anglicans and to Eastern Orthodoxy. But he didn't just reach out to different faiths; he reached also to the human heart. He reached back to the darker side of history. He was the first to acknowledge the Holocaust and to say that antisemitism was a sin and to officially visit Israel. He wanted the improvement of relationships.

If we want to honor the Pope, we should do it not with words but with deeds: To be not afraid, to speak up for truth, to speak truth to power, speak about justice, speak about human rights, to speak about the marginalized and the oppressed. Today we grieve the death of the Pope. We express our gratitude for his remarkable life and his remarkable leadership and legacy of faith and freedom and the enduring promise of the Gospels calling us to feed the hungry, care for the sick, and turn our spears into plowshares.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, when Pope John Paul II died over the weekend, the Catholic Church lost its spiritual shepherd. The world lost a giant of a man. As successor of St. Peter, he began his papacy by reminding the world to ''Be not afraid.'' The captive people of Eastern Europe and Latin America heard that message loud and clear. And as he prepared for his own death, he met his suffering with a fearlessness and hopefulness that was heard by us all.

For millions of American Catholics, including many Utahns, and many of my colleagues in this body, Pope John Paul II's passing represents the loss of a profound spiritual leader. My prayers are with all of you and with the Pope.

For non-Catholics like myself the Pope's death is a cause for mourning as well. His was an example of strength,

commitment, and moral courage that we will all miss and that we will never forget. The Communist tyranny that the Pope ultimately triumphed over once mocked the power of the Catholic Church, asking how many divisions the Pope had. While it is true that the Pope possessed no military might, his witness to hope, his faith that life would triumph over death, that the light would prevail over the darkness, was more powerful than any army.

As a result of his simple faith, this humble man from Krakow, Poland emerged from behind the Iron Curtain, became the first non-Italian Pope in nearly 500 years, and concluded his life as one of the towering figures of the Twentieth Century. I have no doubt that his example will guide us in the Twenty-first Century as well, and I understand why it is that so many Catholics are already referring to him as John Paul the Great.

My career as a public servant began shortly before John Paul II became Pope. I am fortunate to have spent time with him on two occasions over the years, and so it was no surprise to me to watch the world's and this country's admiration and love for him grow. I was struck by his joyful and his charitable spirit. Yet behind that peaceful demeanor was a determination to challenge the totalitarian assaults on human dignity that stained much of the last century.

As a young man he was witness to the Nazi terror in his native Poland, and later as Pope he went to Poland and encouraged the Solidarity movement. He understood that all persons are created in the image and likeness of God and that no matter how small, old or weak, no person is without significance. I have no doubt that his powerful witness to the dignity of all people contributed as much to the downfall of the horror of communism as anything we accomplished in Washington. A year after he assumed the papacy, John Paul II went to Poland and awakened a sleeping giant. Today, I hear that over a million thankful Poles are en route to Rome to pay their respects to their native son.

As the Pope grew older and he lost his youthful vigor, his own suffering served as a powerful reminder of the need to nurture a culture of life. Catholics and non-Catholics alike have heard this call. As President Bush put it the other day, it remains the duty of the strong to protect the weak.

It only took about twenty-four hours before some commentators came out to declare the Pope's legacy a mixed one. The Pope was too strident on certain issues, they say. He left certain groups unsatisfied. Perhaps. But I think that these criticisms really miss what this man was about. John Paul II reminded us of the meaning that our human lives can have. This truth is not something that you can focus group. The truth about the universe, about our duty to God and to our fellow man, is not something that you can triangulate.

Still, some fault the Pope for not being more like a politician. He was not accommodating enough. He should have compromised and found a middle ground. As elected officials, that is our charge. But as the spiritual head of the Catholic Church, the Pope's duty was greater than what we work to accomplish. He was a witness to truth. His message was not always one that people on either side of the aisle wanted to hear, but the call to the faithful is not often an easy one to swallow. The Pope reminded us of the splendor of truth. I think what is revealed in these criticisms of the Pope is the knee-jerk aversion by some to the very idea that there are eternal truths. The Pope should be commended, not criticized, for reminding us of them.

The talking heads have this exactly backward. They think that it was the Pope who was inconsistent because he was not easily labeled as politically liberal or conservative. It never occurs to them that it is we who are conflicted; that our divisions are something to be overcome. The Pope spoke to what Abraham Lincoln called the better angels of our nature. He was not someone seeking political advantage or gain. He sought peace and unity, and nowhere was this more clear than in his historic outreach to non-Catholic Christians, to the Jewish people, and to moderate Muslims.

Our commentators might not get this, but the world's people certainly do. As is clear from the different languages one hears in Rome as people wait to file past the Pope, this was a man who belonged to the world. And the Pope's trips to this country will never be forgotten. People in this country stood in the rain to attend papal masses in Boston and Miami, New Orleans and New York. Youth from around the world came to celebrate with him in Denver. Though this was a man with a universal message, I think that he had a certain American spirit as well. He was a kindred spirit. His faith in the future, and in the inherent dignity of man, made him at home with the American people, and it is appropriate that this nation, which was blessed with his visits on numerous occasions, will be flying its flags at half staff until his interment on Friday.

This weekend the Catholic Church lost its shepherd. For over a quarter of a century, Pope John Paul II watched over his flock. With his death this weekend, I am sure that there are some who feel lost, but they should not forget the Pope's reminder: ''Be not afraid.'' When he reminded his native Poles of this, they changed the course of history. In his passing we should take heed as well. We will miss him, and we will mourn, but we have faith that he is now at peace and at one with his Lord.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on Saturday evening the world lost a voice for peace, justice, and human dignity.

Born in Poland in 1920, Pope John Paul II grew up in the aftermath of World War I. As a young man, he witnessed the injustice of the Nazi occupation of his country, lived amid the horrendous crimes of the Holocaust, and survived decades of repression behind the Iron Curtain.

Out of those experiences, he developed a hopeful view of the world that defined his 26 years as the leader of the Roman Catholic Church, and he shared that vision with Catholics and non-Catholics worldwide.

As the first non-Italian Pope since 1523, Pope John Paul II was a truly groundbreaking figure. He redefined the papacy, coming out from behind the walls of the Vatican to travel to 129 countries and literally reach out to people wherever he went.

Through his travel—more than any other Pope—he helped rejuvenate and expand Catholicism to areas far beyond its roots.

During his 26 years as Pope, the Catholic Church grew from 750 million people to over 1 billion, with most of that growth coming from the third world.

For those in developing countries who struggled merely to survive, the Pope was a strong advocate for economic justice. And for those who lived under repression, he was a powerful voice for freedom.

His 1979 visit to his native Poland is viewed as the spark that ignited the labor movement which toppled communism in Poland and led to its demise throughout Eastern Europe a decade later.

It was his powerful yet simple belief in the value of human life that brought him to challenge violence wherever he saw it.

He chastised the brutal Communist governments of Eastern Europe. He criticized the military junta that governed Brazil in the early 1980s. He condemned nuclear war while meeting with survivors of the Hiroshima bombing. He called for an end to the violence in Northern Ireland. And he appealed for human rights in Cuba.

The Pope consistently urged leaders and citizens alike to seek peace and respect human life.

The Pope also sought to heal wounds. He apologized for the errors of Catholics over the last 2,000 years and for injustices against Jews, women, indigenous peoples, immigrants, and the poor. He acknowledged the failure of many Catholics to help Jews during the Holocaust. And more recently, he condemned the sexual abuse of children by priests in the United States.

The Pope reached out to members of other faiths at a time of growing sectarian violence and religious strife.

He was the first Pope to pray in a synagogue, the first to visit Auschwitz, and the first to make an official papal visit to the Holy Land—John Paul II made great strides in improving relations between Catholics and Jews.

And just as he acknowledged the mistakes made by his Church and its members, he also demonstrated a willingness to forgive those who had done harm to him.

In December 1983, he met with the man who had attempted to assassinate him 2½ half years earlier. During that meeting, the Pope forgave the man who had shot him three times.

The Pope regularly visited the United States and met with five Presidents. He believed that the U.S. had a special responsibility to the world calling on our Nation to be ''for the world, an example of a genuinely free, democratic, just and humane society.''

In recent years, even as his health deteriorated, he refused to give up. And in this, he served as a model to millions of people throughout the world about how faith and willpower can overcome adversity.

Indeed, I cannot remember a Pope who has been more warmly received and loved. I had the great honor to meet him at the Vatican in 1982 where I presented him with a cross sculpted from handguns melted down after being turned into police when they were banned in San Francisco. He received my gift warmly, giving me a rosary in return.

The world has lost a strong voice for peace, justice, and human dignity. Pope John Paul II will be dearly missed.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I watched with great sadness this weekend as the world lost a remarkable leader and faithful servant. Pope John Paul II, born Karol Wojtyla, was the leader of the world's largest church and shepherd to more than a billion Catholics throughout the world. In my home State of North Dakota, more than 130,000 Catholics are mourning the Pope's death this week and praying for the repose of his soul. I join these faithful and millions of others in grieving for the Holy Father who spread a message of peace and charity during his 26-year-long pontificate.

Reflecting on the Pope's legacy, I will forever admire his bravery, both in answering God's call and in challenging corrupt governments for the sake of humanity. In his first mass at St. Peter's Basilica in 1978, Pope John Paul II called on Catholics throughout the world to ''be not afraid.''

The Pope spent his entire life living that call. Born on the eve of World War II, Pope John Paul knew the horrors of war; the Nazis forced him into labor when they invaded Poland in 1939. During this period, he found comfort in his Catholic faith and challenged the Nazis by attending illegal prayer meetings. These experiences hardened his conviction that war is ''always a defeat for humanity.''

He again answered the call to ''be not afraid'' when he challenged the Soviet Union and the tyranny of communism in his homeland, Poland. Both as Archbishop of Krakow and then as Pope, John Paul II provided religious strength to those fighting these regimes. He is credited with helping to topple communism in Poland, and his steadfastness against oppression in all forms will forever be honored.

There may be no event more telling of his commitment to bravery and mercy than the attempt on his life in 1981. After being shot twice, nearly resulting in his death, the Pope recovered and continued his public works. Two years after the shooting, he visited his attacker in jail and offered his forgiveness. Responding to this act of evil with compassion and grace, John Paul served as a witness to what humanity should strive to become.

The world has lost a great leader and the father of a religious family. John Paul II will be remembered as a teacher and defender of the faith he was called to serve. He will be honored as a diplomat and as a revolutionary in the fight against injustice and oppression. And he will provide us ongoing inspiration to respect human dignity and the worth of all humankind.

I am saddened by the loss of this just and holy man; however, I am joyful that he surely has passed to a more perfect place and is in communion with the God he served so faithfully. My thoughts and prayers are with the Catholic community and all those who mourn the death of Pope John Paul II.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2006 AND 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 600) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today, the Senate will be considering S. 600, the Foreign Affairs Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007. The Foreign Relations Committee passed this bill on March 3 by a vote of 18–0. This is the third successive year that the Foreign Relations Committee has reported out a comprehensive Foreign Affairs Authorization bill by a unanimous vote. We are pleased to have this opportunity to bring it to the floor for the Senate's consideration. I want to especially thank the majority leader and the Democratic leader for their assistance and support in bringing this measure to the floor.

This legislation gives voice to Senate views on issues touching every continent—from tbe threat of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, to the safety of Americans working in our embassies overseas, to an increased and focused effort to spur economic growth in the poorest countries. It authorizes the executive branch to take important actions on a wide range of issues. And, it authorizes appropriations for our diplomats, our foreign aid workers, and our Peace Corps volunteers, as well as the programs and policies that they manage on behalf of the United States.

These people are our civilian soldiers—they pursue a bold war on terrorism and a noble and far-sighted battle against disease, poverty, and humanitarian disasters. Most work in circumstances where the threat level is severe. American diplomats and aid workers frequently have been targets of terrorism while serving overseas. But they understand the importance of representing the United States, and they go anyway.

At this time in our history we are experiencing a confluence of foreign policy crises that is unparalleled in the post-Cold War era. Our Nation has lived through the September 11 tragedy, and we have responded with a worldwide war against terrorism. We have fought wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, where we are likely to be engaged in security and reconstruction efforts for years to come. We have been confronted by nuclear proliferation problems in North Korea and Iran that threaten U.S. national security and regional stability. We are continuing efforts to safeguard Russia's massive stockpiles of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and to prevent proliferation throughout the world. We have experienced strains in the Atlantic Alliance, even as we have expanded it. We are trying to respond to the AIDS pandemic in Africa, the natural disasters in the Indian Ocean region, and the man-made calamity in Sudan. We are trying to take advantage of openings in the Middle East peace process and spur the advance of democracy in many countries. Emerging powers, including China, India, and Brazil, may soon reconfigure the world economically and politically in ways that we do not yet comprehend.

There is a tendency in the media and sometimes in this body to see diplomatic activities as the rival of military solutions to problems. We have to get beyond this simplistic formulation. We

have to understand that our military and our diplomats are both instruments of U.S. national power that depend on one another. They both help shape the international environment and influence the attitudes of governments and peoples. They both gather information and provide expertise that is vital to the war on terrorism. And they both must be unsurpassed in their capabilities, if the United States is going to survive and prosper.

Americans rightly demand that U.S. military capabilities be unrivaled in the world. Should not our diplomatic strength meet the same test? If a greater commitment of resources can prevent the bombing of one of our embassies, or the proliferation of a nuclear weapon, or the spiral into chaos of a vulnerable nation wracked by disease and hunger, the investment will have yielded dividends far beyond its cost.

In considering this legislation today, it is important to remember that since the end of the Cold War, the Foreign Affairs Account frequently has suffered from inadequate funding. The American public generally understands that the United States reduced military spending in the 1990s following the fall of the Soviet Union. Few are aware, however, that this peace dividend spending reduction theme was applied even more unsparingly to our foreign affairs programs. In constant dollars, the foreign affairs budget was cut in six consecutive years from 1992 to 1998. This slide occurred even as the United States sustained the heavy added costs of establishing new missions in the fifteen emergent states of the former Soviet Union. In constant dollars, the cumulative effect was a 26 percent decrease in our foreign affairs programs. As a percentage of GDP, this six-year slide represented a 36 percent cut in foreign affairs programs.

By the beginning of the new millennium, these cuts had taken their toll. The General Accounting Office reported that staffing shortfalls, lack of adequate language skills, and security vulnerabilities plagued many of our diplomatic posts. In 2001 the share of the U.S. budget devoted to the international affairs account stood at a paltry 1.18 percent—barely above its post-World War II low and only about half of its share in the mid-1980s, during the Reagan administration.

Under President Bush, funding for the Foreign Affairs Account has increased substantially. The President has requested increases in each of the last four budgets. In this year's budget, the President has requested a 13 percent increase over last year's appropriated amount for the Foreign Affairs Account—the largest percentage increase of any major account in the budget. This is a tangible demonstration of the President's commitment to diplomatic strength. Congress must now do its part by providing the resources and authorities that the President needs to carry out an effective foreign policy.

The bill before us preserves the funding decisions in the President's request. Inevitably, members will have some differences with the specifics of the President's request. But we should recognize that this bill represents a generous attempt to raise the profile and effectiveness of U.S. diplomacy. Those of us who have advocated funding increases for the 150 Account should take ''Yes'' for an answer. Accordingly, I believe that if amendments are offered to increase funding for a particular program, they should include offsets.

The bill funds the Millennium Challenge Corporation at the President's requested level of $3 billion. Some have argued that the President should have requested $5 billion—the amount he originally had conceived for the corporation's third year of funding. Others have argued that $3 billion is too much for a new venture that is just getting off the ground, and that some of this money should be shifted to other priorities. My own view is that $3 billion is a reasonable amount, given the scope of the program and its potential for spurring democratic reforms overseas. The credibility of the program, which foreign nations are observing closely, would be strengthened if the Senate endorsed the President's funding request. For these reasons, I will oppose amendments that seek to use MCC funds as an offset for other priorities.

This bill contains numerous policy initiatives, most notably the bipartisan Stabilization and Reconstruction Civilian Management Act, which was developed in the Foreign Relations Committee and included in last year's bill. The bill before the Senate also includes a 10 percent increase in danger pay for State Department employees who serve in dangerous posts overseas, funding for refugee assistance, and provisions designed to improve protections for women, children, and other vulnerable populations in the context of war or disaster.

Since the mid-1980s, Congress has not fulfilled its responsibility to pass an Omnibus Foreign Assistance Act. Several discrete measures, such as the Millennium Challenge Account, the global AIDS bill, the Freedom Support Act, and the Support for Eastern European Democracy Act, have been enacted. But in the absence of a comprehensive authorization, much of the responsibility for providing guidance for foreign assistance policy has fallen to the appropriations committees. Appropriators have kept our foreign assistance programs going, but in many cases, they have had to do so without proper authorization. In some years, the Congress did pass a State Department authorization bill, but that bill only authorizes about 35 percent of the Function 150 Account. To fund the remaining accounts, appropriators frequently had to waive the legal requirement to appropriate funds only following the passage of an authorization bill.

Passing a comprehensive Foreign Affairs authorization bill is good politics, as well as good policy. It is good politics because it underscores the leadership of this Senate at a time when our country is in peril. It is good politics because foreign assistance is an instrument of national power in the war on terrorism. It is good politics because it recognizes that our standard of living, the retirements of our parents, our children's educations, advancements in our health care, and the security of Americans can be undermined by what happens overseas. It recognizes that American prosperity is far more likely to be sustained if we are successful in spreading democracy, stability, and free market principles.

I thank the members of my committee for their hard work during the authorization process. Members on both sides of the aisle devoted many hours and much thought to constructive approaches to a number of very difficult foreign policy questions. Although this is a new bill developed during the last several months, it reflects much work that has been done by the Committee during the previous Congress. Committee hearings during the last 2 years on post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction, U.S. policy in the Middle East, developments on the Korean peninsula, relations between India and Pakistan, public diplomacy, foreign assistance, and numerous other topics have been well attended. In fact, no Senate committee held as many hearings or met as often as the Foreign Relations Committee during the last Congress.

I especially thank the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator BIDEN, for his support of this process and his leadership in foreign policy matters. We have agreed on the vast majority of provisions in this bill, and when we have disagreed, we have worked hard to bridge our differences and find bipartisan solutions. We have always shared the common goal of bringing good legislation to the floor for the Senate's judgment.

It has long been my intent that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approach foreign policy problems in a bipartisan spirit. This legislation reflects the committee's success in that regard. Republicans and Democrats have worked together closely to seek consensus, reason together, make compromises and craft excellent legislation. Our committee is united in the belief that passing a comprehensive Foreign Affairs authorization bill will enhance U.S. national security.

I am looking forward to the debate on this bill and the constructive contributions of Members at this important time in our Nation's history.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 266

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] proposes an amendment numbered 266.

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the amendment to the limitation on the United States share of assessments for United Nations Peacekeeping operations)

On page 55, strike lines 3 through 11.

Mr. LUGAR. I rise to offer an amendment that strikes section 401, a section which establishes a permanent cap of 27.1 percent on the American share of cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations. The Helms-Biden legislation passed in 1999 anticipated the U.S. share of peacekeeping dues would decline to 25 percent in total. This remains an important goal of the U.S. policy toward the U.N.

This issue has raised strong feelings on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate the perspective of Senators who want to preserve a 27.1-percent cap as well as those who want the cap to be reduced to the 25 percent level in accordance with the Helms-Biden legislation. We would all like to see American financial responsibilities at the United Nations reduced.

We should acknowledge that existing U.S. law sets 25 percent as our target for peacekeeping contributions. I believe we should give the U.S. negotiators the most leverage possible to attain the U.S. goals. Passing a permanent 27.1-percent cap in this bill at this moment might reduce that leverage.

In coming weeks Congress will have further opportunities to work with President Bush to craft the most effective means possible of reducing the U.S. share of peacekeeping assessments. I believe this is an issue on which further consultation with the executive branch is certainly warranted. This is particularly true at a moment when the Secretary General has recently put forward a substantial United Nations reform plan, and the President's nominee to be U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. is pending before the Senate.

After discussions with the majority leader and other Members, I have come to the conclusion that we will facilitate further consultations on the peacekeeping cap with the administration and improve prospects for passage of the underlying legislation if we strike this provision. Consequently, I am hopeful Senators will join me in passing this amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside in order that I may send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 267

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for himself and Mr. DEWINE, proposes an amendment numbered 267.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Ukraine)

On page 277, after line 8, add the following:

TITLE XXIX—TRADE TREATMENT OF UKRAINE

SEC. 2901. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that Ukraine has—

(1) made considerable progress toward respecting fundamental human rights consistent with the objectives of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974;

(2) adopted administrative procedures that accord its citizens the right to emigrate, travel freely, and to return to their country without restriction; and

(3) been found to be in full compliance with the freedom of emigration provisions in title IV of the Trade Act of 1974.

SEC. 2902. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO UKRAINE.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

(1) determine that such title should no longer apply to Ukraine; and

(2) after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to Ukraine, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of that country.

(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV.—On and after the effective date of the extension under subsection (a)(2) of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of Ukraine, title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as we all know, the recent Orange Revolution in Ukraine marked a huge victory for the advancement of democracy in the world. The Ukrainian people made clear that they would not stand idle as a corrupt regime sought to deny them their democratic rights. Now that the people of Ukraine have seized control of their destiny, the United States must stand ready to assist them as they do the hard work of consolidating democracy.

The purpose of the amendment is to repeal the so-called and well-known Jackson-Vanik amendment, for it to be terminated with respect to Ukraine. At his appearance yesterday with President Viktor Yushchenko, President Bush pledged to seek the termination of Jackson-Vanik. In a White House statement yesterday, both Governments stated that they support ''immediately ending the application of Jackson-Vanik to Ukraine.'' We should all agree. This 31-year-old legislation is, with respect to Ukraine, now anachronistic and inappropriate. I am pleased to offer this amendment along with Senator DEWINE. And I know there will be others.

Specifically, this amendment would authorize the President to terminate the application of Jackson-Vanik, which is title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, to Ukraine. Ukraine would then be eligible to receive permanent normal trade relations tariff status in its trade with the United States. Several Members in the Senate and House have also introduced legislation to terminate Jackson-Vanik, and these bills in the Senate have been pending in the committee since the start of this session. I am hopeful that today the Senate will agree to adopt this amendment.

Beyond any benefits to our bilateral trading relationship, lifting Jackson-Vanik for Ukraine constitutes an important symbol of Ukraine's new democracy and its relationship with the United States. In February, along with three other Senators and six representatives, I went to Kiev, where we met with President Yushchenko, Prime Minister Tymoshenko, and students who led protests in Independence Square. I was struck by the great enthusiasm for democracy and freedom that has taken hold in Ukraine, and I know we all wish the new leaders all the best as they begin the challenge of governing. I pledged to them that we

would work toward the lifting of Jackson-Vanik on Ukraine, and today I am happy to move toward that end.

Tomorrow, President Yushchenko will address a joint session of Congress, an honor which we bestow on few foreign leaders. As we have the privilege of welcoming this true hero of democracy, I can think of no better gesture than today terminating the anachronistic and inappropriate Jackson-Vanik restrictions on Ukraine.

I note the presence of my most respected colleague, Senator LUGAR, who has gained the respect and appreciation of all of us with his knowledge and expertise on issues of national security and foreign affairs and his chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope he would see his way clear to have a look at this amendment, and I would obviously seek his support.

Mr. President, we who follow events in that part of the world were thrilled at the Orange Revolution. We saw a flawed election that was repudiated by the people of Ukraine in a peaceful manner. It was one of the remarkable events in that part of the world.

I remind my colleagues that Ukraine is a very pivotal and important country in its own right, one with a tragic history of bloodshed and sacrifice but also, when its geostrategic location is considered, a very important part of the world. Dr. Henry Kissinger once was quoted as saying: Russia with Ukraine is a Western power, without Ukraine is an Eastern power.

I fully agree with our President's stated commitment yesterday for repeal of Jackson-Vanik as far as Ukraine is concerned.

Jackson-Vanik was a very incredibly important tool in asserting our support and advocacy for human rights in then-Iron-Curtain countries. I think it is very clear that neither Senator Jackson nor Congressman Vanik envisioned this anachronistic provision to apply to a country that is now on the verge of a functioning democracy in a free and exuberant nation.

I am told by my staff that somehow the chairman of the Finance Committee, or probably more likely one of his zealous staffers, has said they would object to this provision because of the fact there are certain problems with intellectual property or other reasons. I would hope that assertion of jurisdiction, or reluctance to approve of this, particularly in light of this particular moment, would disappear in light of the priorities that this repeal of Jackson-Vanik would send as a sign of strong support and advocacy for democracy and process of an open and free society which is obviously taking place in Ukraine.

So if there is a problem that we have with Ukraine, I would think the President of the United States would have articulated those views in his meetings with President Yushchenko yesterday. And if the President had a problem, he certainly would not have come out after the meeting and advocated the repeal of Jackson-Vanik.

Not many Americans even know what Jackson-Vanik is. But a whole lot of people in these countries that this law still applies to are very aware of it. I think it would not only be appropriate to send a signal with the repeal of Jackson-Vanik as far as Ukraine is concerned, but I think it would be a slap in the face to the new Ukrainian Government and people because some committee of the Senate asserted its jurisdiction at a time when we should be providing as much encouragement as we can to the process of democracy and freedom, which has exhilarated all of us as we watched this marvelous transformation take place.

So I urge adoption of the amendment. I hope we can dispose of the amendment today. If the chairman of the Finance Committee or any of his staff would like to debate this issue, I would be more than happy to engage in that at their convenience and have a recorded vote, which I think would carry overwhelmingly in the Senate.

I again recognize the leadership and dedicated hard work on this legislation by our distinguished and respected chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his very thoughtful comments about my work in the Foreign Relations Committee. I thank him for offering this amendment.

Let me point out, as the Senator from Arizona has already, a number of bills attempting to achieve repeal of Jackson-Vanik have been introduced in both Houses. But they have not come to conclusion, and apparently today that will happen.

I am one of the authors of one of those bills, S. 632, which authorizes the extension of permanent normal trade relations treatment with Ukraine. As the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, unfortunately Ukraine is still subject to the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974, which sanctions nations for failure to comply with freedom of emigration requirements. My bill, and I believe Senator MCCAIN's bill, would repeal permanently the application of Jackson-Vanik to Ukraine. As has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator, that bill has been referred to the Finance Committee, which still has it under consideration.

But I would offer this argument. In the post-Cold-War era, Ukraine has demonstrated a commitment to meeting the requirements for the lifting of Jackson-Vanik and, in addition, has expressed a strong desire to abide by free market principles and good governance.

Last November 21, I served as President Bush's personal representative to the runoff election between Prime Minister Yanukovich and Viktor Yushchenko. During that visit, I promoted free and fair election procedures that would strengthen worldwide respect for the legitimacy of the winning candidate. Unfortunately, that was not possible at that time. The Government of Ukraine allowed, or aided and abetted, wholesale fraud and abuse that changed the results of that November 21 election. It is clear that Prime Minister Yanukovich did not win that election.

In response, however, the people of Ukraine rallied in the streets and squares and demanded justice. After tremendous international pressure and mediation, Ukraine repeated the runoff election. It was held on December 26. A newly named Central Election Commission and a new set of election laws led to a much improved process. International monitors concluded the process was generally free and fair. Viktor Yushchenko was inaugurated as President of, Ukraine, and tomorrow he will address a joint session of our Congress.

Extraordinary events have occurred in Ukraine over the last several months since the December 26 election. A free press has revolted against Government intimidation and reasserted itself. An emerging middle class has found its political footing. A new generation has embraced democracy and openness. A society has rebelled against the illegal activities of its Government. It is in our interest to recognize and to protect these advances in Ukraine.

The United States has a long record of cooperation with Ukraine through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Act.

Ukraine inherited the third largest nuclear arsenal in the world with the fall of the Soviet Union. Through the Nunn-Lugar Program, the United States has assisted Ukraine in eliminating this deadly arsenal and joining the nonproliferation treaty as a nonnuclear state.

One of the areas where we can deepen United States-Ukraine relations is bilateral trade. Trade relations between the United States and Ukraine are currently governed by a bilateral trade agreement signed in 1992. There are other economic agreements in place seeking to further facilitate economic cooperation between the United States and Ukraine, including a bilateral investment treaty which was signed in 1996 and a taxation treaty signed in the year 2000. In addition, Ukraine commenced negotiations to become a member of the World Trade Organization in 1993, further demonstrating its commitment to adhere to the free market principles of fair trade.

In light of its adherence to freedom of immigration requirements, democratic principles, compliance with threat reduction, and several agreements on economic cooperation, the products of Ukraine should not be subject to the sanctions of Jackson-Vanik.

There are areas in which Ukraine needs to continue to improve. These include market access, protection of intellectual property, and reduction of tariffs. The United States must remain committed to assisting Ukraine in pursuing market economic reforms. The permanent waiver of Jackson-Vanik and establishment of permanent normal trade relations will be the foundation on which further progress in a burgeoning economic partnership can be made.

My colleagues on the Finance Committee have committed to joining me in supporting this important legislation. It is essential that the Finance Committee and the full Senate act promptly to bolster this burgeoning democracy to promote stability in this region. I am most hopeful that in the course of the day, we will take favorable action on this amendment.

For the moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise for the point of giving information to all Senators about the legislation we have in front of us. As the Chair has observed, several minutes have passed without activity. We have through staff attempted to notify all Senators who might be anticipating offering amendments or action on this bill. This will be an excellent opportunity to do so prior to the time the two party luncheons are held and a recess for that reason is called. We know that following lunch, there will be two important amendments offered, and we welcome those. I would like to proceed to our debate and votes, with disposition of amendments that are now pending.

I simply mention, Mr. President, that I recognize, as does the Chair, many Senators are under some urgent requirements in terms of scheduling in this particular week, as we mourn the death of Pope John Paul II. Some Senators are contemplating potential travel to the funeral of the Pope. Others have other requirements. So it would be my intent, as we conclude these amendments that are available, to move for final passage of the bill, to conclude activity on this bill today and as early today as possible.

My understanding is a potential debate on the Social Security issue will ensue at some point this evening after we have concluded activities on the authorization bill. So we might make that more readily available and that time more certain. I mention this because for Senators who do have amendments, even if they are not completely formulated, I request they bring those to the floor so that staff on both sides of the aisle can work through those amendments to find an acceptable form. It would be at least our general view of a liberal policy of adopting amendments that enhance the authorization process and do no violence at least to the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

With that in mind, hopefully those listening to the debate will hear our plea, proceed with amendments, and help us with the activities.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Having spoken to the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for no more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, AND 277, EN BLOC

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk a group of amendments to S. 600 that have the approval of the managers of the bill. The package has bipartisan support. I intend to ask they be agreed to by unanimous consent as soon as the ranking member has joined me in the Senate.

I have received word that the presence of the ranking member will not be required. Staff on both sides of the aisle have cleared these amendments; therefore, I ask they be agreed to en bloc by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 268

(Purpose: To permit grants to be used for broadcasting outside the Middle East region)

On page 59, strike lines 16 though 25 and insert the following:

''(a) AUTHORITY.—Grants authorized under section 305 shall be available to make annual grants to Middle East Broadcasting Networks for the purpose of carrying out radio and television broadcasting.

''(b) FUNCTION.—Middle East Broadcasting Networks shall provide radio and television programming consistent with the broadcasting standards and broadcasting principles set forth in section 303.

AMENDMENT NO. 269

(Purpose: To limit the compensation paid to employees of the Middle East Broadcasting Networks)

On page 60, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

''(C) not more than 5 officers or employees of the Middle East Broadcasting Networks may be provided a rate of basic compensation at such rate authorized for Level II of the Executive Schedule provided in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, and such compensation shall be subject to the provisions of section 5307 of such title.

AMENDMENT NO. 270

(Purpose: To require payments from the Broadcasting Board of Governors for costs resulting from the creditable service of employees of the Middle East Broadcasting Networks)

On page 64, strike lines 3 through 6, and insert the following:

(4) CREDITABLE SERVICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 8332(b)(11) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''the Middle East Broadcasting Networks;'' after ''the Asia Foundation;''.

(B) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—With regard to creditable service with the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall—

(i) pay into the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount determined by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to be necessary to reimburse such Fund for any estimated increase in the unfunded liability of such Fund that results from the amendment made by subparagraph (4), computed using dynamic assumptions; and

(ii) pay the amount required by clause (i) in 5 equal annual installments, together with interest on such amount computed at the rate used in the computation required by such clause.

AMENDMENT NO. 271

(Purpose: To extend the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy until 2008)

On page 110, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 812. UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

Section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) is amended by striking ''October 1, 2005'' and inserting ''October 1, 2008''.

AMENDMENT NO. 272

(Purpose: To clarify Foreign Service Grievance Board procedures in the case of an alleged overpayment of an annuity)

On page 47, line 13, strike ''and'';

On page 47, line 15, strike the period at the end and insert as semicolon and ''and''.

On page 47, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(3) by striking ''or allowances'' and inserting ''allowances, or annuities''.

AMENDMENT NO. 273

(Purpose: To limit the availability of funds authorized for contributions for international peacekeeping activities)

On page 12, strike lines 11 through 13, and insert the following:

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) FISCAL YEAR 2006.—Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2006 are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2007.

(B) FISCAL YEAR 2007.—Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2007 are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2008.

AMENDMENT NO. 274

(Purpose: To provide a short title)

On page 1, after line 2, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Affairs Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007''.

AMENDMENT NO. 275

(Purpose: To require a determination to provide assistance for destruction of small arms and related ammunition)

Beginning on page 150, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 151, line 4, and insert the following:

(a) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2348) is amended by adding at the end ''Such assistance may also include assistance for demining activities, clearance of unexploded ordnance, destruction of small arms and related ammunition when determined to be in the national security interest of the United States, and related activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 276

(Purpose: To require a determination to provide assistance for the safeguarding, removal, or elimination of conventional weapons and related ammunition)

On page 272, line 15, strike ''weapons,'' and insert ''weapons and related ammunition when determined to be in the national security interest of the United States,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 277

(Purpose: To waive the passport fees for a relative of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member or to attend a funeral or memorial service for such member)

On page 74, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 603. PASSPORT FEES.

Section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920 (22 U.S.C. 214) is amended in the third sentence by striking ''or from a widow, widower, child, parent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member'' and inserting ''or from a widow, widower, child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member or to attend a funeral or memorial service for such member''.

Mr. LUGAR. I simply point out these are amendments that followed the consideration of the bill in the Committee on Foreign Relations and were suggested by the administration. They have been carefully considered over the course of several days, and there has been unanimous consent on the list that was agreed to.

I encourage Senators who have amendments, once again, to come to the Senate to make their presence known so we can work with them. It would be our hope we could accept most of those amendments or work on modifications so they can be part of the legislation, as has been the case with the package we just agreed to.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOWELL HEFLIN

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to the passing of my good friend, our former colleague, Senator Howell Heflin.

Judge Heflin, as we often called him, was a stalwart in the Senate, devoted to improving my State of Alabama and the Nation with each decision he made and I believe every vote he cast.

When I first entered the Senate in 1987, Judge Heflin was the senior Senator from my State of Alabama. I considered him a good friend and colleague over the 18 years he served here. I always appreciated his humor and his solid values. I believe he will be remembered as one of Alabama's most respected politicians.

Judge Heflin was a strong voice for Alabama in the Senate. He served as chairman of the Senate Ethics Committee and as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He worked to ensure that Alabama was indeed well represented in this body.

He was deeply devoted to his job, and, as we know, often spent dinners out that were meant to be time off as an opportunity to help his constituents who happened to be at the same restaurant.

Howell Heflin was born June 19, 1921, in Poulan, GA, to Reverend Marvin Rutledge Heflin and Louise Strudwick Heflin. He graduated from Colbert County High School in Leighton, AL, and Birmingham Southern College in Birmingham, AL.

Following his graduation from Birmingham Southern College in 1942, Judge Heflin enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps. His military service during World War II took him to the Pacific Theater, where he was wounded twice and awarded the Silver Star for bravery. He was also awarded two Purple Hearts.

Upon his return from World War II, he attended the University of Alabama School of Law and was admitted to the Alabama State Bar in 1948. From 1948 to 1971, Judge Heflin was an attorney in Tuscumbia, AL.

He was elected as the chief justice of the Alabama Supreme Court in 1970. He was well known for his efforts to modernize Alabama's legal system. It was because of his profound work as chief justice that he became affectionately known as ''The Judge'' even after he became a Senator. He was elected first to the Senate in 1978, and was reelected to two more terms, for a total of 18 years of service—three terms—in the Senate.

In 1997, he left public life and returned home to Tuscumbia, AL, to enjoy time with his family.

Howell Thomas Heflin led a full life. Each chapter of his life—as a war hero, a jurist, and a public servant—was completed with great fervor and devotion. He did nothing halfway, and everyone who knew him recognized and appreciated that.

He embodied the qualities of hard work, honesty, humility, and humor, and he left this earth with a great legacy. Senator Heflin died on March 29, 2005, last week. He is survived by his wife Elizabeth Heflin; a son, Howell Thomas Heflin, Jr.; a daughter-in-law, Cornelia Hood Heflin; grandson Wilson Carmichael Heflin; and a granddaughter, Mary Catherine Heflin.

Senator Heflin was devoted to his family, his State, and his country. As a World War II hero, he put his love of country above all else. He made remarkable contributions to Alabama and the Nation as a whole. His warm-hearted personality will be remembered by all who knew him well. We will all miss him. We will certainly miss him in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I, too, wish to speak in morning business. What a passing of a great generation. I, too, want to pay my respects to Senator Heflin, an outstanding Senator, a wonderful Senator from Alabama. When I came to the Senate in 1987, he was one of the men of the Senate who welcomed me with graciousness. He introduced me to hand-pulled barbecue from Alabama. He also introduced me to the Marshall Space Program. I had

the opportunity to work with him in terms of creating jobs in Alabama and also creating opportunity through the Space Program.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2006 AND 2007—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, very shortly there will be a unanimous consent request on how to proceed on the Boxer amendment, which has not been introduced yet but will be spoken to shortly. I would like, with the permission of my friend from California, to make a brief opening statement relative to the overall bill.

Mrs. BOXER. Would the Senator also then make the unanimous consent request for the 40/20 so I know that is in line?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I say to my friend, we are just clearing it with the leadership. We are working that out. I am sure we will be able to move the amendment immediately after my statement which I don't think will take more than a few minutes.

Mr. President, under the leadership of Chairman LUGAR, we tried very hard to move this bill in the last couple of years. I hope the third time is a charm. As I believe the chairman has explained, the bill contains the basic authorization for all the major foreign affairs agencies and programs at the Department of State, foreign assistance programs, the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the Peace Corps.

The bill contains several initiatives I would like to briefly highlight.

I am glad the bill includes the Global Pathogen Surveillance Act, which we have been trying to enact over 3 years. In recent years, the SARS epidemic and the avian flu epidemic have made us acutely aware of how vulnerable the world is to a rapid spread of infectious diseases. We face that same vulnerability for diseases that might be used as weapons of bioterrorism.

The Global Pathogen Surveillance Act will combat the bioterrorism threat by improving other countries' capabilities to detect and limit disease outbreaks and by improving international investigation of disease outbreaks. Because these diseases—whether they are natural occurrences or man-made—have no respect for borders, we are only as safe as the weakest link in the chain is strong. This bill will go a long way to help other countries at an early stage detect the existence of these diseases, these potential biodiseases that can be spread via what we call bioterrorism.

The majority leader, who cosponsored the original version of the act in 2001, is once again pressing for action on this bill. He added a very useful provision to the act, which Chairman LUGAR and I have happily endorsed, calling for the executive branch to develop a real-time data collection and analysis capability to serve as a warning sign for a possible bioterrorism event. With the majority leader's support, I hope and believe this year we will finally enact this important measure.

I am also proud of the work the committee has done, with the chairman's leadership, to help the U.S. Government strengthen its capacity to handle postconflict reconstruction.

In the last decade, the United States has taken on stabilization missions in countries such as Bosnia, East Timor, Haiti, Somalia, Afghanistan, and Iraq. In the decade to come, whether we like it or not, nation-building and postconflict resolution and reconstruction will remain important to our security. As the Presiding Officer knows because of all the work he has done in the Balkans, this is not something that gets done in a day and we are able to leave behind in a year. We should not attempt to reinvent the wheel every time we are faced with a stabilization crisis, such as the one we faced in the last decade. It is inefficient and ineffective. Rather than address crises by cobbling together plans and personnel each time they occur as we have been doing, we need to be better prepared.

This bill establishes a special office in the State Department for reconstruction and stabilization. It establishes a special corps of civilian reconstruction experts who would be ready to be deployed on short notice. The bill also creates a special emergency fund to deal with such crises.

Finally, I am pleased the chairman and I are able to agree on the inclusion of a provision to protect vulnerable persons during humanitarian emergencies—an undated version of a bill I first introduced in 2003 called the Women and Children in Conflict Protection Act.

I have been concerned about the vulnerability of women and children affected by conflict and humanitarian emergencies for some time now. Since the accusations were made about sexual exploitation of refugees by humanitarian workers in west Africa nearly 3 years ago, that concern has been heightened.

Most recently, we have been confronted with cases of rape used as a weapon of war in Darfur, sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. peacekeepers in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and concerns that the children affected by the tsunami in Asia could be vulnerable to human trafficking.

This provision in the bill establishes a coordinator at the Department of State or AID specifically charged with ensuring that our assistance programs not only provide food and shelter, but also support programs to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse of those living in refugee and internally displaced persons camps. It prohibits U.S. funding of humanitarian organizations that do not sign a code of conduct prohibiting improper relations between aid workers and beneficiaries. Finally, the provision authorizes the President to provide aid specifically for things such as security for refugee camps or something as simple and inexpensive as buying firewood so women will not have to leave these camps, which they have to do now, in order to find material with which they can make a fire to cook and find themselves subject to rape and exploitation outside the confines of these camps.

We have a very good bill that was passed out of our committee 18 to 0. I urge my colleagues, as Senator BOXER is about to do, to come forward with their amendments because I, like the chairman, would very much like to move this bill forward. It is within the budget. It is right on the button of the President's budget number. It has, as I said, unanimous support out of our committee. I believe it is a solid bill, and I hope we can move it forward this year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, in a short while, we hope to have a unanimous consent agreement so that Members will have a roadmap for the remainder of the afternoon. That is not at hand for the moment; therefore, I hope the Chair might recognize the distinguished Senator from California, who will offer an amendment. Informally, we have talked in terms of an hour of debate being the limit, 40 minutes for the Senator from California, 20 minutes for me or others I may designate. We will encapsulate, hopefully, a unanimous consent agreement in due course during the course of this debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to ask my chairman, for whom I have great respect and admiration, am I then to send the amendment to the desk at this time?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I prefer the Senator send it to the desk and our debate commence.

AMENDMENT NO. 278

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mrs. MURRAY, proposes an amendment numbered 278.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961)

On page 172, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 2227. GLOBAL DEMOCRACY PROMOTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, regulation, or policy, in determining eligibility for assistance authorized under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), foreign nongovernmental organizations—

(1) shall not be ineligible for such assistance solely on the basis of health or medical services including counseling and referral services, provided by such organizations with non-United States Government funds if such services do not violate the laws of the country in which they are being provided and would not violate United States Federal law if provided in the United States; and

(2) shall not be subject to requirements relating to the use of non-United States Government funds for advocacy and lobbying activities other than those that apply to United States nongovernmental organizations receiving assistance under part I of such Act.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am offering an amendment to overturn the so-called Mexico City policy which undermines some of our country's most important values and goals. The Mexico City policy is also known as the global gag rule, and I will explain what it does in a moment.

Most of my colleagues know the history of this policy. It was named the Mexico City policy because that is where it was announced in 1984. But it is also known, as I said, as the global gag rule because that is exactly what it does—it gags international organizations that receive USAID family planning funds.

What does that mean? It means, for example, that a family planning clinic in Nepal that receives USAID funding is prohibited from using its own funds—the clinic's own funds—to provide, advocate for, or even talk about abortion to the women they serve, even talk to a woman about her options.

Let's be clear what we are talking about one more time. We are not talking about spending one slim dime or one penny of U.S. money to pay for abortions abroad because that has been illegal under the Helms Act since 1973. So since 1973, U.S. funds abroad cannot be used in any way to advocate for abortion, to allow women to have an abortion, or to refer her for an abortion. U.S. funds since 1973 can never be used for any of those purposes.

We can debate that, but I am not going to debate that. What I am going to debate is why the greatest, freest country in the world, the United States of America, would put a global gag rule, put a tape over the mouths of organizations that are trying to help the women in their country if they use their own funds—not U.S. funds but their own funds—for those purposes.

I cannot understand for the life of me how we can in good faith, as the leading democracy in the world, sending our troops abroad—and they are dying every day for freedom of speech and for the kind of constitution we hope others will have—how we could put a global gag rule on those organizations when in this country we could not even consider it for 2 seconds because it would be completely unconstitutional.

This is a free country. We are proud of the fact that it is free. We are proud of the fact that we do not tell our citizens what they can think, what they can say, if it is on their own dime. Yet abroad, in some of the poorest countries in the world, we are saying if they want to get a penny of Federal funds, USAID or the like, they cannot use their own funds in any way they would like. We are telling family planning clinics that are in the toughest of circumstances, treating women in the direst poverty, that they are gagged if they want to receive any U.S. funds.

Again, these restrictions we are placing on these nonprofit agencies would be unconstitutional and unacceptable in the United States of America.

Ironically, what is very interesting is the global gag rule is even stricter than the requirements put on by the Helms amendment. So this is an unbelievable move by this administration, after these restrictions were removed in 1993, to place these restrictions back.

It is true that the White House, depending on who is in the White House, has shifted back and forth on the advisability of the global gag rule, but the Senate has always said it has no place as part of American law. The Senate has stood proud, Democrats and enough Republicans, yes, to make sure that we do not have a double standard, that we do not say with the one hand to these countries we want democracy for them, we want freedom for them, we want freedom of speech for them, and then on the other hand say, but if they exercise it they are going to be punished.

Tell me how that makes sense for America. Tell me how that makes any sense for our credibility in the world.

The last time we debated this global gag rule and the Mexico City policy in this Chamber was about 2 years ago. I introduced this exact amendment, and it passed with bipartisan support. We hope we will achieve that same outcome today. It will be a close vote—we have had some changes in this body—but we still think and hope we have the votes. We will find that out.

What is at stake is do we want to have an America that lives what it says, that not only says to the world freedom is good and freedom of expression is good, and if groups work hard and raise their own funds, as long as they spend them consistent with their own laws in their own countries, we will say it is their right. But, oh, no, that is not what this administration has done. One of the first things the President did when he got elected the first time was to put back in place this global gag rule.

This global gag rule is not fair. We are a country that believes in fundamental fairness. Yet this global gag rule tells foreign nongovernmental organizations—these are people working in the toughest of circumstances—how they should spend their own money.

For example, it tells clinics they cannot use their own money to help a woman in deep despair who comes in with a serious problem, an unintended pregnancy that perhaps was even forced on her. It tells the NGOs, the nongovernmental organizations, they cannot use their own funds even to advocate for less restrictive laws.

For example, let's say there is a law on the books in one of these poor countries that says if a person is raped or a victim of incest they cannot have an abortion, and in this country we changed that. If one is a victim of rape or incest we say Federal funds can be used to help her. Let us say there is a country that has a total restriction, even if someone is raped or there is incest involved, and the nongovernmental entity is trying to change that law in their country. Under the global gag rule we say they will lose all of their Federal American dollars if they advocate to change what I would call ignorant laws.

This global gag rule tells clinics that they cannot use their own funds to even tell a woman who comes before them what her options could be. Even if the woman asks what she can do, they cannot tell her. In our country, that would be illegal, unconstitutional. But, no, we put this on the poorest nations of the world. That is not Uncle Sam, that is Imperial Sam, and none of us wants to be imperial. At least that is my impression. We want to be democratic. But we are not acting in a democratic fashion when we have this double standard around the world.

We believe in freedom of speech and yet the global gag rule tells foreign nongovernmental organizations they cannot in any way express an opinion on this subject without losing their funds. We do not tell organizations of the United States of America what they can say and what they cannot say in this country, even if we find it offensive. There are a lot of organizations that I find we would be better off without. I do not think their advocacy is right, but I have no right as a Senator to tell any organization in America I am tired of hearing what they are saying, do not say it anymore, because if I tried to stop them I would be ruled out of order, unconstitutional, and that would be the right thing.

Yet we do it to foreign nongovernmental organizations.

Some Senators just came back from Iraq. I was one of those people. We saw the unimaginable challenges facing our soldiers, government officials, and the Iraqis themselves as they struggle to deal with a very dangerous insurgency in that country. Our soldiers are putting their lives on the line so that the Iraqis have a chance to live in freedom. One of the foremost freedoms in our country that we wish for other people is freedom of speech. Government will not interfere with a person no matter what they say. As long as they are not hurting anybody or inciting anybody, they can hold an opinion. That is why our soldiers are over there fighting so that the Iraqi people can write a constitution that gives them the same freedoms we have.

We heard the Iraqis tell us, the up and coming leaders: We read your constitution, we read your history, we know about your filibuster, and how it protects minority rights. These are the Iraqis. We heard our soldiers say they are willing to risk their lives so the Iraqis can have freedom. Well, that includes freedom of speech. Yet we take away the freedom of nongovernmental organizations to tell the truth to the women who may come before them seeking help with their reproductive freedom.

Our policy should be a model for the world, but the gag rule instead sends a bad signal. It enforces a dangerous code of silence. It tells people if the government in power does not agree with them, then they should put a gag over their mouth and just suck it up and not tell the truth about how they feel and keep vital information from the women they are serving. Whether one is pro-choice or anti-choice, this has nothing to do with it. It is a question of freedom of speech. I hope that regardless of how we come down on the issue of choice, we would agree that it is fair to debate it. I may not like to hear your opinion if I do not agree with you, it may be hard for me to handle, but that is part of this great country. We have to listen to each other. We have to debate and we have to respect each other's views. But I am not showing respect if I walk up to a Senator on the floor and say, you know what, I am tired of hearing your point of view and I am going to put a gag over your mouth. How ridiculous. If they did that to me? How ridiculous. It is freedom of speech we are talking about, and the global gag rule takes a hammer to our Constitution, to our credibility, and I think just knocks us down in the eyes of the world. And it makes hypocritical what we are asking our soldiers to do across this globe.

I want to give some examples. In Peru, for example, family planning NGOs funded by the U.S. were barred from advocating against a constitutional clause banning abortion. It was not the Peruvian Government gagging their own people, it was our Government. And it was not all Peruvian NGOs who were barred from participating in that debate, it was only those who opposed the abortion ban. The other people were free to talk about it.

What is that about? America comes in and says if you want our money you can only advocate for the position that the Government in power wants. You cannot have another opinion. I think that is beyond outrageous.

Just listen to what one nongovernmental organization leader in Peru said, and I am quoting this individual:

> We used to hold debates, invite medical doctors, produce research publications. We cannot speak as freely now. No one knows at what point it becomes prohibited speech. USAID told us we couldn't lobby for abortion liberalization or decriminalization. If we attend a general conference and the issue of abortion comes up, we can speak. But we don't know how much we can talk about it before it crosses over to not being permitted anymore. We, for example, can do research on unsafe abortions, but if we draw any conclusions someone can say, ''that's lobbying,'' [and we will lose all of our money.]

This is a terrible thing, this global gag rule. I am so proud of the Senate. Every time we have brought it up we overturned it. I hope that will be the case today.

I want to tell you a story about a real case in Nepal. In 2001, this issue came to my attention. There was a nongovernmental organization that had to make a Hobson's choice: Do we take USAID money which we desperately need to help our people if it will force us to remain silent on the issue of reproductive freedom? What should we do? Should we give up the money and retain our freedom?

Let me tell you what this organization did. It gave back the USAID money, even though it put them in a very precarious financial position. They did it because of a 13-year-old girl named Min Min. I brought her picture with me to the Senate floor 2 years ago because I wanted my colleagues to see the face of what we are talking about here today. This is not just about freedom of speech. This is about real, live people and what happens to them if they cannot get reproductive health care.

Min Min was raped by a relative. She was raped by an uncle. She became pregnant, and it was a shame upon the family and the family said you must have an illegal abortion. As a result of that illegal abortion of a girl 13 years old who was raped by her uncle, someone was sentenced to 20 years in prison. Who was it? Was it the rapist? No. Was it the parents who said you have to end the pregnancy? No. It was this tiny girl, 13 years old, who was sent to jail for 20 years for the crime of being raped by a relative and being forced by her family to have an abortion.

The nongovernmental organization wanted to go to bat for this child, so they turned back American money. Can you believe it? We punished an organization that wanted to go to bat for a 13-year-old rape victim—incest victim, really. We took the side of the rapist. That is what we did. We said to the NGO: If you want to help this child, give back the money because you cannot advocate for changing the law in your land.

So this clinic in Nepal turned back their money—our money—and fought for Min Min. She had her 14th birthday in prison. She had her 15th birthday in prison. But then, because they did not take American money and they were free to lobby in behalf of Min Min, they succeeded in changing the laws of Nepal, and they helped set that little girl free.

For their valor and their courage and their success in freeing a child from prison who was put there after she was raped by her uncle, this is what they had to do. They had to give up $100,000 in USAID funding, and they had to let 60 staff members go. They couldn't help more than 50,000 other people who desperately needed them.

These are the real stories behind this Presidential edict of the President, when he steps up to the plate and says I am putting in place a gag rule.

I am ashamed. I am ashamed that we were on the side of the rapist and against the side of a little girl who was a victim of incest. How can this Senate look at that story and say, yes, that's right, we want to be on the side of the rapist? Why should the rapist suffer? We don't want to change the laws in Nepal. To me, this example alone is enough reason to do away with this global gag rule.

Here is another point. We should always look at our policies and ask the question: Are our policies decreasing the number of abortions that take place worldwide because all of us want to decrease the number of abortions taking place worldwide. Frankly, the Mexico City global gag rule makes it far tougher to reduce the number of abortions. We support family planning counseling and care. We support family planning, I thought, because we want to prevent abortions. Between 1988 and 2001, modern contraceptive use in Russia increased by 74 percent, and the abortion rate went down 60 percent. So there is a direct correlation between contraception and education on how to use contraception and the abortion rate. I say this, even though I believe this should be a known fact, but sometimes we seem to forget it. So what happens when we punish a nongovernmental organization that is involved with family planning, such as that clinic in Nepal I talked to you about, that had to give back $100,000 and lay off 60 people? They could no longer serve the women who so desperately needed their help.

Is this President saying he wants to keep contraception away from women who are asking for it? Because if that is what he wants to do, this global gag rule is doing just that. This is a radical thing we are dealing with because when you tell agencies they have to make a deal with the devil, take money and then be gagged, many of them will say: I don't want your money. I would rather be able to advocate.

And if they do not take the money, then they are in a terrible circumstance because they have to lay off people who would otherwise go out and counsel young women about family planning. Then, when those young women, in the poorest of the poor nations, are desperate, unfortunately they may seek what we called here, when abortion was illegal, back-ally abortions—and women died. Many women have died, thousands every year across this globe, because of illegal, unsafe abortions.

I believe very much that family planning is the answer. It can bring us all together, whether we believe in a woman's right to chose or we believe the Government should be involved in it, we should not tell a woman, tell a family how to live their lives regardless of what side you are on. My goodness. Family planning ought to bring us together.

For those of us who believe abortion should be safe, legal, and rare, the way to get to that place is to have adequate family planning. For those of us who believe the Government should prohibit the jailing of women and doctors who have or give abortions, they should want to have family planning services so we have fewer abortions.

Why don't we hold hands on this vote as we have in the past and walk down the aisle together across those divides and say family planning is the way to make abortion rare? That is the key. But the global gag rule has the opposite impact. The global gag rule is causing more abortions because the nongovernmental organizations will not take the funding, they won't be gagged, and they won't have the staff to go out and give those women the advice and the contraceptions that they are asking for.

There is another issue that comes into play here, and that is the issue of HIV/AIDS. Preventing AIDS is very important. The use of modern family planning methods will help us prevent AIDS.

This global gag rule is dangerous. It is dangerous directly, and it is dangerous indirectly. It goes against our Constitution and freedom of speech. If this President tried to put this kind of gag rule on in America, he would be laughed out of the courts. Of course, they do not do that because we have something called the Constitution and freedom of speech. We don't go around putting a gag on doctors who have their own practices. We let them do what they think is right—to do no harm and to help people.

I want to talk about a school in Uganda where three of its students died from unsafe abortions. The same man impregnated the three girls. It was a horrible tragedy. But the local clinic still didn't know what to do since it received USAID funding. They had a situation where three girls were impregnated by the same man, and they didn't want to give back the money they had gotten from the United States of America. This is what they said.

What should the school do? Refer the girls to the clinic? It is a very difficult situation for the nurses. What can they counsel about? It is a problem if the provider is a member of that community. A person cannot even speak as a community member or a parent. Because how can you differentiate between an individual and the fact that they are an employee of a nongovernmental organization?

The point here is that if someone in the clinic in the area where one man impregnated three girls in the school feels that he or she can't speak out in their capacity as an individual citizen because they work for a nongovernmental organization that could be forced to give up its funding—this is a very bad policy. We are saying to clinics throughout the world that are supposedly trying to help that you must choose between limiting your services to a woman who comes to you in desperate need or shut down your doors because you have to give back the funding from the United States of America. It is really a stunning and unfair policy.

One of the Planned Parenthood chapters in my State is in Ethiopia right now. They are seeing firsthand the impact of the global gag rule on women's lives. Think about what it means to try to get health care in Ethiopia. If you are lucky, you might have only a 3-day or 4-day walk to a clinic—a 3-day or 4-day walk to a clinic in Ethiopia.

Less than 8 percent of the population has access to contraception. Only 20 percent get prenatal care. One in seven women die from pregnancies or unsafe abortions. In fact, backyard abortions are the second leading cause of death among women only, behind tuberculosis.

Because of the global gag rule that this administration has put in place, supplies to the largest planning provider in Ethiopia have been cut. They have been cut because they refuse to be gagged. The people in Ethiopia are looking to America with our Constitution and our freedom and our freedom of speech, and they are saying: We are not going to allow the President of the United States of America and this Congress to gag us. We will have to give back the money.

That is the most counterproductive thing we can do. Why? Because they are running out of the contraceptives because they don't have the money. They are less able to serve rural areas, only 7 percent of which have access to basic sanitation. They are less able to curb the rising tide of HIV which is sweeping over the population, leaving shattered lives and families in its wake.

Why would we want to be responsible for that? We don't have to be today. We are going to have a chance to do what the Senate has done year after year after year. We have stood up for women's health. We have stood up for freedom of speech. We have stood up for the right of people—even the poorest of the poor—to get access to health care, to find out what their options are, to know what the possibilities are, to fight for changes in the law.

The Senate has stood on the right side of this issue—on the correct side of this issue—for years. I am so proud of the Senate. We did it with almost all Democrats and many Republicans standing with us. I hope that happens today. If it doesn't, a message will be sent throughout the world—yes, to our troops in Iraq who are fighting to bring freedom of speech around the world, that here in the U.S. Senate, we have just stood with a global gag rule. I hope that is not the message we send.

I don't want to see us continue this global gag rule. It is hurting the very people we say we care about—the poorest of the poor, the women, the girls, the victims of rape, the victims of incest.

The amendment I plan to offer and which we have actually set aside is identical to the one we passed 2 years ago. It is very simple. It simply says that nongovernmental organizations cannot be denied funding solely because the medical services they provide with their own funds include counsel and referrals. They cannot be denied funding solely because they use their own funds to advocate for new laws. That is all we say.

In this amendment we admit very straightforwardly that no NGO can violate its own country's law. If abortion is illegal and you cannot refer people in your country, if they say that is the law of the land, of course, we support people paying attention to the laws of their country. But we do not say, and we shouldn't say and we wouldn't say it here, that these NGOs shouldn't be able to lobby for new laws. This is very important.

In Nepal they sent a 13-year-old girl away for 20 years. She was a victim of an uncle's incest. They let the rapist go free and there were no penalties for the parents who forced her to have an abortion. That NGO, that clinic that turned back USAID funding, said we are not selling out our people. We are not selling out a child for some dollars.

I cannot believe the side that we were on. The global gag rule put us on

the side of a rapist. That is what the global gag rule did. That is not a side anyone in this Chamber wants to be on. I hope everyone in this Chamber will vote to be on the side of the women who were the victims. They need us to be by their side.

Basically, what we are saying in our amendment is we believe in human rights. We believe in freedom of speech. We believe other countries should have the same freedoms we have in this country. And if we cannot gag people in this country, let's not do it abroad just because we can. Almost 60 years ago in the dark shadows of World War II, it was our country that championed the universal declaration of human rights, setting a standard for human rights all over the world. This is what that declaration said:

> [T]he advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people.

That is America after World War II. Can someone explain to me how America feels it is on the side of the good when we will punish a nongovernmental organization that goes to bat for a rape victim who is 13 years old? We are not on the side of human rights. We are on the side of people who are doing evil. That is wrong. That is not what our Government ought to be doing.

The aspirations of our country and of our people should be reflected in our policies. That is why I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what they have done over and over again: Stand up and be counted on the side of freedom and justice and the American way. It is the American way to foster freedom and justice, to allow people, even when we do not agree with them, to take their complaints and their points of view to their governments. That is what our soldiers are fighting for and dying for in Iraq, yet with this policy we stand on the side of tyranny.

I urge my colleagues to stand with us again. This is a bipartisan Boxer-Snowe amendment. I urge Members when the time comes—and I hope the chairman will let us know at what point we will be voting—I urge Members to stand with Senators BOXER and SNOWE in this bipartisan amendment to end the global gag rule.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, once again the distinguished Senator from California has presented her case, as always, with conviction and with eloquence. She is an able and a remarkable advocate for her position on this very important and controversial issue.

When President Bush restored the so-called Mexico City policy upon coming into office in 2001, he stated his conviction that United States taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions or for those who actively promote abortions as a means of family planning.

It should be made clear this does not lessen our country's commitment to strong international family planning programs. Indeed, President Bush's fiscal year 2005 budget requests $425 million for population assistance, the same funding level appropriated during fiscal year 2001, President Clinton's final year in office.

President Bush has confirmed his commitment to maintaining these funding levels for population assistance because he knows that one of the best ways to prevent abortions is to prevent unwanted pregnancies through voluntary family planning services. This is the policy of our Government today and it is one that President Bush advocates in the future.

I expect we will continue to have debates in the Senate on the Mexico City policy. As the distinguished Senator from California has pointed out, that has been the case for several years. Over the years there have been numerous attempts to reach compromise language that would satisfy all sides on this important issue, but no acceptable accommodation has thus far been found. This is why President Bush has advised us he will veto any legislation that seeks to override the Mexico City policy.

USAID can and does provide the family planning information services in developing countries through many foreign NGOs. The President has determined that such family planning assistance will be provided only to those foreign grantees whose family planning programs are consistent with the policies of this administration. Every President since 1984 has exercised that right.

As manager of the President's bill, I, along with every other Senator, must take seriously the President's statements that he would veto the legislation if it were presented to him without the Mexico City policy intact. I believe it is highly unlikely that he will change his mind at this point. The President has been very clear and the directives with regard to administration policy on this legislation are also clear.

I will oppose this amendment. I ask other Senators to do so for the reasons I have given.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senators CORZINE and MIKULSKI to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, women around the world should have access to safe health care, especially those who are struggling in some of our world's poorest nations. That is why I am in the Senate this afternoon to support the Boxer amendment. I thank Senator BOXER for standing up on an issue that affects women around the globe. I am very proud to be a cosponsor and supporter of this amendment.

This amendment is about ensuring that women around the world have access to health care that they need, especially reproductive health care. It does not get much attention, but in the developing world, complication from pregnancy is one of the leading causes of death for women. It ranks right up there with tuberculosis. According to the World Health Organization, more than half a million women die every year of causes related to pregnancy or childbirth. That is more than one woman dying every minute of every day. That is what we are talking about with this amendment. That is a crisis.

Now, you know when there is a medical crisis, something that kills hundreds of thousands of people every year, we do not just stand by. We work to make things better. In poor countries around the world, medical professionals and nongovernmental organizations are simply trying to make things better. They have set up clinics. They have done an excellent job. They are reaching out to poor communities. And they are opening the doors of access to women and families who desperately need health care. They are doing great work. But today their hands are tied, and even worse their hands are tied because the Bush administration has imposed a political ideology on the world. We cannot allow this undemocratic policy to deny women and their children health care and ultimately sentence them to die.

As my colleague, Senator BOXER, has talked about, when President Bush took office in 2001, he signed an Executive order known as the global gag rule. It denies U.S. funds to any overseas health clinic unless it agrees not to use its own—its own—private, non-U.S. funds for anything related to abortion. If you are a medical professional living in an impoverished country trying to help people, save lives, you are gagged from even talking about certain reproductive health services.

We would not stand for that in the United States. We know how important the doctor-patient relationship is. When we go to a doctor, we want to know that the doctor is giving us all the advice we need—not holding something back because of a gag rule imposed on him by someone else. But that is exactly what the global gag rule does. It is forced on women in poor countries around the world, and that is just simply wrong.

I am not going to take the time to go into detail on why I believe this gag rule is so wrong, but I just want to mention a few things. Simply put, the

gag rule undermines reproductive health care, it hurts our efforts to prevent HIV and AIDS, and it limits access to contraceptives. The gag rule places limits on women and doctors that we would never accept here in the United States.

But here is the bottom line and something all of our colleagues should remember as we go to vote on this amendment: This is about protecting women's lives. Today, the women around the world are being denied the care they need because of an ideological policy, and they are dying as a result. We cannot tolerate that as Americans, and that is why I have come to the floor this afternoon, to urge my colleagues to support the Boxer amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Thank young very much, Mr. President. I thank my colleagues for discussing this important issue and I appreciate Senator BOXER's concern. This is well-plowed ground that we have traveled over several times. We have been over this issue a number of years. The Mexico City Policy was first introduced by Ronald Reagan. It is a commonsense policy that President Reagan first put forward in 1984, based in part on his belief that U.S. taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize or support organizations that perform or promote abortions through international family planning programs, period.

President Reagan, as was typical in his way, looked at the root of the issue and said: I understand we have an enormous debate in America and around the world about the issues surrounding the questions ''when does life begin? Does it begin in the womb or not?'' There is an enormous debate about these important questions—and I am going to set that debate aside, President Reagan said, but I am going to say as well, the American public has very clearly defined itself on the issue of taxpayer funding of abortion. The people are saying: We may debate back and forth about the life issue, but we do not want taxpayer funding to provide for abortions, particularly overseas. That is just a bridge way too far for me to cross, too far from the very fundamentals of the debate, for now the country is a pro-life country and generally people are opposed to abortion taking place.

That was the 1984 decision put in place by Ronald Reagan, later overturned by President Clinton, later put back into place by President Bush. One of George W. Bush's first acts in office was to reinstate the Mexico City Policy. The Mexico City Policy simply prohibits provision of Federal taxpayer funds to organizations that ''perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning in other nations.'' It is a very simple issue. It is a very direct, straightforward issue. I want to say as well, that when individuals try to frame this debate by saying this is about women's rights and issues, and a lack of our support of them on the international level, I want to step aside for just a minute and point out the record of the Bush administration on women's rights, on issues in Afghanistan where women are now voting and actively participating in politics and society, is just tremendous.

Senator BOXER and I both put forward a bill about women's rights in Afghanistan, and, in addition, the Bush administration is implementing and remedying concerns for women in Iraq who are now voting and are now proudly waving their fingers with the ink stain upon them. Brave women are demonstrating their rights and standing up to defend their rights around the world. This administration, on a very practical level, is putting forth and implementing programs in great strides to assure women's rights around the world, and they should be congratulated for that and thanked for all their efforts.

Now, you can try to tie this question of taxpayer funding for abortions oversees back into that issue, but I do not think that is a fair point of the debate. The fair point of the debate is, it is taxpayer dollars. It involves the very difficult, sensitive issue of ''when does human life begin?''—a question which we have failed to resolve in this country as of this moment.

Should American taxpayers be funding abortions in many countries all around the world? People say: Well, there is more family planning now. The dollars do not go directly for abortion. The money is fungible. It can go into an organization and be used to replace dollars that can then be used for abortion. Why should we put that sort of ideology forward on another country when we have not resolved it ourselves?

I think the Bush doctrine, formerly the Reagan doctrine, the Mexico City Policy, should stand for good reason. It stands with the American public. We should not be using Federal taxpayer dollars to fund abortions overseas. That is the view of 75 to 80 percent of Americans.

Many Americans do not like the way we handle foreign assistance now anyway. I personally think we should be generous in our foreign assistance and in some cases do substantially more to alleviate poverty. But if you frame the debate into these sorts of issues alone, you start to drive away people's support for foreign aid and for supporting the good that is taking place in other countries. That is not a good thing to do, particularly when we have been given so much as a nation. I would hope we could help more overseas, but it has to be in a sensible way that the American public agrees with.

So while I appreciate being able to work with my colleague from California on many issues, this is one where we will have to part company. I really think President Reagan got this principle right, and the continuation of the Mexico City Policy by President Bush is right as well. Respectfully, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Boxer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I so appreciate my colleague coming to the floor and taking time to express his views, but I think it is very important to straighten out the record.

What my colleague is talking about is putting strings on U.S. taxpayer funds. That is the Helms amendment, and that has been the law since 1973. What the global gag rule does is different. It tells nongovernmental organizations abroad that they will lose U.S. funding if they use their own funds not ours, but theirs—to lobby to change egregious laws in their country.

In order for a nongovernmental organization to fight to change an egregious law, like the one that used to exist in Napal—which I know my friend would not agree with—that nongovernmental organization, I tell my friend, had to give back their USAID money because they were using their own funds to change the laws of Nepal. So we gagged this nongovernmental organization from helping a child who was raped. The rapist did not go to prison. The rapist—the uncle—was free. The parents did not go to prison even though they forced her to have an illegal abortion. The child went to prison.

The only way the nongovernmental organization was able to work to change the law in that country, which punished a child who was a victim of incest, was to give back the USAID money. Otherwise, they could not lobby for law changes in their own country.

Now, I use that example because it shows why this law is so egregious. And again, to make the point to my friend, the Helms amendment, which has been in place since 1973, already precludes U.S. Federal funds from being used by nongovernmental organizations in any aspect having to do with abortion. They already cannot use our funds to perform abortion. They already cannot use our funds to refer.

They already can't use funds to advocate. That is taken care of. The global gag rule is different from that. It is putting a gag around the very people who are trying to help prevent pregnancies, who are trying to help girls such as Min Min in Nepal who was the victim of incest. That is plain wrong. I don't mind my friend disagreeing with me. And we do agree on many issues and have worked together and will continue to. But I would hope we would not confuse the Helms amendment,

which has been in place since 1973 and does not allow a penny of taxpayer funds to go in any way to the provision of abortion services. Don't confuse that with the gag rule, which keeps nongovernmental organizations from being able to use their own funds as they see fit to help women and girls in tragic circumstances such as the one I described by changing the repressive laws in some of their countries.

I urge my friend to please be clear that these are different issues. We already deny the use of Federal funds for anything having to do with overseas abortion or its lobbying. But the gag rule takes it a step further and says these organizations that work so hard in the toughest environments cannot use their own funds in the way they see fit to advocate for changes in the law, to help women understand what their options are. And it is antithetical to the United States of America, to freedom of speech. My friend knows we couldn't do that here. We couldn't tell people here that they can't talk to their patients. That would be unconstitutional.

I urge my colleagues to please vote on what this issue is, not on what this issue is not. We live with the Helms rule. We are not changing that. We simply want to get rid of this global gag rule today. I hope Members will vote aye on the Boxer-Snowe amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, we are looking forward to conclusion of this debate and another debate prior to getting into the voting sequence at about 4:30. May I ask the participants, the distinguished Senator from California and the distinguished Senator from Kansas, could there be agreement that the amendment would come to conclusion in 20 minutes of time and that this be apportioned 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California and 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kansas? There would be no other speakers and that would conclude the debate. Then we would be able to proceed with an amendment by Senators CRAIG and BAUCUS.

Mrs. BOXER. If I may respond to the chairman, I have no problem. I would like to close the debate. That will be fine with us as long as I may conclude.

Mr. BROWNBACK. No objection from myself.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask that debate be of 20 minutes duration, that the time be under control of the Senator from California and the Senator from Kansas, and that the Senator from California be able to conclude the debate.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, 10 minutes each and no second-degree amendments; is that part of it?

Mr. LUGAR. That would be correct, no second-degree amendments.

Mrs. BOXER. Then I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair and the Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, responding to a couple of the comments of my colleague from California, I would like to cite and include in the RECORD a Congressional Research Service report on international family planning, the Mexico City policy. This report is dated April 2, 2001. And then another one, an updated one on population assistance and family planning programs, issued for Congress, May 19, 2003.

In the 2003 report, I want to cite this briefly because we are getting involved in a discussion about what the wording of the Boxer amendment does and what it does not do. I contend that clearly what could take place with the passage of the Boxer amendment, is that money could go to a foreign organization that performs abortions. These organizations can't use the money directly for abortions, but they can move private money to do abortions while using the government money for advocacy. That is what I am saying. My colleague is giving the illustration of this tragic situation that has occurred where there has been a rape in Nepal and this is a heart-rending example of these types of cases right before us now.

Regardless of how you view life, and when human life begins, we are going to set that issue aside but I hope we get to debate that issue one of these days. In this CRS report dated 2003, USAID issued additional guidelines on the implementation of the Mexico City Policy and stated that organizations could not ''perform abortions in a foreign country except where the life of the mother would be endangered or in cases of forcible rape or incest.'' So where my colleague is talking about a case of forcible rape taking place and a choice of an organization having to choose between performing an abortion or losing their funding, the USAID policy says that performing such an abortion is a specific exemption from this Mexico City policy that is squarely on point in this CRS report.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD selections from the two CRS reports that I have mentioned.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At Mexico City, Reagan Administration officials emphasized the need for developing countries to adopt sound economic policies that stressed open markets and an active private sector.

Again nearly a decade later, the Clinton Administration changed the U.S. position on family planning programs by lifting restrictive provisions adopted at the Mexico City Conference. At the 1994 Cairo Conference, U.S. officials emphasized support for family planning and reproductive health services, improving the status of women, and providing access to safe abortion. Eight years later, President Bush revoked the Clinton Administration position on family planning issues and abortion, reimposing in full the Mexico City restrictions in force during the 1980s and early 1990s. Throughout this debate, which at times has been the most contentious foreign aid policy issue considered by Congress, the cornerstone of U.S. policy has remained to be a commitment to international family planning programs based on principles of voluntarism and informed choice that give participants access to information on all major methods of birth control.

Nevertheless, the controversy spilled over into U.S. foreign aid policy almost immediately when Congress approved in late 1973 an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Section 104(f)) prohibiting the use of foreign development assistance to pay for the performance of abortions or involuntary sterilizations, to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions, or to coerce or provide persons with any financial incentive to undergo sterilizations. Since 1981, Congress has enacted nearly identical restrictions in annual Foreign Operations appropriation bills.

For the past 25 years, both congressional actions and administrative directives have restricted U.S. population assistance in various ways, including those set out in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and more recent executive regulations and appropriation riders prohibiting indirect support for coercive family planning (specifically in China) and abortion activities related to the work of international and foreign nongovernmental organizations. Two issues in particular which were initiated in 1984—the ''Mexico City'' policy involving funding for non-governmental-organizations (NGOs), and restrictions on funding for the U.N. Population Fund (UNFPA) because of its activities in China—have remained controversial and continue as prominent features in the population assistance debate.

During the Bush Administration, efforts were made in Congress to overturn the Mexico City policy and rely on existing congressional restrictions in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 banning direct U.S. funding of abortions and coerced sterilizations. Provisions adopted by the House and/or Senate that would have reversed the policy, however, were removed from legislation under threat of a presidential veto.

Efforts to Legislate the Mexico City Policy. Beginning in 1993, abortion opponents in Congress attempted to legislate modified terms of the Mexico City policy. Under the threat of a Presidential veto and resistance from the Senate, Mexico City restrictions had not been enacted into law until passage in November 1999 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2000 (P.L. 106–113).

In USAID-issued certification forms, organizations had to state that they would not engage in three types of activities with either USAID or non-USAID funds from the date they signed an agreement to receive FY2000 USAID population funds through September 30, 2001: perform abortions in a foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered, or in cases of forcible rape or incest; violate the laws of a foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or restricted; or attempt

to alter the laws or governmental policies concerning circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or restricted.

If an organization declined to certify or did not return the certification form, it was ineligible to receive FY2000 USAID population funds unless it was granted a waiver under the $15 million exemption cap.

The regulations also contain exceptions: abortions may be performed if the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or abortions performed following rape or incest; health care facilities may treat injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions (post-abortion care).

The new Administration Mexico City guidelines state that U.S. cannot furnish assistance to foreign NGOs which perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning in USAID-recipient countries, or that furnish assistance to other foreign NGOs that conduct such activities.

Examples of what constitutes the promotion of abortion include: operating a family planning counseling service that includes information regarding the benefits and availability of abortion; providing advice that abortion is an available option or encouraging women to consider abortion; lobbying a foreign government to legalize or to continue the legality of abortion as a method of family planning . . .

The regulations also contain exceptions to these policies:

abortions may be performed if the life to the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or abortions performed following rape or incest.

health care facilities may treat injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions (post-abortion care).

''passive'' responses by family planning counselors to questions about abortion from pregnant women who have already decided to have a legal abortion is not considered an act of promoting abortion.

referrals for abortion as a result of rape, incest, or where the mother's life would be endangered, or for post-abortion care are permitted.

Recipients of USAID grants, however, could use their own funds to engage in abortion-related activities, but were required to maintain segregated accounts for U.S. money in order to show evidence they were in compliance with the abortion restrictions.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Furthermore, I want to back up to an earlier point that I engaged on with my colleague. We live in a wonderful nation. This is a beautiful land. I have traveled to many of the developing countries around the world. They look up to America. They seek help and support from America. They seek our ideals. When we go there and we push issues such as abortion or are associated with groups that push issues such as abortion, we are reduced as a nation. Actions like this says to developing countries: We have issues such as malaria, we have issues such as HIV/AIDS, feeding our poor people, and you are out here pushing this ideology. Why are you doing that?

I go home to my constituents in Kansas. They think the foreign aid budget is about 25 percent of the budget, which it is not. It is about 1 percent. But then if a case such as this comes up, tax payer funding of abortions in developing countries—and they don't say it as much now—they say: We are funding abortions overseas, and we don't like it. I remember in 1994 hearing many people saying things such as that.

If we pursue this sort of policy, it diminishes our possibility to go to the public and say: We want to do whatever we possibly can to end poverty, hunger, and alleviate suffering in the world. We can do more and we want to do more. We are out there pushing to do more. If we force policies such as this, it cuts the knees out from underneath all our other efforts because then a number of people say: How are you doing alleviating poverty by funding a group that funds and works for abortion? How is this work alleviating suffering and poverty? It seems as though you are going against the very message you ought to be driving and pushing forward.

My colleague and I have come together to discuss and work on many important issues, but we disagree sometimes. We have different views on the point of life. But, from my work, I know that there are great groups of people in this country and a pretty strong majority that says we need to help more overseas. But it has to be sensible help. There have to be ways we can feed more people and ways we can take care of sickness, where we can end the fighting in places such as Darfur, where we can move forward in economic development, in ways such as the Millennium Challenge Account Program is structured to do.

Amendments such as this have a harmful overall impact on the body politic of this country, disrupting a chance to do something that is very noble and good. I understand my colleague is putting it forward as a noble cause. I don't think it is being received or can be viewed in that way.

With all due respect to my colleague and her heart for her goodness to do the right thing, this amendment is not helpful on many levels. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, my colleague misses the entire point. The reason this child was sent to prison in Nepal after incest by an uncle and being forced by her parents to have an abortion is because of the former law in Nepal. And the policy my friend is supporting, the global gag rule he extolls, prohibited that clinic from going to bat for this child and using its own funds to change the laws. To do that, they had to turn back their U.S. funding. Are you proud of that? They decided, this nongovernmental organization, to give back the money because they felt it was that important to fight for that child who was the victim of incest and get that law changed.

It took them several years. That child had a 14th birthday in prison, and she had a 15th birthday in prison. But they succeeded. One would think we would be on their side. One would think the United States of America would be on the side of a child who was raped and against a man who performed that act. One would think that is the side we would be on, the side of this child. But, oh, no, the global gag rule told that clinic: You cannot change the law because if you do that, you are violating the global gag rule.

That is the point. It is true there is an exception for rape and incest in the rule, but it does not apply if the country does not make an exception for rape and incest. So what we should say in those cases—at least work with me on this—is allow them to keep their money if they are working to change the law on rape and incest in their country. But my friend is not doing that. He wants the status quo.

Then we have the case in Uganda where three underage girls died from botched abortions. The same man impregnated them, and the clinic was afraid to help because they could lose all their American money. The girls died.

Is that what we are celebrating today, a policy that allows a child to rot in prison if she is raped, a policy that allows a rapist to be free, a policy that says three girls impregnated by the same man should die in a back alley? I hope not. This is very serious. This is not only about words. This is not a debate about when life begins. We can have that debate any day of the week.

I will tell my friend right now, I would die for his right to believe what he believes on that issue, and I hope he would die for my right to believe what I believe on that issue because that is a question between us and our God. That is not on the table today.

What is on the table is a real-life question: With whom do we stand? I hope when we come to this vote, which we are going to have shortly today, we are going to stand with the women and girls of the world who need our protection, not our vengeance, who need to know we are not going to gag the people who are there to help them, but, in fact, allow the people who are there to help them, to use their own funds to tell the truth about their life and their options and their health. This is a very serious matter.

Mr. President, if the other side will yield back its time, I will be glad to yield back mine; otherwise, I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, if I could have 1 minute. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I will address directly one point, if the

Senator does not object. I read from the CRS document May 19, 2003, on this topic:

In USAID-issued certification forms, organizations had to state that they would not engage in three types of activities with either USAID or non-USAID funds from the date they signed an agreement to receive FY2000 USAID population funds . . . :

Perform abortions in a foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered, or in cases of forcible rape or incest;

Violate the laws of a foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or restricted; or

Attempt to alter laws or governmental policies concerning circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or restricted.

As I understand it, USAID is required by the Mexico City language, that in horrific difficulties and circumstances, such as the case the Senator discussed, individuals may work with organizations who provide abortions. But it is on a narrow set of circumstances because the American public does not agree with taxpayer funding of abortions overseas.

I submit the report for the RECORD, and I yield the floor. If my colleague is prepared to yield back time, I am prepared to yield back time, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to respond.

Again, my colleague has made my point. He read into the RECORD exactly what I said. Under the gag rule, you cannot perform abortions except for rape, incest, or life of the mother. That is right. But here is the second point: You cannot attempt to alter the laws, and that is the exact reason I cited for why the nongovernmental organization that is prohibited from altering the laws of their country had to give back their funding. That is exactly the point.

My friend made my argument for me by reading what I have been saying. This nongovernmental organization wanted to change the laws in Nepal so that a child who was raped or a victim of incest would not rot in prison. They were precluded from using their own money to alter the laws of their country. My friend read it right into the RECORD, and I thank him for that. He made my point.

So, yes, at the end of the day, we stand with the rapist in this case against the child, and that is wrong, and that is the reason I hope my colleagues will join with me.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, in an effort not to belabor this too much, there is a set of semantics being argued back and forth. I invite my colleague to submit suggestions on regulatory changes to the USAID to try to address this narrow point, if that is, indeed, the case. I hope we do not, in focusing on a particular very narrow tragic issue and circumstance—and nobody is celebrating that tragedy—I hope we do not lose focus of the broader issue of taxpayer funding of abortions overseas.

We can focus in on this very narrow point of view—and it is a tragic circumstance, I will concede that to my colleague. Maybe we can negotiate a regulatory change to address these important concerns if these words do not do it. I think we are arguing semantics here. Let's not lose sight of the fact, which is that this amendment would send taxpayer dollars to fund abortions overseas.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Boxer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is as if we are talking past each other. My friend made the case for me. He read the restriction which is that no organization can attempt to alter the laws of their country. And so we are standing against people having their rights at self-determination. Can you imagine if we sent out a notice to our people, let's say on both sides of the gun debate, and said to both sides: You cannot discuss this matter with your representatives. We could not do that for 3 seconds. First, we would be run out of office on a rail. But we are willing to be an imperial power and tell others in other countries they cannot advocate on behalf of the people of their country.

The last point I will make is my friend keeps repeating the phrase ''U.S. taxpayer funds.'' He is confusing the debate. There was an outright ban written in 1973 by Jesse Helms which has been upheld in the Congress ever since that not a dime of U.S. taxpayer money could be used in any way, shape, or form to provide abortion. And there is another law that says you cannot use U.S. taxpayer funds to lobby. So those things are already set.

What we are talking about is an additional law put into place by the Bush administration after it was off the books for 8 years which says forget about U.S. taxpayer money, we are telling nongovernmental organizations that to get that money, they cannot use their own funds in any way to provide abortion, to counsel women, to tell women their options, or—and this is the case in point—even to lobby their legislature to change laws, such as the one that put this child in prison who is the victim of incest. I do not understand how we can stand on that side of this issue.

I can give you 100 examples. I do not want to take the Senate's time to do that. The other case was in Uganda where the clinic was gagged and could not tell these girls where they could go to get a safe abortion to end a pregnancy forced on them by a gentleman—I should not call him a gentleman—a man who impregnated three of his students, and the clinic was scared to say anything, and these girls got illegal, what they call backyard abortions in that country and died.

Now, why do we want to stand on the side of the law that is resulting in girls going to jail when they are raped by a relative and girls dying from botched abortions because we put a gag on the clinic? I hope this Senate will pass the Boxer-Snowe bipartisan amendment that will send a signal to the world that we believe very strongly in their rights to aggressively approach their government and talk about laws that may need changing, their rights to look a woman or a girl in the eye and say, look, regardless of what your religion is or what your feeling is, these are the options you have.

I do not think keeping women ignorant is a very liked policy, and anyone who votes for this global gag rule votes to keep the women of the world ignorant. I hope my colleagues will vote for the Boxer-Snowe amendment. I look forward to a successful vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senators for this debate. A vote will occur on it at a time in the future, probably in sequence with the 4:30 vote.

At this point, I have two points of important business. These are amendments that have been agreed upon.

AMENDMENT NO. 279

Mr. LUGAR. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] proposes an amendment numbered 279.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike section 207)

On page 24, strike lines 1 through 5.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, this amendment strikes section 207. It was scored by the Congressional Budget Office as containing direct spending that needed an offset. While there is some disagreement between the executive branch and Congressional Budget Office on the scoring, if section 207 were not stricken, the legislation would be subject to a budget point of order. I understand the staff of the Budget Committee and the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have come to an agreement, and this amendment removes the threat to the legislation. We know the State Department considers section 207 important. We will do our best to provide these authorities,

but we must do so in a way that is budget neutral.

For this reason, until a way can be found to resolve the scoring difficulties, we ask unanimous consent that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 279) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 280

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator SCHUMER, I send an amendment to the desk. This is an amendment that requires that foreign assistance be withheld from foreign countries that owe parking fines in Washington, DC, or New York City. The amount withheld would be 110 percent of the fines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], for Mr. SCHUMER, proposes an amendment numbered 280.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To impose an economic sanction on foreign countries that owe parking fines and penalties or property taxes to Washington, D.C. or New York City)

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE FOR PARKING FINES AND REAL PROPERTY TAXES OWED BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

SEC. . (a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), of the funds made available by this Act for assistance for a foreign country, an amount equal to 110 percent of the total amount of the unpaid fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes owed by the central government of such country shall be withheld from obligation for assistance for the central government of such country.

(b) PAYMENT. Funds withheld from obligation for a country under subsection (a) shall be paid to the jurisdiction to which the unpaid fully adjudicated parking fines or penalties or unpaid property taxes are owed.

(c) AMOUNTS WITHHELD TO BE ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—Subsection (a) shall not include amounts that have been withheld under any other provision of law.

(d) WAIVER.—

(1) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to parking fines and penalties no sooner than 60 days from the date of enactment of this Act, or at any time with respect to a particular country, if the Secretary determines that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

(2) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to the unpaid property taxes if the Secretary of State determines that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the initial exercise of the waiver authority in subsection (d), the Secretary of State, after consultations with the City of New York, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees describing a strategy, including a timetable and steps currently being taken, to collect the parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes and interest owed by nations receiving foreign assistance under this Act.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

(2) The term ''fully adjudicated'' includes circumstances in which the person or government to whom the vehicle is registered—

(A)(i) has not responded to the parking violation summons; or

(ii) has not followed the appropriate adjudication procedure to challenge the summons; and

(B) the period of time for payment of or challenge to the summons has lapsed.

(3) The term ''parking fines and penalties'' means parking fines and penalties—

(A) owed to—

(i) the District of Columbia; or

(ii) New York, New York; and

(B) incurred during the period April 1, 1997 through September 30, 2005.

(4) The term ''unpaid property taxes'' means the amount of unpaid taxes and interest determined by a court or other tribunal to be owed by a foreign country on real property in the District of Columbia or New York, New York.

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 280) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 274, WITHDRAWN

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that adoption of amendment No. 274 be vitiated and the amendment then be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. At this juncture, I ask the Chair to recognize the distinguished Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I ask that the pending amendments be temporarily set aside so I might offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to raise a question with the distinguished Senator from Montana. Would the Senator and his colleague, Senator CRAIG, be prepared to enter into an agreement that the amendment should have 36 minutes of consideration; namely, between now and 4:30, with the time equally divided between opponents and proponents, no second-degree amendments?

Mr. BAUCUS. I might tell the chairman that is certainly fine with this Senator.

Mr. CRAIG. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. What was the Senator's conditioning on the second degree?

Mr. LUGAR. The request is 36 minutes total for the amendment, 18 minutes per side, that concluding at the time of our voting sequence starting at 4:30.

Mr. CRAIG. Including all amendments?

Mr. LUGAR. Yes, with no second degree.

Mr. CRAIG. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Reserving the right to object, the minority leader staff tells me we have to check with other Senators on this side who may want to speak to this amendment, but why do we not proceed. I would object for the moment, but hopefully I can resolve this very quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 281

(Purpose: To facilitate the sale of United States agricultural products to Cuba, as authorized by the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000)

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] proposes an amendment numbered 281.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 282 TO AMENDMENT NO. 281

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], for himself, and Mr. ROBERTS, proposes an amendment numbered 282 to amendment No. 281.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify the payment terms under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000)

In the matter proposed to be added, strike section 2905 and insert the following:

SEC. 2905. CLARIFICATION OF PAYMENT TERMS UNDER TRADE SANCTIONS REFORM AND EXPORT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 908(b)(1) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7207(b)(1)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term 'payment of cash in advance' means the payment by the purchaser of an agricultural commodity or product and the receipt of such payment by the seller prior to—

''(i) the transfer of title of such commodity or product to the purchaser; and

''(ii) the release of control of such commodity or product to the purchaser.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on February 22, 2005.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a second degree of time certainty to the most important legislation of the Senator from Montana, S. 328, that was produced in bill form and now we hope can become an amendment to the State Department's authorization bill that deals with agricultural export facilitation. I speak to that most importantly because of the tremendously positive work that has been going on in agricultural exports between this country, our agricultural producers, and the Nation of Cuba.

I am in complete agreement with the President when he said:

> Open trade is not just an economic opportunity, it is a moral imperative. When we negotiate for open markets, we are providing new hope for the world's poor. And when we promote open trade, we are promoting political freedom. Societies that open to commerce across their borders will open to democracy within their borders, not always immediately, and not always smoothly, but in good time.

That was a quote in 2001. It is most appropriate today. Senator BAUCUS, myself, Senator ROBERTS, Senator HAGEL, Senator LUGAR, and 25 other Members of this Senate have grown increasingly frustrated with the bureaucratic effort at the Department of Treasury literally to shut down the intent of very important legislation that became law in 2000. The Trade Sanctions Reform Act recognized a need and an opportunity to sell agricultural products to Cuba for cash, that we would not ask the taxpayers of this country to facilitate. In fact, we would be very strict and very narrow in those relationships with the nation of Cuba because of overwhelming interests in a variety of other areas at that time, and it passed the Congress.

That became law. That law began to work. In the course of its workings, Cuba grew from a trading partner that was the 226th largest against all of our trading partners to the 21st largest this past year. We have produced and sold nearly $1 billion worth of agricultural products to Cuba since that law became operative in 2000. It has become one part of a total of valuable tools that the agricultural community of this Nation uses in trade.

Nearly 34 States have sold products to Cuba and that clearly speaks about the broad base of support that this legislation has.

Somehow and for some apparently very biased reason—let me be blunt—Cold War bureaucrats in the Department of Treasury at OFAC decided, no, we are going to change the law by regulation.

We are going to squeeze and push and deny, and as a result we will collapse the ongoing trade with Cuba that is clearly within the law and within the Trade Sanctions Reform Act of 2000.

What we do with this amendment offered to the State Department authorization bill, and my second-degree amendment, is very clear. We simply restate the law, the intent of the law. We want OFAC to understand what Congress's intent was. We define what a cash payment in advance is. We authorize the issuance of a general license for U.S. agricultural producers to travel to Cuba for the purpose of agricultural trade. We authorize direct cash payments to U.S. banks, cash payments. It is very important we understand that. We repeal section 211 as it relates to the 1999 Omnibus Act, and trademarks, and we clarify a variety of other issues.

What is most important, and for our colleagues who support us in this effort and support the agricultural community in our country's ability to sell to Cuba for cash, we say we are for all intents and purposes reinstating the intent of Congress as expressed in the 2000 law. That is what is important here. We do not believe it is the right or responsibility of Treasury to change the rules or the name of the game or the intent of the law. That is why the Senator from Montana and I have come to the floor, for that purpose. The Senator remains on the floor and I know wants to express his concern.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, first I thank the chairman of the committee, second my good friend from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, and other Senators who have cosponsored this amendment. There are at the present moment about 30 cosponsors of this amendment. It is bipartisan. I might say there is tremendous interest in this legislation also in the other body.

To review where we are, back in the year 2000, not too many years ago, we in the Congress approved legislation called the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act, otherwise known as TSREEA. What was the point of that legislation? It was legislation which authorized cash-in-advance food and medicine sales to Cuba. That is, the Congress carved out a substantive area of food and agricultural sales to Cuba. It did not provide a broad-brush authorization for trade with Cuba; rather, it narrowed it to food and to medicine for humanitarian reasons. It just made sense for the United States to be able to send its medicine and its food products, its agriculture, to Cuba. Clearly this made a lot of sense. Food should never be used as a weapon, and surely no dictator has ever missed a meal.

Second, big government has no business telling the U.S. farmers and ranchers to whom they could sell their products, for a lot of reasons. One is agriculture is facing such dire straits in many parts of our country. In addition, U.S. agriculture is facing a shrinking trade surplus. It used to be agriculture products exported overseas were the one big bright spot in the trade imbalance. That is no longer true. Agricultural programs are under tremendous pressure from budget cuts—more so now than has been the case in the past.

We should be looking around for new markets for American products, not cutting out export markets for American agricultural products. Cuba certainly presents a promising market for Montana and for American agriculture. Yet, unbelievably, the Treasury Department has recently issued a new rule. That rule makes it harder, it makes it much more difficult, for U.S. farmers and ranchers to sell agricultural products to Cuba. It makes it much more difficult in spite of the intent of the law we passed in 2000.

This rule by Treasury requires Cuba to pay for goods before shipment instead of before delivery, as was the case in the last 3 years after the act was passed. For some reason, here in 2005, a few years after the act has been in operation and working, the Treasury Department passes new regulations, just out of the blue, which make it much more difficult for American farmers to sell their products to Cuba. If Cuba pays for the goods while they are still on U.S. soil, these goods, under this new rule, become Cuban assets, which make them vulnerable to seizure to satisfy unrelated claims.

What is the effect of that? That has a very chilling effect. Treasury says it issued this rule as a ''clarification'' of the intent of Congress in the bill we passed in the year 2000. Let me be clear. My colleagues and I did not vote for a bill to enhance exports to Cuba that contained payment restrictions so severe as to render U.S. exports uncompetitive or worse. Clearly we did not pass a bill, we did not vote for a bill which makes it more difficult to sell agricultural products to Cuba rather than less difficult, and this regulation makes it more difficult. That was not the intent of Congress. We pass the laws. We decide what the laws of the Nation should be. It was our intent

that agricultural sales should proceed unimpeded on a cash basis to Cuba.

When Treasury proposed this rule, I and colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Chambers made our point very clear that we did not intend this. It was not our intent to have this interpretation.

Why is this so important? Cuba, the largest island in the Caribbean, was worth $400 million to U.S. agriculture exporters in the year 2004. Since 2001, Cuba has purchased more than $800 million in agricultural products from 35 States in our Nation, making that island the 25th largest export market for agricultural products.

A year and a half ago, I led a trade mission to Cuba, and I walked away with what I think is a pretty good deal for my State of Montana: $10 billion in agricultural products on a cash basis; and the fact is they bought $10.4 million of agricultural products from my State of Montana. I went back last December and signed a new agreement, this time worth $15 million for Montana agricultural products. Unfortunately, that agreement is now in jeopardy because of the new rule.

In the interim, Treasury passed this new rule. It also applied this new rule even to sales completed months earlier on a retroactive basis, which is totally unfair. The rule is wrong in the first place. It makes it doubly wrong when it is retroactive. We have $3 million worth of wheat and pea shipments lined up, and now they have to be renegotiated or abandoned because of this Treasury rule. That is wrong, just dead wrong. I, in this body, have worked hard to sell agricultural products to Cuba and will not stand idly by while Government bureaucrats try to undo all that hard work.

First, this reverses that Treasury rule and clarifies the intent of Congress for Cuba to pay cash for delivery of U.S. goods before delivery, not before shipment. This will ensure that cash sales continue as they have without interruption.

Second, the amendment gives general license to producers and port authorities to travel to Cuba whenever they have agreements to negotiate. This is a big point. Very often, the United States makes it very difficult with a huge amount of bureaucracy and paperwork to go through when the American agricultural exporter wants to go to Cuba to negotiate an agreement. It makes it difficult to do so if we can't go to Cuba to put the deal together.

Third, it requires greater transparency in visa processing for the Cuban buyers and inspectors who have legitimate itineraries in the United States related to the sale or inspection of TSREEA-authorized products.

Again, if a State has sales to Cuba, it only makes sense if the State Department can allow a representative for the Government of Cuba or the representative of agriculture, the purchaser, to come visit that State to see what products that State has in mind. So far the Government is making it very difficult for that to happen.

Fourth, this authorizes direct banking relations for authorized agricultural sales only. We are not talking about any other product. We are talking just about authorized agriculture sales—direct banking relations which would have the effect that U.S. banks can deal directly on this matter rather than as currently is the case where they would have to go through a third party, where European banks are making money off the U.S. agricultural sales.

Finally, this amendment repeals an obscure trademark law that benefits no U.S. company, but puts at risk thousands of U.S. trademarks, including those branded food products sold to Cuba in the past 3 years. Section 211's supporters say it protects confiscated trademarks but in fact makes very clear no government—not even Fidel Castro's—can expropriate legally registered trademark rights. It is impossible to do. That is why this provision must be enacted.

The truth is, section 211 was enacted to interfere in an ongoing rum label dispute. The fight is not my concern. But what concerns me is unless we fully repeal section 211, Cuba has the right, under international trademark law, to deny U.S. trademarks reciprocal recognition. That does not make any sense.

In conclusion, I am here to urge us to pass this amendment. It allows American farmers and ranchers a break. More importantly, let them do what we intended them to do when we passed that law in the year 2000. Let us send a message to Treasury that when we pass laws, we mean it. It is not for Treasury. They are the executive branch, and they are supposed to implement the laws, not make new laws, which in effect Treasury is doing by changing its regulations. They are being totally irresponsible. There comes a time when, frankly, it is up to us to put a stop to it and say this is not right and we are going to change it.

I see many of my friends on the floor. I thank my good friend from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, who cosponsored this amendment.

I say also that I support the trade amendment offered by Senator CRAIG, a perfecting amendment which will help implement the major underlying amendment which I described.

I yield the floor but reserve the time we have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, are we under a time agreement at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me make a couple of comments about this, and first credit my colleagues Senator CRAIG, Senator BAUCUS, and many other colleagues who have worked so hard on this. Their leadership is especially appreciated.

Go back 5 years to the year 2000 when I, then-Senator John Ashcroft, and my colleagues Senators CRAIG, BAUCUS, and others passed an amendment here in the Senate that became law. The amendment we offered which became law said that American farmers could sell food into the country of Cuba as long as Cuba paid cash for that food. Since that time, we have sold over $1 billion worth of agricultural commodities into Cuba. When we debated that 5 years ago, I was on the floor of the Senate saying I think it is almost immoral for any country to use food as a weapon. Food ought not be a weapon in foreign policy.

Does anybody here think that for 40 years when we prevented the sale of food to Cuba we injured Fidel Castro? Does anybody believe Fidel Castro missed breakfast, or lunch, or supper, or dinner, because of our embargo on food, because we decided to use food as a weapon? It didn't hurt Fidel Castro. When we use food as a weapon, it hurts hungry, sick, and poor people. That is what happens.

One day not too long ago—a couple of years ago—22 train carloads of dried feeds left the State of North Dakota, my home State, to go from our farms to Cuba to be fed to the Cuban people. Cuba paid cash for it. It was the first shipment in 42 years.

We have people who never liked that law; didn't like the fact that Congress passed that law; still want to use food as a weapon. What has happened is the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Asset Control has decided to illegally, in my judgment, redetermine how they interpret that force of law that requires cash payment for food. Normally, when you buy something, when they give you the product, you pay cash and they give you the product. That is the way it is. You pay the money, they give you the product.

What the Department of Treasury has decided in OFAC is that the Cubans would have to pay for this. By the way, they paid cash through a European bank because they can't use a U.S. banking institution. They have to pay for it before that shipment even leaves the local country elevator. It dramatically changes the circumstances of being able to sell and be competitive. They are doing it for one reason, because those who did this don't want American farmers to sell food into the Cuban marketplace. The Canadians sell into the Cuban marketplace. The Europeans do. But they want to go back to the good old days when the American farmers were paying the cost of an embargo. They are dead wrong.

It is interesting. We are told repeatedly and have been told for years that

the way to move Communist countries into the mainstream toward democratic reform is through trade and travel. I have been to the country of China; I have been to Vietnam—both Communist countries. We encourage trade and travel with Communist countries, China and Vietnam. But when it comes to Cuba, a Communist country headed by Fidel Castro, who admittedly keeps sticking his finger into our country's eye—I understand that. It is not about Fidel Castro. It is about our farmers being able to sell food into the Cuban marketplace. When it comes to Cuba and Castro, he has lived through 10 Presidents and over 40 years of an embargo.

The fact is this amendment is necessary in order to stop the Treasury from doing something that the Congressional Research Service says they do not think is legal.

Let me make another couple of comments that relate more generally to a related issue. The Office of Foreign Asset Control is an agency down in Treasury that is supposed to be tracking money supporting terrorism. That money supporting terrorism is to be intercepted by OFAC in their investigations, trying to figure out who is supporting Osama bin Laden, and how do we shut down their funding. Guess what. This little agency, which has 21 people, triple the number of people who are working on Osama bin Laden's funding supply, is trying to figure out how they shut down trade and travel to Cuba. They are investigating American citizens who are under suspicion of having taken a vacation in Cuba without a license.

I have a picture of a young woman I have shown on the floor of the Senate many times. Her transgression was she went to Cuba to pass out free Bibles on the streets of Cuba and OFAC tracked her down and fined her $10,000.

Trade and travel are two related issues that I believe would work with Cuba, as they work with China and Vietnam. I believe the Communist countries I have described, China and Vietnam as examples, have moved toward more democratic reforms, not completely, but as a result of our policy called engagement, travel, and trade.

With respect to Cuba, we have had this some 40-plus years embargo that simply hasn't worked. But the piece of the embargo, the piece of that issue my colleagues Senator CRAIG and Senator BAUCUS and I and others now want to address is to correct something that is happening down at the Treasury Department that we believe misinterprets current law to correct something the Congressional Research Service says is being done which they believe is not legal. We will find any way we can to force this correction.

My colleagues have described—I shall not go into any greater detail—the provisions. It allows generally visas for agricultural sales to Cuba. If you are going to sell and have a trade relationship, you have to go there and talk about what you have to sell. It would express the sense of Congress that we should issue visas to Cubans who want to buy U.S. agricultural goods, and want to come here. They have systematically refused to give visas to some of these top food-buying Cubans who would come to this country to purchase food. It also fixes payment and advance issues and resolves those kinds of problems that have arisen in recent months with the new ruling by OFAC.

One final point: The current Secretary of the Treasury knows, as did the previous Secretary of the Treasury, that what is happening is goofy; totally without good sense. They know that.

I had a hearing one day when I was chairing a subcommittee, and Treasury Secretary O'Neill was there. I asked him about four or five times. He didn't answer. I knew why he wouldn't answer; it was because he would get in trouble if he did. But about the fifth or sixth time I asked the question—I knew he would eventually answer—he finally answered candidly. I said, Wouldn't you, if you had the choice, rather than track people suspected of vacationing in Cuba, rather than trying to shut down agricultural trade, if you had the choice, use your assets in OFAC to track terrorist money and shut down terrorism?

He finally said, of course. The next day he was chastised publicly by the White House for saying that. We do not get that kind of answer out of anyone in the administration anymore.

This is very simple. It is not a partisan issue. It is the expression of Congress, on a bipartisan basis, Republicans and Democrats, that we ought not use food as a weapon. It is immoral. Farmers should not the pay the cost of this country's foreign policy. It makes no sense to allow the Treasury Department to misinterpret law and to try to shut down the ability of United States farmers to sell food to Cuba.

To close where I began, let me say again, these policies have never hurt Fidel Castro. He has never missed a meal. It hurts poor people, hungry people, and sick people in Cuba, and it hurts American farmers. The policymakers who do this know that, they know both of those circumstances and they do it, in my judgment, to perpetuate a political advantage they think exists somewhere in about two States in our country. I think they are wrong.

On behalf of this country's farmers and on behalf of the people in Cuba who would buy and who would need that food, I believe we ought to pass this amendment to the underlying bill.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 273, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent an amendment numbered 273, previously agreed to, be modified with language that is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment (No. 273), as modified, was agreed to as follows:

On page 12, strike lines 16 through 18, and insert the following:

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) FISCAL YEAR 2006.—Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2006 are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2007.

(B) FISCAL YEAR 2007.—Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2007 are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2008.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that following the vote at 4:45 on the resolution regarding Pope John Paul II, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Boxer amendment; provided further that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I will take the time before the vote to rise in support of the Craig-Baucus amendment. I am a cosponsor of S. 328, the bill on which the amendment is based. I appreciate the views of the Senators on both sides of the Cuban embargo issue. In the Committee on Foreign Relations, concerned Senators have offered constructive ideas on how to approach Cuba with the goal of transforming that island into a democracy, even as Senators disagree on interim policy steps.

My view is within the defined limits of Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, United States businesses and farmers should be able to sell products to Cuba. In the interest of expanding opportunities for U.S. agriculture, 5 years ago Congress enacted this law. It exempts from the trade embargo on Cuba commercial sales of agricultural and medical products and allows only for cash sales. No credit or subsidies to the Cuban Government are allowed.

This law has provided a new market for our farmers and ranchers. The American Farm Bureau has reported that since the passage of the bill, United States farmers have sold approximately $800 million in agricultural products to Cuba. Exports to Cuba have more than doubled since 2002, reaching approximately $400 million in 2004. Growth in the Cuban market has become especially important as the United States agricultural trade surplus has narrowed over the last 2 years.

Recently, the Bush administration issued a clarification to our Cuban export policy which changed the payment terms of cash sales to Cuba. The Treasury Department rule will make it more difficult to sell agricultural products to Cuba.

The amendment would reverse the Treasury rule by returning it to the status quo payment terms. That has worked well since 2001. It also would cut some of the redtape that makes United States producers less competitive in the Cuban market.

Expanding international markets in our hemisphere and the world will have a positive impact on the lives of Americans. All sectors, especially American agricultural, benefit from the opportunity to sell products to other nations that create jobs in the United States. My home state of Indiana is a world leader in agricultural production and manufacturing. If we hope to sustain our economic strength in the 21st century, we must participate in an expanding global economy. We must aggressively pursue opportunities in new markets and we must keep our competitive advantage and sell our products worldwide.

As a Senator, I worked in the Congress to support trade and economic policies that I believe are in the best long-term interests of our Nation. Constricting agricultural sales to Cuba would have little or no effect on the Cuban regime, particularly since the rest of the world does not participate in our embargo. It would, however, limit the ability of our farmers and our ranchers to sell their products abroad.

I urge my colleagues to support the Craig-Baucus amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATING TO THE DEATH OF THE HOLY FATHER, POPE JOHN PAUL II

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 4:45 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to a vote on the resolution relating to the death of the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II.

The clerk will report the resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 95) relating to the death of the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 82 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Dole	McCain
Alexander	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Dorgan	Mikulski
Baucus	Durbin	Murkowski
Bayh	Ensign	Murray
Bennett	Enzi	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Feinstein	Obama
Bond	Frist	Pryor
Boxer	Graham	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bunning	Gregg	Roberts
Burns	Hagel	Rockefeller
Burr	Harkin	Salazar
Byrd	Hatch	Santorum
Cantwell	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Chafee	Inouye	Sessions
Chambliss	Isakson	Shelby
Clinton	Jeffords	Smith
Coburn	Johnson	Snowe
Cochran	Kerry	Specter
Coleman	Kohl	Stabenow
Collins	Kyl	Stevens
Conrad	Landrieu	Sununu
Cornyn	Lautenberg	Talent
Corzine	Leahy	Thomas
Craig	Levin	Thune
Crapo	Lieberman	Vitter
Dayton	Lincoln	Voinovich
DeMint	Lott	Warner
DeWine	Lugar	Wyden
Dodd	Martinez	

NOT VOTING—2

Allard	Kennedy

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 95

Whereas Pope John Paul II was one of the greatest spiritual leaders and moral teachers of the Modern Era; and

Whereas he set an extraordinary example of personal integrity and courage, not only for his fellow Catholics but for people of every religious and philosophical viewpoint; and

Whereas throughout the course of his pontificate he campaigned tirelessly for human rights and human dignity throughout the world; and

Whereas he practiced and inspired resistance to the great totalitarian systems and tyrannies that rose and, with his help, fell in the 20th Century; and

Whereas he fostered harmony between Catholics and Eastern Orthodox and Protestant Christians, reached out in friendship to Jews, Muslims and members of other faiths, and warmly promoted interfaith understanding and cooperation; and

Whereas he dedicated himself to the defense of the weakest and most vulnerable members of the human family; and

Whereas on his visits to our country he has called all Americans to be true and faithful to the great principles of liberty and justice inscribed in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution; and

Whereas his selfless service to God and man has been an inspiration to Americans and men and women of goodwill across the globe; Therefore be it

Resolved That the Congress of the United States joins the world in mourning his death, and pays tribute to him by pledging to be ever faithful to our national calling to be ''one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all,'' and to help our neighbors in immeasurable ways.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2006 AND 2007—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 278

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes evenly divided relating to a vote on amendment No. 278, the Boxer amendment. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will support the Boxer-Snowe amendment. It is very important to make sure women around the world are given the health care they deserve. Since 1973, the Helms amendment has been in place. That means no American funds can ever be used for anything to do with abortion. But the global gag rule which we are trying to overturn goes much further. It says nonprofit organizations overseas cannot use their own money to help a woman by giving her options, by giving her a referral. It even says a nongovernmental organization would lose all their USAID funding if they advocated to change a very restrictive law in their own country. This is clearly unconstitutional if it were applied here in America.

With our men and women dying around the world for freedom, I do not think we should say there should be no freedom of speech in these countries. We overturned this law many times. I hope we will do it again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues. This is well-plowed ground. We have been around this issue since 1984, with Ronald

Reagan putting this policy in place. The Boxer amendment overturns that policy. This is about taxpayer funding of abortion overseas.

We can separate the issue of abortion here altogether and say we are not going to talk about that, but this is taxpayer dollars used to support organizations supporting abortion overseas. We talk about different semantics. That is what it does. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. Clearly, 70-plus percent of the American public would be against that. Let's work on foreign policy issues and funding of things on which we have great unity, not ones on which we are divided.

I respectfully urge a vote against the amendment of my colleague, Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Feinstein	Obama
Bayh	Harkin	Pryor
Biden	Inouye	Reed
Bingaman	Jeffords	Reid
Boxer	Johnson	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kerry	Salazar
Cantwell	Kohl	Sarbanes
Carper	Landrieu	Schumer
Chafee	Lautenberg	Smith
Clinton	Leahy	Snowe
Collins	Levin	Specter
Conrad	Lieberman	Stabenow
Corzine	Lincoln	Stevens
Dayton	Mikulski	Warner
Dodd	Murkowski	Wyden
Dorgan	Murray	
Durbin	Nelson (FL)	

NAYS—46

Alexander	DeWine	Lugar
Allen	Dole	Martinez
Bennett	Domenici	McCain
Bond	Ensign	McConnell
Brownback	Enzi	Roberts
Bunning	Frist	Santorum
Burns	Graham	Sessions
Burr	Grassley	Shelby
Chambliss	Gregg	Sununu
Coburn	Hagel	Talent
Cochran	Hatch	Thomas
Coleman	Hutchison	Thune
Cornyn	Inhofe	Vitter
Craig	Isakson	Voinovich
Crapo	Kyl	
DeMint	Lott	

NOT VOTING—2

Allard Kennedy

The amendment (No. 278) was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DODD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 283

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] proposes an amendment numbered 283.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To Express the Sense of the Senate concerning recent provocation actions by the Peoples Republic of China and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following new section:

SEC. .

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) During most of last four years relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China have been relatively stable;

(2) The recently released 2004 State Department Country Report on Human Rights continues to characterize China's human rights as poor;

(3) Bilateral economic and trade relations are important components of the United States/Chinese relationship,

(4) China's growing international economic and political influence has implications for the United States competitive position and for maintaining a strong domestic industrial base;

(5) Taiwan remains an extremely sensitive and complex bilateral issue between the U.S. and the Peoples Republic of China;

(6) The U.S. decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China in 1979 was based upon the premise that the future of Taiwan would be determined solely by peaceful means and in a manner that was mutually satisfactory;

(7) The Taiwan Relations Act makes clear that peace and stability in the region are in the political, security and economic interests of the United States;

(8) The United States has consistently urged restraint by both China and Taiwan with respect to their actions and declarations; and

(9) The anti-succession law adopted by the Chinese National People's Congress on March 14, 2005 targeted at Taiwan's independence advocates was a provocative action which has altered the status quo in the region.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

1. China's anti-succession law is destabilizing to regional peace and stability, and is therefore of grave concern to the United States;

2. The United States Government should employ all diplomatic means to encourage the repeal of that law so the regional stability can be restored;

3. The United States Government should continue to speak out with respect to China's human rights practices and advocate the release from detention of all political and human rights activists;

4. The United States Government should more effectively promote United States economic and trade interests by insisting that the People's Republic of China lives up to its international trade obligations to respect and safeguard U.S. intellectual property rights and cease artificially pegging its currency exchange rates; and

5. The United States Government should undertake a comprehensive review of the implications of China's growing international economic and political influence that are byproducts of its expanding network of trade agreements, its aggressive shipbuilding programs, its efforts to cement scientific and technological cooperation arrangements, and secure additional oil and gas contracts; and should determine what steps should be taken to safeguard the U.S. industrial base and maintain and enhance United States economic competitiveness and political interests.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is not my intention to debate the amendment at this moment, but I wanted to get in the queue. I will defer any debate on the amendment until a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, we have been attempting to arrange for a vote on the Lugar amendment. Senator BIDEN would like to debate that amendment, as I understand it. It may be that an arrangement can be made for a conclusion of debate tonight and a vote certain tomorrow morning. But for the moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 284

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator WYDEN and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 284.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit funds from being used for television broadcasting to Cuba)

On page 16, strike lines 13 through 21 and insert the following:

(1) INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS.—For ''International Broadcasting Operations,'' $620,050,000 for the fiscal year 2006 and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year 2007.

(2) BROADCASTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS.—For ''Broadcasting Capital Improvements,'' $10,893,000 for the fiscal year 2006 and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year 2007.

(3) PROHIBITION ON TELEVISION BROADCASTING TO CUBA.—None of the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in paragraph (1) or (2) may be used to provide television broadcasting to Cuba.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I visited with Senator LUGAR and Senator BIDEN and indicated, on behalf of myself and Senator WYDEN, I would offer the amendment. We would be prepared to discuss it in the morning, but we will be happy to have it set aside for other business on this legislation. I want to say also it is not our intention in any way to delay this legislation. It is a very important amendment to us and I think to the Senate. But when we come back tomorrow to spend some time talking about it, we will not necessarily take very much time, and we will hope for favorable consideration by the full Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, very briefly, I thank Senator LUGAR and Senator BIDEN, in particular, for working this arrangement out with Senator DORGAN and me. We think this is a waste of money. We are anxious to talk about it tomorrow after folks have had a chance, overnight, to look at it.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the chance to make these brief remarks.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it appears there are a couple of minutes before we move on. I will debate the amendment, along with my colleague, Senator WYDEN, more extensively in the morning. I will not take a lot of time. But as long as the floor was available, I wanted to indicate that the amendment we just laid down deals with TV Marti.

We fund broadcasts into Cuba on something called Radio Marti which are very effective. The Cuban people listen to Radio Marti. Of course, they can listen to Miami radio stations as well. But we also fund something called TV Marti, and we have done it for years. The Government of Cuba, of Fidel Castro, jams the signals. We have Fat Albert, an aerostat balloon up there thousands of feet in the air, and the American taxpayer is paying for a fancy studio down on the ground. And up through this cable to Fat Albert we actually send signals into Cuba, television signals that the Cuban people can't see. Traditionally, they have been broadcast from 3 to 8 in the morning, and they are systematically jammed.

We have been spending about $10 to $12 million a year, and we have been doing it for years. We have spent almost $200 million doing it. Now the President wants to double the funding. There is something called waste, fraud, and abuse. I am not exactly sure where this fits, but it is one of the three. It fits with something else called stupidity.

We ought not continue to pay to send television signals to a country that can't receive them or television signals to people who can't see them because the Government is jamming them. Let me say that the Acting Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau, Mr. Brian Coniff, testified before the House Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

He said: Transmission to Cuba has been consistently jammed by the Cuban Government. The American official said that. This transmission of television signals has been systematically jammed by the Cuban Government. We don't have any official evidence that the audience has increased due to broadcast schedule change. They did have some anecdotal evidence that just a smattering of Cubans would be able to spot the signal that we broadcast into Cuba. Before the Castro government caught the signal and jammed it, they would get a minute or two. So that is a sighting. That is a Cuban who was able to see the signal of TV Marti. They finally stopped measuring that because the audience was so miniscule as to be almost zero.

Finally their argument was, the same official says: TV Marti, though jammed, is well positioned to be an important instrument of U.S. foreign policy should a crisis occur on the island.

So there we are. We have big, old Fat Albert up there, an aerostat balloon sending signals to the Cuban people they can't see. We spend $10, $12 million a year on something we don't have. And now the President says we should double that. And do you know how we are going to do it? A balloon isn't enough and a balloon causes problems because the balloon got off of its aerostat mooring and went over the Everglades, and we had people on grappling hooks and ladders trying to tame the balloon that was broadcasting signals into Cuba. So now they want to buy an airplane.

If this were a television show, it would be a comedy. Now they want to buy an airplane for $8 million to send signals into Cuba that they can't receive. All of this would be funny were it not for the fact that this is paid for by American taxpayers. If ever there was a case of waste, fraud, and abuse in government spending, it is this.

It is not partisan. There is no Democratic waste or Republican waste. There is just plain old waste. It seems to me when you see something that doesn't work, isn't needed, shouldn't be done and doesn't function at all, maybe it is time for all of us to say: This we can get rid of.

This is not the largest amendment offered this year. It is roughly $20, $21 million. But it saves money; $21 million is a lot of money in my hometown. It saves the taxpayers money and stops doing something that has always been completely ineffective.

We broadcast in Radio Marti. That is effective. The Cubans listen to it. They can listen to commercial stations from Miami for that matter. But Television Marti has never worked because the Castro government systematically jams it. So we send signals no one can receive.

This amendment, I hope, should be simple enough. I know there will be some who may have an apoplectic seizure about my offering this amendment because there are a couple of States where the Cuban vote is very important and there are some in the Cuban community who think we are doing something very important and very worthy if we send signals from this country that can't be seen by the Cuban people. That escapes some notion of mine that would represent logical thinking. But nonetheless there may be some who will feel that way.

We will have a broader discussion of this tomorrow. I support many of the broadcasting programs we have. Many have been very effective. But this is pure, solid, thoughtless waste. It is time for this Congress to take a stand to shut this spending down.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BIDEN be recognized in order to offer a substitute amendment to the language proposed to be stricken; provided further that there be 30 minutes equally

divided for debate this evening; provided further that at 10 a.m. tomorrow, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Biden amendment, with no amendments in order to the Biden amendment prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 286

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the Lugar amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] proposes an amendment numbered 286 in lieu of the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 266.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a second degree amendment related to the United States share of assessment for United Nations Peacekeeping operations)

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken, insert the following:

''Section 404(b)(2)(B) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (P.L. 103–236) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) For assessments made during calendar years 2005, 2006, and 2007, 27.1 percent.''

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I will be very brief. The amendment I have sent to the desk does a simple thing. It maintains the current cap on the amount that the United States contributes to the United Nations peacekeeping missions. It keeps it at 27.1 percent for the next 2 years.

For those who may be watching, they may wonder what that is all about. When a peacekeeping mission gets sent overseas, authorized by the United Nations, the countries in question have a prior assessment as to how much they are going to pay, usually based on the size of their countries and the size of their economies, and it has been agreed to by us that the appropriate figure for the United States to chip in is 27.1 percent. So if it costs $1 million for peacekeeping, our share would be $271,000, and so on.

Let me briefly explain the history of the law and what this does to the Lugar amendment.

In 1994, Congress unilaterally limited what we would pay for the peacekeeping endeavors of the United Nations. We said we will no longer pay any more than 25 percent. I believe at the time we were paying 31 percent. That is what the previous administrations had agreed to. That is what the U.N. was assessing us, 31 percent. We said in 1994: No, no, we are not going to pay any more than 25 percent.

What happened was, we never negotiated that rate with the United Nations. We unilaterally stated that. We did not go back to the U.N. and say: Look, we want to reconfigure how much we are paying. We want to go down from 31 percent, which we had been paying, to 25 percent. It never occurred, and the U.N. continued to bill us at 31 percent. So if a peacekeeping mission was $1 million—and none are as cheap as $1 million—we were getting billed $310,000 and we only agreed to pay $250,000. So we were in arrears of $60,000.

The bill that my former colleague Jesse Helms and I did in the late 1990s to clear up what the United States allegedly owed—everybody used to call it dues, but it was more than dues. This peacekeeping is part of what people euphemistically refer to as dues. The accumulated obligation that we owed to the United Nations, although somewhat in dispute, was a little over $1 billion.

Senator Helms, and many others, when he was chairman of the committee, argued that we should not be paying any of this; we did not owe any of these arrears. Senator Helms, after conferring with his trusted aide who has passed away, the Staff Director for the Foreign Relations Committee, Admiral Bud Nance, when he realized a lot of this was owed to some of our friends such as Great Britain, Europe, and others, he said I did not realize that; OK, we should pay that amount we owe. But in the process Senator Helms, Senator LUGAR, myself, and many others also thought there should be reforms that should take place in the United Nations. In addition to settling this arrears question, we wrote a much larger bill that required some changes and commitments on the part of the United Nations as well. In the process of doing that, Senator Helms agreed and the Helms-Biden legislation said we would only pay at 25 percent.

The Ambassador to the United Nations at the time was Richard Holbrooke. Richard Holbrooke, who was in negotiation with the United Nations to try to get them to agree that we would only pay 25 percent and that they would agree with that beyond us unilaterally asserting it, worked out an agreement that said the United Nations agreed we would only pay 27 percent. I know what I am talking about sounds arcane, but it is real money. Senator Helms and I said: OK, close enough. And we agreed to amend the Helms-Biden law to let these arrearage payments flow.

What we never did was repeal the underlying law that was passed in the Congress, signed by the President in 1994, that said we would pay no more than 25 percent. The underlying law in 1994 was never repealed.

In 2002, because these arrearages are running up again, the difference between 25 percent and what the U.N. thought we owed and what we had been paying at the 27 percent, we put in a provision in the law, a 3-year amendment that amended the 1994 law putting a ceiling on our payments at 27, not 25, percent through the year 2004.

Last year, we came up against this issue again, and the Appropriations Committee, because we were unable to get our bill passed, extended the 27-percent number through calendar year 2005. So if nothing else is done now, the 1994 law kicks back in, and our maximum payment drops from 27 percent to 25 percent, and we are back in the same old tangle of building up arrearages of whatever the 2-percent difference would be every year that we thought we solved initially. So we need to address this issue. We do not want to get into this fight again.

The U.N. peacekeepers perform critical functions in the area of conflict and instability around the world. They monitor cease-fires, human rights conditions, clearing minefields, disarming combatants, providing humanitarian assistance, and organizing and observing elections, which all costs money.

The U.N. peacekeeping missions have become increasingly critical in the past year as authorizing missions that support U.S. policy objectives for stabilization in Burundi, Haiti, and other places, as well as an operation to Sudan which will begin to deploy in the upcoming weeks.

Through missions such as these, the United States contributes to international peace and stability while sharing the cost of doing so with other nations. Therefore, it is my view that we need to continue to pay our U.N. peacekeeping bill, the one negotiated by Holbrooke, particularly at this point in time when we are asking for and need U.N. cooperation on issues such as democracy building in Iraq, post-tsunami disaster relief in Indonesia, and other areas.

I remind my colleagues, and I am in no way being critical of my chairman, the bill we reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee corrected the problem. It said we are lifting the 25-percent cap passed in 1994, and we are doing it permanently. What the chairman of the committee is doing is introducing an amendment saying: I guess, on second thought, I do not like that idea very much. I want to now go back and amend what passed 18 to 0 and say we are going back to the 25-percent level.

I know that is complicated for all the Members, but the bottom line is my amendment does what the President's budget request proposed. I want to do it permanently, but the President said keep it at 27 percent for another 2 years. That is what the President requested. That is what I am attempting to amend the Lugar amendment with. If I prevail, the President's position

prevails. We no longer go in arrearages, and we put off another 2 years reckoning with the underlying problem.

I see my colleague from Maryland is in the Chamber. With the permission of the Senator from Indiana, I would be happy to yield to him on this point. There is a time agreement. I do not know how much of my time I have used, but I am sure we could accommodate the Senator for the time he wants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I will be brief. I rise in very strong support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I do it out of respect for his past efforts in addressing this issue, along with Senator Helms. I have to confess that, at the time, I thought we should pay all of our arrearages without those conditions. We had a very difficult situation in the U.N., but in the end, the situation was negotiated out and an agreement was reached on the 27 percent. So as long as we pay that amount, we are not falling into arrears.

If we drop the 27 percent down to 25 percent, as I understand the amendment of the chairman of the committee would do, we immediately throw ourselves back into a situation where we start building up arrears. In effect, we end up going back on an agreement that was reached after very intense negotiations with the U.N., as I recall, led by Ambassador Holbrooke at the time.

Interestingly enough, the current administration, the Bush administration, as I understand it, is supportive of the position that the Senator from Delaware is offering with this amendment. This amendment is consistent with what the administration has sought in terms of extending the 27-percent cap.

Now, the bill as it came out of the committee extended that cap permanently. This amendment would extend it for 2 years. I understand that is the administration's position. Given all of that and the importance of this, I would hope that the chairman of the committee would find it within his reasonable judgment to accept this amendment. I do not think we ought to be having an intense division over this because it seems to me it makes extraordinarily good sense to do this amendment. Earlier, we imposed a unilateral cap. It did not work. We had very complicated relationships. We were able to work that out. We were able to pay off our arrears.

Our influence is going to be diminished in any international body if we are sitting at the table and our representative is in a position where the United States is in arrears to these very institutions that we helped to found and establish and to make a success over the years.

In fact, we are going to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations this year. So it seems to me that is a very sensible amendment. It does pull back a bit from what was in the committee-reported bill, from a permanent 27 percent cap to a 2-year extension, which conforms to the administration's position. But to go down to 25 percent, as the underlying amendment proposes, would simply recreate all of the difficulties we previously encountered and previously went through.

In a sense, I appeal to the chairman of the committee to see the wisdom in the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware as a very reasonable, positive, and constructive way in which to address this issue.

So I very much hope he will find it possible to accept the amendment of the Senator from Delaware as we proceed in trying to move this bill through the Senate.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield briefly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THUNE). The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senators from Delaware and Maryland pointed out, and certainly Senator BIDEN was very heavily involved in the Helms-Biden legislation of 1999, that legislation which came after considerable argument in the committee and in the Senate, perhaps in the country, about what our fair share ought to be, the Helms-Biden decision was that the U.S. share of peacekeeping duties would decline to 25 percent of the world total. That still remains the law and important goal of U.S. policy toward the United Nations, at least for many Senators.

Expression has been made tonight that perhaps our Nation ought to be more generous, and that could very well be the result of negotiations with the United Nations, but the intent, at least, of the amendment that I offered earlier in the day would strike section 401, which established a permanent cap of 27.1 percent. Senator BIDEN's substitute changes that permanent idea to a 2-year cap of 27.1 so that perhaps pragmatically there is some room and time to come to some agreement either up or down from that point.

I simply observe that this issue, long before Senator Helms and Senator BIDEN reached a bipartisan compromise in 1999, exercised strong feelings on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate very much the sentiment of the Senators who wish to preserve the 27.1 cap. As I pointed out earlier in the day, I believe that we ought to pay our dues.

Furthermore, I believe the United States has obligations of a humanitarian sort, quite apart from the pragmatic aspects of peacekeeping, which are important. Nevertheless, my hope had been that by in essence setting aside the issue out of this bill that we would give the U.S. negotiators the most leverage possible to obtain whatever our goals and objectives may be. I think there may be some ambivalence as to what those goals are. It may be ambivalence of a generous sort; namely, given all of the problems occurring in the world, we may wish to take on more. On the other hand, I would observe, as certain other Senators have, that the United Nations is in the process now of a great deal of reform thinking.

The Secretary General, Kofi Annan, has suggested very substantial reforms. We are about to have a hearing on the nominee for our country's representative at the United Nations, John Bolton. I am certain many Senators on the committee will question Secretary Bolton on his ideas about reform and how he could be effective in bringing about a stronger United Nations and what the correct presence ought to be and what the correct leadership ought to be. Peacekeeping ought to be a part of that negotiation.

I would further observe that in the coming weeks Congress will have further opportunities to work with President Bush and his administration to craft the most effective means of reducing the U.S. share of assessments or increasing them, as may be our preference. I believe this is an issue in which further consultation with the executive branch is desirable.

For the moment, I appreciate that Senators will continue to have strong feelings about the United Nations generally, as well as our degree of participation financially and otherwise. That has been the nature of several debates over the years, and each time one of our authorization bills comes to the floor, this issue arises in one form or another. Nevertheless, I will oppose the Biden amendment with the recognition that, as a substitute, if it is adopted, it will be language that I hope at least goes to final passage of this legislation.

If the Senator's substitute is not adopted, then he has assured me that by voice vote we will adopt the amendment I offered earlier on and proceed on to other considerations.

I hope the Senate will adopt my point of view because I believe it offers more latitude for our administration and offers, perhaps, a more constructive avenue for reform of the United Nations and perhaps some leverage for both. In any event, I appreciate the sincerity of the debate, the importance of the issue, the recognition of the history of this debate over several years of time, and at least the resolve that tonight is the point at which I think we must make a decision.

Mr. BIDEN. I realize I have no more time. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes off the time of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. I am happy to yield the Senator 2 minutes of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, very briefly, necessarily, the administration has not asked for any latitude. The administration is quite clear. They came up and said there is nothing we are trying to negotiate on 27 percent for dues. They didn't ask for that. Speaking to the Secretary of State, I asked her about Assistant Secretary Bolton, nominee for the United Nations post. She assured me he shares the administration's view. The administration's view was sent to me in writing. It said we ask you to extend for 2 more years at the 27-percent number. There may be negotiation in the future. But as recently as an hour ago—although this was not the subject matter, in my discussions with the Secretary of State—no reference was made by me to anyone in the administration that they were desirous of having a stronger negotiation in hand by keeping this at 25 percent.

So it may turn out to be that. The administration's statement says—this is Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, date April 5, 2005:

> Section 401 makes permanent the 27.1 percent United Nations peacekeeping rate, which is not consistent with the Administration's request for a two year extension.

So they are asking for a 2-year extension. They didn't want to make it permanent, but they asked for 2 years. That is the only point I want to make.

Mr. SARBANES. What does the Senator's amendment do?

Mr. BIDEN. My amendment does exactly what the administration asks. I thank the Senator for the additional 2 minutes.

Parliamentary inquiry: Tomorrow the vote is set for 10, and I believe the Senator from Delaware will have 2 or 3 minutes before the vote?

I thank my colleague. I yield the floor. I see our friends are on the floor to debate another substantive issue, and I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. I will conclude at least my portion of the debate by saying I recognize the Senator from Delaware does visit and works carefully with our administration. I appreciate that. I think it is important that America present as united a voice and face to the world as we can. I would just observe, pragmatically, that the administration in my judgment would like to have some latitude on an issue that has divided the Senate as well as the country for some time.

I don't think this is a monumental subject. I think it is one that, clearly, constructive people can resolve. My hope is we can simply strike the peacekeeping issue from the bill so that latitude is available for whatever reform, reconstruction, and debate the administration reformers may wish to have at the U.N. in the coming months.

Having said this, I appreciate Senators staying with this debate. We understand another will be on the way and there will be a short debate on this issue at 10 o'clock or thereabouts tomorrow, and then a vote on that issue before we retire to see the distinguished leader from Ukraine.

I yield back my time.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for S. 600, the State Department and Foreign Assistance Authorization bill. I commend Chairman LUGAR and Senator BIDEN for their efforts to make the authorizing role of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee real again, and to thank all of my colleagues on the committee for their hard work on this bill, which represents a strong bipartisan consensus in favor of energetic, engaged diplomacy.

I am especially pleased that this bill contains a number of provisions that I authored, including a provision emphasizing the importance of supporting press freedom in Ethiopia. Many of my colleagues may be aware of the Government of Ethiopia's recent troubling decision to expel representatives of the National Democratic Institute, the International Republican Institute, and the International Foundation for Election Systems from the country in the lead-up to the May elections. But I suspect fewer people know about the Ethiopian Government's well-established pattern of suppressing the independent press. According to the Committee to Protect Journalists, ''in the run-up to 2005 elections, the ruling Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front came under increasing criticism from local journalists and international media organizations for its antagonism toward the country's private press. Authorities continued to imprison journalists for their reporting and to intimidate others into silence on sensitive issues, such as government infighting and Ethiopia's tense relations with its neighbors. Throughout 2004, local journalists and international press freedom groups petitioned the Ethiopian government to revise a repressive press bill, with little success.'' The United States-Ethiopian relationship is an important and complex one. American support for a truly free press should be a part of it.

This bill also contains a provision I authored encouraging a more focused effort to combat impunity and build judicial capacity in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda. In the eastern part of the DRC, government troops and rebel fighters have raped tens of thousands of women and girls, but fewer than a dozen perpetrators have been prosecuted. The brutality of these crimes and the staggering scale of the problem, which has gripped the region for years without attracting adequate international attention, demand justice. Similarly, impunity for brutal crimes against civilians is the norm in Burundi. But if Burundi's peace process is to deliver lasting stability and bring an end to the horrifying violence that keeps families afraid to sleep in their homes at night, the international community must work to help create a strong and independent judiciary in the country. Rwanda continues to struggle with the backlog of serious cases relating to the 2004 genocide, and in Northern Uganda, civilians are too often trapped between the thugs of the Lords Resistance Army and a military presence that has not proven able or willing to provide security or justice. These problems are moral outrages, but they are also destabilizing factors. Over the long run, reasserting the rule of law in Central Africa must be a part of ending the cycle of conflict in the region, and creating space for peaceful development.

This bill also contains authorizing language for the administration's Global Peace Operations Initiative based on language that I authored for the African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance program, or ACOTA, which is subsumed in the Global Peace Operations Initiative. This language will ensure that Congress and the administration have a shared set of understandings about the nature of this program and about criteria for participation as we move forward with this effort to strengthen global capacity to share the burden of difficult peacekeeping missions. By clearly stating that human rights standards and democratic governance are important factors in determining eligibility for participation, and by explicitly calling for outreach to civil society in participating countries, this language can help build confidence in this important program and avoid the mistakes of past military assistance initiatives.

I know that the administration and colleagues on both sides of the aisle share my conviction that the global fight against HIV/AIDS is one of the most important and urgent issues of our time. This bill contains an amendment that I offered that supports efforts to provide treatment to the millions infected with HIV, by requiring full transparency regarding the price of the HIV/AIDS drugs being purchased with U.S. assistance under the auspices of the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or PEPFAR. Last year, the GAO found that PEPFAR is purchasing antiretroviral drugs that differ in price by as much as $328 per person per year from corresponding generic drugs. Shining a light on what is being accomplished with US taxpayer dollars will help us all to determine if there are responsible ways to stretch those

dollars further to save more lives. My provision does not require that any specific drugs—be they generic or brand name—be purchased. It simply requires reporting on what is purchased and on how much it costs. I have asked Ambassador Tobias in the past directly about his support for this kind of transparency, and he has assured me that he absolutely supports transparency. I firmly believe that this kind of transparency is in everyone's interest, protecting taxpayers and supporting AIDS relief efforts.

The bill also contains a provision I authored related to Indonesia. This provision simply requires the administration to report to Congress on the status of the ongoing investigation of the murder of American citizens that occurred on August 31, 2002 in Timika, Indonesia, before releasing funds for certain military assistance programs for Indonesia in 2006. As my colleagues know, for the past two years Congress has supported language restricting Indonesia's access to certain, very narrowly defined types of military assistance, pending a determination that the Indonesian Government and military are fully cooperating with the FBI in the investigation of the murder of American citizens that occurred on August 31, 2002 in Timika, Indonesia. Secretary Rice has made such a determination for the current fiscal year, but this issue is by no means resolved. The FBI considers this an ongoing investigation, and the FBI has not exonerated anyone. A number of questions remain unanswered, and clearly other conspirators were involved.

Most importantly, I believe that resolution of this case means that efforts are made to hold those responsible for the ambush accountable for their actions in a court of law. But even the one individual indicted by the U.S. remains at large, and has been neither indicted nor arrested by Indonesian authorities. It is important to keep Congress apprised of ongoing cooperation in this ongoing investigation, as this case tells us a great deal about the context in which our bilateral relationship is moving forward. I look forward to receiving this report, and I certainly hope that it will contain positive news that will reinforce the United States-Indonesian bilateral relationship.

This bill also contains the text of several important measures that I have cosponsored and strongly support. The Global Pathogen Surveillance Act, which will help strengthen international capacity to cope with the threats of biological terrorism and infectious disease, has been turned into a title in this bill, and I commend Senator BIDEN for his excellent work on this issue. Similarly, the Protection of Vulnerable Populations during Humanitarian Emergencies Act is also reflected in this larger authorization bill. This provision will help place the U.S. Government on a firmer footing to address the special vulnerabilities of women and children confronted by humanitarian crisis. Once again, I commend Senators BIDEN and LUGAR for their efforts on this issue.

This bill is not perfect. Reflecting the administration's budget request, this bill cuts the Development Assistance, Child Survival, and International Organizations and Programs accounts in order to dramatically increase the budget of the Office of Transition Initiatives. But the administration acknowledges that OTI will not actually administer this new money. The reasoning behind this request is to give the administration more flexibility with four very different countries—Haiti, Sudan, Afghanistan, and Ethiopia. While I am sympathetic to the need for flexibility in these important countries, I am also alarmed at essentially putting the entire foreign aid budget for these countries in an account that does not operate under the rules and restrictions that apply to other types of foreign assistance. I am also concerned about the likely consequences for OTI itself, which has never handled a budget of more than $50 million and was always intended to be a small, highly flexible, very special entity. I urge my colleagues to consider these provisions carefully and to oppose this blank check approach to foreign assistance.

Overall this bill is a vitally important step toward placing the congressional role in foreign policy on a more serious footing. When we consider the stakes in world affairs; when we consider the potential for the developing world's vast youthful populations to grow into allies rather than resentful enemies, when we consider the potential for increased international cooperation in fighting terrorism, we can see that our constituents and future generations stand to gain a great deal from getting foreign policy right. At the very least, we need to start by taking these issues seriously, authorizing important activities and programs, and giving important initiatives the support they deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h–276k, as amended, appoints the following Senator as Chair of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group during the 109th Congress: the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

FRANK PERDUE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge the passing of a great Marylander, Frank Perdue, Sr., who helped build the poultry industry on the Eastern Shore, a leading entrepreneur, a philanthropist. He passed away of Parkinson's disease a few days ago.

Born in Parsonburg, on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, Frank Perdue grew up working in his family's egg business—collecting and cleaning eggs from childhood. But Frank Perdue was determined to take the family business to another level—and it was his tremendous capacity for hard work that did just that. When Perdue said, ''It takes a tough man to make a tender chicken,'' America listened, and Frank Perdue became both a savvy businessman and a cultural icon. Today Perdue Farms employs more than 20,000 people across America and has annual sales of about $3 billion.

I am proud to work have worked with Frank Perdue—and now with his son Jim Perdue—to fight for fair trade policies that enable Maryland chicken producers to export around the world.

As Frank Perdue's business soared, he worked to bring Maryland with him. He became a great benefactor to Salisbury University, establishing the Perdue School of Business with a generous gift. Once a college baseball player and always a baseball fan, Frank Perdue brought the Delmarva Shorebirds to Salisbury in 1996, and then built the team and the Eastern Shore community a stadium. It is for both his business sense and his philanthropic heart that I salute him today.

Frank Perdue and I came from different ends of the political spectrum. Yet we both believed that the best social program is a job—and that we must give help to those who practice self-help. We joked that we should do an ad for a group we both support—we would say—we're two tough birds from the right wing and the left wing—but we both support this tender cause.

Today as we grieve the loss of one of Maryland's finest, Frank Perdue, we send our thoughts and prayers to his family and his many friends and colleagues.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT SHANE KOELE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I speak in remembrance of an Iowan who has died in service to his country. A member of the 212th Military Police Company, SSG Shane Koele died on the 16th of March from injuries sustained when his military vehicle ran over a land mine the day before near Shindand, Afghanistan. He was 25 years old and is survived by a wife, Cheryl, a young daughter, Kiley, a mother, Mary Donnenwerth, a father, Keith Koele, and two sisters.

Staff Sergeant Koele grew up in Hartley, IA, and graduated in 1998 from Hartley-Melvin-Sanborn High School. He attended college at Northwestern College and Wayne State before joining the Army. After serving in Iraq for 6 months in 2003, Shane returned home to get married. He was sent to Afghanistan on March 13, 2005.

SSG Shane Koele is remembered by family and friends as a true hero. President Ronald Reagan once said, ''Those who say that we're in a time when there are no heroes, they just don't know where to look.'' Today, we don't have to look far. We have only to remember with pride SSG Shane Koele and all those who have died in courageous service to their country. As his family and friends grieve their loss, I can only offer my prayers and my gratitude.

CHILD LABOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, it is with extreme disappointment that I come to the floor today. This week the New York Times ran a story detailing a recent agreement signed between Wal-Mart Stores and the Department of Labor. Wal-Mart was fined just over $135,000 for 24 child labor violations that occurred in New Hampshire, Arkansas, and Connecticut. One of the most egregious violations involved a boy who injured his thumb while using a chain saw to cut Christmas trees. Others were operating cardboard balers and chain saws, which are illegal for anyone under the age of 18 to work on. The $135,000 figure is a paltry figure that demonstrates DOL's lax enforcement policy. A $135,000 penalty against a company the size of Wal-Mart has the same financial impact as a 40-cent penalty for a million-dollar company. DOL has sent American companies a message with this settlement: violators of child labor laws needn't worry about child labor, even if they are caught.

Beyond this minimal fining of Wal-Mart, the Labor Department recently released new regulations that place young workers at greater risk of serious injuries. The new regulations are the first since the May 2002 release of a report detailing dozens of deficiencies in our Nation's child labor laws. The report, published by NIOSH, recommended over 40 changes in child labor laws to better protect America's employed youth from dangerous jobs and equipment. Since the 2002 release, it is estimated that more than 600,000 child workers have been injured in the United States. Among the disappointments in the new regulations, fast food restaurants can now employ 14- and 15-year-olds to operate deep fryers and grills that are cooled to 100 degrees Fahrenheit. According to NIOSH, however, half of all burn injuries among child laborers occur in fast food restaurants. In another regulatory change, 16- and 17-year-olds are now allowed to load paper balers and compactors that meet specified safety standards. Since 1954, children under the age of 18 have been prohibited from any contact with these machines. As with cooking, compliance with this standard will require vigilance by employers who put youth in contact with these machines. Unfortunately, the Labor Department requires no specific training for young workers under these new regulations. Issuing regulations that sometimes allow exposure to certain machines, equipment, and hot surfaces, but not to others, is confusing both to workers and employers. It is bound to result in young workers being exposed to greater dangers. Additionally, young workers still work at dangerous heights, on tractors, in pesticide handling, and in exposure to lead and silica. These hazards and more are recognized in the NIOSH report but have yet to be addressed by the Labor Department.

Sadly, this is not the first instance of Wal-Mart employing dangerous and illegal child labor. In March 2000, the State of Maine fined the company $205,650 for violations of child labor laws in every one of its 20 stores in the State. In January 2004, a weeklong internal audit of 128 stores found 1,371 instances in which minors worked too late at night, during school hours, or for too many hours in a day. In the most recent fine levied against Wal-Mart, the average fine per violation is approximately just $5,600. This is about half of DOL's maximum penalty of $11,000 per violation. Wal-Mart banks $285 billion in annual sales. This is not what one would classify a financial hardship.

The most disturbing part of Wal-Mart's settlement with the Labor Department is not even the small and insignificant fines, however. The distressing part of the agreement are the special favors handed out to Wal-Mart. The agreement, which was signed on January 6, was not even made public until now. It took a reporter to question officials about concerns raised by several DOL employees that the agreement gave Wal-Mart special favors. Those employees have remained anonymous, however, due to their fear of retaliation.

What special favors were given to Wal-Mart? First off, DOL promises to give the retailer 15 days' notice prior to any ''wage and hour'' investigation, like failure to pay minimum wage or overtime. As my colleagues will recall, I have tried for the past year to get the Department of Labor to reverse their damning new overtime provisions which stripped overtime pay benefits from thousands of American workers. This administration's Labor Department continues to stand opposed to respecting worker rights, child labor rights, and overtime rights. But Wal-Mart is really their perfect ally, since they do not allow their workers to unionize. DOL's cozying up to Wal-Mart is outrageous and completely unacceptable. By doling out these special privileges, worker rights in America are taking a giant leap backwards.

The degree to which the current administration has relaxed worker rights should not be seen in a partisan light. Elizabeth Dole, U.S. Secretary of Labor in the first President Bush administration, launched a crackdown amidst record levels of reported child labor law violations in America in 1990. She reminded all Americans that ''the children of America are our future. The Department of Labor will do everything within its power to protect children against those who violate our child labor laws. The first step in this process is to reassess our fine structure and take immediate action to step up enforcement.'' This was the view of a previous Republican Department of Labor. Sadly, we have regressed.

According to John R. Fraser, who was our Government's top wage official under the first President Bush and President Clinton, said the advance-notice provision was unusual. Quoting Mr. Fraser from the New York Times article:

> Giving the company 15 days' notice of any investigation is very unusual. The language appears to go beyond child labor allegations and cover all wage and hour allegations. It appears to put Wal-Mart in a privileged positions that to my knowledge no other employ has.

And an anonymous DOL employee, who is a 20-year veteran of the Department's Wage and Hour Division, said ''with child labor cases involving the use of hazardous machinery, why give 15 days' notice before we can do an investigation? What's the rationale?''

I don't know what the rationale is, Mr. President. There is no viable excuse for this agreement. It flies in the face of our labor laws. It seems more than coincidental that this Labor Department which has taken away overtime pay is now coming close to rewarding a corporation for doing the same. Is it mere coincidence also, then, that Wal-Mart gives more money to the Republican Party than any other corporation in America? Wal-Mart's political action committee, the biggest company PAC in America, gave Republicans 81 percent of its $1.3 million in donations in the past 2 years, the highest proportion of any of the top 25 corporate PACs, according to PoliticalMoneyLine, a nonpartisan Washington-based group.

Wal-Mart's top three managers each gave the maximum individual contribution of $2,000 to President Bush's campaign last year and Jay Allen, vice president for corporate affairs went one step further. He raised at least $100,000 to reelect the President, earning him the Bush campaign's designation of

''Pioneer.'' I bet he had to work some overtime to fit that into his busy schedule.

It is often said that money buys influence in Washington, DC. I certainly hope that is not the case here. I would hope that just because Wal-Mart gives so heavily to the Republican Party they are not given special favors by our Republican President. So Mr. President, I urge the Department of Labor to rethink this agreement. How can child labor be investigated if companies are given 2 weeks' advance notice? Of course they will clean up their act temporarily, but what is to stop them from again regressing into their illegal ways? Nothing. There is no incentive. This agreement was completely unwarranted and should be reversed at the earliest possible time.

NORTH CAROLINA TAR HEELS MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the University of North Carolina Tar Heels men's basketball team on their national championship. This is the fourth NCAA Division I title for this storied program and a well deserved finish to an amazing season.

Now, I know some of you are wondering . . . Yes, I am a Duke graduate and a Duke fan, and as you know, Duke and North Carolina have one of the most legendary rivalries in the nation. That being said, I truly have been behind this team—I even wore Carolina blue to several events in North Carolina last week to show my support!

On Monday night, the Tar Heels defeated the Illinois Fighting Illini 75–70 in a remarkable display of teamwork and talent. Led by the performance of Raymond Felton and Sean May, the Tar Heels played strong basketball on both ends of the court. They were able to make critical baskets when the game was on the line and played tenacious defense that stifled their opponent. With this victory, this year's Tar Heel team has solidified its place in college basketball history alongside Carolina greats such as Michael Jordan and James Worthy.

Roy Williams, who returned to his home state and alma mater just two years ago, earned his first title and demonstrated once again why he is one of the best coaches in college basketball. Under his leadership, this group of talented young men developed into truly great players with heart and determination.

The Tar Heels' Sean May was named most outstanding player in the Final Four for his dominant scoring and rebounding. Sean finished an incredible season with 26 points and 10 rebounds against Illinois.

This year started with great expectations as the Tar Heels were picked as the pre-season #1 team by Sports Illustrated. However, in recent years, such impressive rankings were not always the case. Seniors on this Tar Heel team faced great adversity early in their careers as they fought to overcome a disappointing 8–20 season their freshman year. Still, these players were determined to work hard to become a better team. And did they ever. Just 4 years later, these young men completed an incredible turnaround and are now able to call themselves national champions.

Today is a proud day for Coach Williams, his terrific players and the state of North Carolina. College basketball is a special tradition for so many North Carolinians. It is a pastime shared from generation to generation and amongst neighbors and friends. It's what so many folks chat about at the grocery store, before class, over dinner, and after church. We are so proud of the North Carolina Tar Heels' accomplishments this season and delighted that they gave us yet another memory to talk about for years to come.

I yield the floor.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS MEN'S BASKETBALL SEASON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Monday night in Saint Louis a dream season came to an end. The University of Illinois was defeated for only the second time this season as they fell to the University of North Carolina Tar Heels. But as painful as the loss was, it does not detract from a remarkable season.

Head coach Bruce Weber and his Illini should know there is nothing to be disappointed about. As much as I would have enjoyed seeing the Illini conclude their remarkable run with an NCAA championship, there is no doubting what the Illini have accomplished. The team tied an NCAA record with 37 victories. They made the first championship game appearance in the school's 100-year basketball history. They won regular-season and conference tournament Big 10 championships and were ranked first overall in the Associated Press poll since early in the season.

If I could pick one word to describe the Illini this season, it would be ''team.'' Rarely has a group of young men worked together as well as the Illini has. After Illinois defeated Louisville 72 to 57 on Saturday evening, Louisville head coach Rick Pitino said, ''I don't know if they necessarily had the greatest talent I've seen from a Final Four, but they're the best team I've seen in some time.''

The Illini are the ultimate team, and that is the ultimate compliment to coach Weber and his players.

Every man on the floor was capable of leading the team to victory, whether it was guards Dee Brown, Luther Head or Deron Williams, or forwards James Augustine or Roger Powell. Yet Illinois plays within head coach Bruce Weber's system and doesn't allow ego, personal statistical goals, or anything else to disrupt their teamwork.

Unfortunately, they came up short against North Carolina. But the State of Illinois is proud of their Illini. An orange hue has been cast across the State as Illinoisans got behind the team for their NCAA tournament run. So many people have enjoyed this tournament and they won't soon forget where they were when the Illini shocked Arizona, or when Roger Powell slam-dunked the rebound from his own three-point shot against Louisville.

I would like to congratulate B. Joseph White, who became the University's 16th president on January 31 of this year, and the administration, faculty, staff, student body, and fans of the University of Illinois on making it to the championship game of the 2005 NCAA tournament.

To the coaches, Illini players, and their families, thanks for the memories. Thanks for showing us what teamwork is all about.

HONORING ARLEN LANCASTER

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a longtime staff member who is moving onto a new and exciting work challenge. Arlen Lancaster has been a valued member of my staff since the start of my first term in the Senate in 1999. He is leaving my staff to become the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Arlen joined my staff as a legislative correspondent and worked his way through two promotions. He now serves as senior policy adviser, covering agriculture, conservation, rural development, energy and the Idaho National Laboratory, natural resources and public lands, defense as well as serving as the staff director of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Forestry, Conservation and Rural Revitalization. Arlen was instrumental in the work that I have done regarding the conservation title in the 2002 farm bill and shepherding the historic Healthy Forest Restoration Act through Congress.

While Arlen's family hails from the Burley area in my home State of Idaho, he lived in many areas due to his father's work with the U.S. Air Force. He attended high school and college in Utah, graduating with a political science degree from the University of Utah. He is definitely a Westerner at heart and his work for me has benefited many in Idaho.

On a personal note, Arlen was great to work with. He is decisive, insightful and innovative. His easy-going personality and sense of humor permeated all that he did in his public service for the people of Idaho and the United States. He provided a certain spark to my office. In fact, he sparked so much with

another LA that they will be getting married this summer and Arlen and Staci have my best wishes for a long, happy life together.

I am excited by Arlen's new challenge at USDA and know he is well up to the task. Although I won't have the same opportunity to work with him on a daily basis, I look forward to our new working relationship and Arlen's continuing successes. His extensive knowledge of agriculture, natural resources and other policy issues will serve Arlen well in his new capacity.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

LIEUTENANT COLONEL ANTONIO R. BAINES

• Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional officer in the United States Army, Lieutenant Colonel Antonio R. Baines, upon his retirement after more than 20 years of distinguished service. Throughout his career, Colonel Baines has personified the Army values of duty, integrity, and selfless service across the many missions the Army provides in defense of our Nation. As a Congressional Legislative Liaison Officer in the office of the Secretary of the Army, many of us on Capitol Hill have enjoyed the opportunity to work with Lieutenant Colonel Baines on a wide variety of Army issues and programs, and it is my privilege to recognize his many accomplishments. I commend his superb service to the United States Army and this great Nation.

Lieutenant Colonel Antonio R. Baines, the son of Mr. Albert and Yolanda Baines of Jonesboro, GA, attended high school in Hephzibah, GA, and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Signal Corps after graduating from North Georgia College in 1984. His first assignment was as the Battalion Signal Officer for the 6th Battalion, 37th Field Artillery, 2nd Infantry Division in Korea. He has served in multiple assignments within the United States, including two tours at Ft. Gordon, GA, and notably as the Signal Officer for 1st Squadron, 9th U.S. Calvary Regiment at Fort Lewis, WA, and the 82nd Aviation Brigade, 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, NC. Lieutenant Colonel Baines served two tours in Europe as the Signal Officer for the 3rd Battalion, 34th Armor Regiment in Stuttgart, Germany, and deployed to South West Asia as part of Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Later as the Assistant Division Signal Officer for the 1st Infantry Division in Wurzburg, he again deployed to Bosnia-Herzegovina. As a signaler, Lieutenant Colonel Baines excelled in a wide variety of leadership and staff assignments to include Platoon Leader, Battalion Adjutant, Company Commander, Brigade Adjutant and Battalion Executive Officer.

In 1999, Lieutenant Colonel Baines was selected to be a Force Development Officer with assignment to the Pentagon. He served on the G–3 and G–8 staff as the Army's Systems Integrator for all tactical radios systems. He was subsequently selected as a Congressional Legislative Liaison Officer in the office of the Secretary of the Army, Congressional Legislative Liaison, Programs Division from June 2001 through June 2005.

Lieutenant Colonel Baines maintained constant liaison with the Professional Staff Members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees on issues relating to Army Procurement programs focusing on Army Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Information Technology, and Ammunition Procurement. In 2003, Lieutenant Colonel Baines was selected to be the team chief of the hardware section of the Programs Division.

Throughout these assignments, Lieutenant Colonel Baines provided outstanding leadership, advice, and sound professional judgment on numerous critical issues of enduring importance to both the Army and Congress. Antonio's actions and counsel were invaluable to Army leaders and Members of Congress as they considered the impact of important issues. On behalf of Congress and the United States of America, I thank Colonel Baines, his wife Peggy, and his entire family for the commitment, sacrifices, and contribution that they have made throughout his honorable military career. Congratulations on completing an exceptional and extremely successful career.•

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL CARLISLE A.H. TROST, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED

• Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to ADM Carlisle A.H. Trost, U.S. Navy, Retired, as he steps down after 17 faithful, diligent, and honorable years as the chairman of the board of directors of the George and Carol Olmsted Foundation of Falls Church, VA. In years past it was a privilege to have worked closely with both George Olmsted and Admiral Trost.

Admiral Trost, who ascended to the position of Chief of Naval Operations during his long and distinguished career as a naval officer, offered his services first as a director, then as chairman of the board, of the prestigious Olmsted Foundation. Demonstrating a vital understanding of this complex world, he led the foundation in its expanding role to educate young, talented, and dedicated military officers in learning foreign languages and in understanding foreign cultures through the awarding of scholarships to study overseas for 2 years. With our military deployed for wars in over 100 countries across the globe, the importance of having officers imbued with the cultural sensitivities and language capabilities provided by this special education is essential. Thanks to Admiral Trost's innate understanding of the importance of the training provided to Olmsted scholars and his visionary leadership, the number of scholars studying annually doubled and the foundation's endowment increased dramatically.

Admiral Trost also established the Tri-Service Academy Cadet and Midshipman Overseas Travel and Cultural Immersion Program at our three service academies in 2001. He later extended this important training and educational program to the three Service Reserve Officer Training Commands, ROTC, and the six senior military colleges, title 10 schools. Admiral Trost graduated from the Naval Academy in 1953, where he was first in his class of 925 midshipmen. He went on to become an Olmsted Scholar in 1960, studying in the German language at the University of Freiburg from 1960 to 1962. From there he had a most successful tour as a submarine officer, eventually commanding the blue crew of the nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine, USS *Sam Rayburn*, SSBN 635.

As a young captain, he was selected by his superiors to serve as a naval aide to the Under Secretary and, later, Secretary of the Navy. It was my good fortune to have served in these positions and to have learned from this great teacher, peer, and life-long friend. Whether as a submarine group commander, a numbered fleet commander, Commander of the Atlantic Fleet, or as Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Trost always served his country with honor and dignity.

Admiral Trost has provided outstanding leadership, advice, and sound professional judgment on many critical issues and at many key levels of decision making for both the Navy and the Nation. Indeed, his actions and wise counsel over the years have been of enduring importance to the U.S. Congress. Though he is a modest man, he truly is an extraordinary individual and leader who has contributed so much to this country and the cause of freedom. He has been dedicated fully to mission accomplishment, education, leadership, and professionalism in the highest traditions of the American spirit.•

HONORING THIRTY YEARS FOR R.J. VIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

• Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, every session in Congress, we spend a large amount of time discussing education in this country. Debates range from accountability to school construction to teacher recruitment. While our discussions are of the utmost importance, it is the implementation of our decisions by individuals within the education

system that changes how our children learn. Today, I honor an elementary school in Paradis, LA that has served as an example of a great school that is achieving the goals we set forth in these halls.

R.J. Vial Elementary School will turn 30 years old this Friday, April 8th. There will be festivities and celebrations for students, alumni, teachers, administrators, and parents. But I would like to take a minute to talk about the real celebration of this school. In the past 5 years, R.J. Vial Elementary School has steadily increased the number of students passing the LEAP 21 test in all four areas that the test covers. R.J. Vial is clearly meeting its mission of developing respectful, lifelong learners. That is what I would like to celebrate today in the United States Senate.

In the April 2005 Community Newsletter of R.J. Vial Elementary School, Principal Frederick A. Treuting wrote, ''Our greatest and perhaps only truly effective discipline tool is a strong relationship that bonds us to our children.'' Principal Treuting could not be more correct. If we are to succeed in educating our children to the best of our ability, we must reach out to them and work to raise academic achievement in our public schools by putting the priority on performance instead of process, delivering results instead of developing rules, and on actively encouraging bold reform instead of passively tolerating failure.

At 510 Louisiana Street in Paradis, LA, R.J. Vial Elementary School is already doing these things and because of that, has become one of the finest schools in the state of Louisiana. There is no greater investment we can in our future than in the education of our children. I commend the hard work of all the people who have and currently work at and with R.J. Vial Elementary School; you are giving the best gift you can to our youth. It has been said that it takes a village to raise a child, so we must all work together to see that we educate our children to the best of our ability. And to the students, both past and present, of R.J. Vial, I offer my congratulations. Because of your efforts in the classroom for the past thirty years, R.J. Vial Elementary School has become the beacon of success that it is today.

Happy Birthday, R.J. Vial Elementary School! My heartfelt congratulations to all involved with the school, and best wishes to another great 30 years.●

HONORING POPE JOHN PAUL II

● Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I was unable to be present for today's vote honoring His Holiness, Pope John Paul II. At the time of the vote, I was in Colorado attending my father-in-law's funeral service. Having been an original cosponsor of the resolution, I would have supported the measure if present.

As we mourn the passage of Pope John Paul II, we also pause to reflect on the many blessings his life bestowed upon the world, This great man was not only a defender of his faith, but of the weakest and most vulnerable among us. He will be remembered, without doubt, as one of the most significant and influential figures of the 20th Century. His influence transcended the Roman Catholic Church and has had an impact on everyone's relationship with the Creator. I humbly pay my respects and honor the legacy that he leaves behind.●

NICOLE WAYANT AND CORMAC O'CONNOR

● Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I congratulate and honor two young Kansas students who have achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in their communities. Nicole Wayant of Topeka, KS, and Cormac O'Connor of Prairie Village, KS, have just been named State Honorees in The 2005 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on only one high school student and one middle-level student in each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Ms. Wayant is being recognized for creating a youth health council to promote the benefits of an active, healthy lifestyle among the students in her school district.

Mr. O'Connor is being recognized for implementing an intergenerational arts program that brought senior citizens and at-risk children together for classes in visual arts, movements, theater and jazz.

In light of numerous statistics that indicate Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it is vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contributions these young people have made. People of all ages need to think more about how we, as individual citizens, can work together at the local level to ensure the health and vitality of our towns and neighborhoods. Young volunteers like Ms. Wayant and Mr. O'Connor are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought these young role models to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. Over the past 10 years, the program has become the Nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, with more than 170,000 young people participating since its inception.

Ms. Wayant and Mr. O'Connor should be extremely proud to have been singled out from such a large group of dedicated volunteers. As part of their recognition, they will come to Washington in early May, along with other 2005 Spirit of Community honorees from across the country, for several days of special events, including a congressional breakfast on Capitol Hill. While here in Washington, 10 will be named America's top youth volunteers of the year by a distinguished national selection committee.

I applaud Ms. Wayant and Mr. O'Connor for their initiative in seeking to make their communities better places to live, and for the positive impact they have had on the lives of others. I also salute the other young people in my State who were named Distinguished Finalists by The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards for their outstanding volunteer service. They are Shawn Bryant of Leavenworth, KS; Brad Harris of Saint Paul, KS; Amanda Knox of Clifton, KS; and Creighton Olsen of Larned, KS.

All of these young people have demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world and they deserve our sincere admiration and respect. Their actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in their communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1454. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report covering defense articles and services that were licensed for export under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act during Fiscal Year 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1455. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Taiwan Relations Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1456. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1457. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1458. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report required under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 relative to U.S. Government departments and agencies relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation between January 1 and December 31, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1459. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Report of the Attorney General relative to the Foreign Agents Registration Act for the six-month period ending December 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1460. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1461. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1462. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Nonproliferation, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1463. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Nonproliferation, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1464. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Nonproliferation, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1465. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1466. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1467. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1468. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1469. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1470. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1471. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1472. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1473. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1474. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1475. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1476. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1477. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1478. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1479. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1480. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1481. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1482. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1483. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1484. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1485. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1486. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of State for Economic, Business and Agricultural Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1487. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of State for Management, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1488. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of State for Management, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1489. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1490. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1491. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, received on March 28, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 696. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding the transfer of students from certain schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 697. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 698. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on methacrylamido etheleneurae monomer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 699. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on allyl ureido monomer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 700. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on potassium sorbate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 701. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on certain sorbic acid (hexadienic acid) (2,4-hexadienoic acid); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the occupational taxes relating to distilled spirits, wine, and beer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. 703. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Nevada to the Las Vegas Motor Speedway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:

S. 704. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for voluntary contributions on a grant basis to the Organization of American States (OAS) to establish a Center for Caribbean Basin Trade and to establish a skills-based training program for Caribbean Basin countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 705. A bill to establish the Interagency Council on Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COLEMAN:

S. 706. A bill to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in this Act to the Secretary of the Interior for the Prairie Island Indian Community in Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. 707. A bill to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH):

S. 708. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide medicare beneficiaries with access to information concerning the quality of care provided by skilled nursing facilities and to provide incentives to skilled nursing facilities to improve the quality of care provided by those facilities by linking the amount of payment under the medicare program to quality reporting and performance requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. BURR, and Mr. DODD):

S. 709. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to provide supportive services in permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 710. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option to expand or add coverage of pregnant women under the medicaid and State children's health insurance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 711. A bill to amend the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000 to reauthorize that Act and to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 712. A bill to require a study and report regarding the designation of a new interstate route from Augusta, Georgia to Natchez, Mississippi; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANTORUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BURR, Mr. BYRD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 95. A resolution relating to the death of the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. Res. 96. A resolution commemorating the tenth anniversary of the attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 8

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 8, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 35

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 35, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for production of electricity from wind.

S. 43

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 43, a bill to provide certain enhancements to the Montgomery GI Bill Program for certain individuals who serve as members of the Armed Forces after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

S. 46

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 46, a bill to authorize the extension of unconditional and permanent nondiscriminatory treatment (permanent normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Ukraine, and for other purposes.

S. 65

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to amend the age restrictions for pilots.

S. 77

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 77, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve death benefits for the families of deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) and the Senator from

Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 119, a bill to provide for the protection of unaccompanied alien children, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, supra.

S. 147

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 147, a bill to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity.

S. 186

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 186, a bill to prohibit the use of Department of Defense funds for any study related to the transportation of chemical munitions across State lines.

S. 241

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 241, a bill to amend section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that funds received as universal service contributions and the universal service support programs established pursuant to that section are not subject to certain provisions of title 31, United States Code, commonly known as the Antideficiency Act.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners to restore, enhance, and manage private land to improve fish and wildlife habitats through the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program.

S. 268

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 268, a bill to provide competitive grants for training court reporters and closed captioners to meet requirements for realtime writers under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

S. 300

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 300, a bill to extend the temporary increase in payments under the medicare program for home health services furnished in a rural area.

S. 333

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 333, a bill to hold the current regime in Iran accountable for its threatening behavior and to support a transition to democracy in Iran.

S. 337

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the age and service requirements for eligibility to receive retired pay for non-regular service, to expand certain authorities to provide health care benefits for Reserves and their families, and for other purposes.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) were added as cosponsors of S. 339, a bill to reaffirm the authority of States to regulate certain hunting and fishing activities.

S. 347

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 347, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act and title III of the Public Health Service Act to improve access to information about individuals' health care operations and legal rights for care near the end of life, to promote advance care planning and decisionmaking so that individuals' wishes are known should they become unable to speak for themselves, to engage health care providers in disseminating information about and assisting in the preparation of advance directives, which include living wills and durable powers of attorney for health care, and for other purposes.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to revise certain requirements for H–2B employers and require submission of information regarding H–2B non-immigrants, and for other purposes.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to expand and enhance postbaccalaureate opportunities at Hispanic-serving institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 359

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 359, a bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain foreign agricultural workers, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform the H–2A worker program under that Act, to provide a stable, legal agricultural workforce, to extend basic legal protections and better working conditions to more workers, and for other purposes.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to promote accessibility, accountability, and openness in Government by strengthening section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 403, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 424, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for arthritis research and public health, and for other purposes.

S. 432

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 432, a bill to establish a digital and wireless network technology program, and for other purposes.

S. 438

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 438, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) were added as cosponsors of S. 445, a resolution to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, as added by the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003, to provide for negotiation of fair prices for Medicare prescription drugs.

S. 471

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 471, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide

for human embryonic stem cell research.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 484, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civilian and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, to limit the duration of Federal consent decrees to which State and local governments are a party, and for other purposes.

S. 492

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 492, a bill to make access to safe water and sanitation for developing countries a specific policy objective of the United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 495

At the request of Mr. CORZINE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 495, a bill to impose sanctions against perpetrators of crimes against humanity in Darfur, Sudan, and for other purposes.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to provide for expansion of electricity transmission networks in order to support competitive electricity markets, to ensure reliability of electric service, to modernize regulation and for other purposes.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to classify automatic fire sprinkler systems as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to provide incentive grants to improve the quality of child care.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 570, a bill to amend title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act and title III of the Public Health Service Act to improve access to information about individuals' health care options and legal rights for care near the end of life, to promote advance care planning and decisionmaking so that individuals' wishes are known should they become unable to speak for themselves, to engage health care providers in disseminating information about and assisting in the preparation of advance directives, which include living wills and durable powers of attorney for health care, and for other purposes.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 582, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the desegregation of the Little Rock Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, and for other purposes.

S. 601

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 601, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include combat pay in determining an allowable contribution to an individual retirement plan.

S. 609

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 609, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the provision of scientifically sound information and support services to patients receiving a positive test diagnosis for Down syndrome or other prenatally diagnosed conditions.

S. 626

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 626, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self management training by designating certified diabetes educators who are recognized by a nationally recognized certifying body and who meet the same quality standards set forth for other providers of diabetes self management training, as certified providers for purposes of outpatient diabetes self-management training services under part B of the medicare program.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 633, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of veterans who became disabled for life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to support certain national youth organizations, including the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

S. 643

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 643, a bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 to reauthorize State mediation programs.

S. 647

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 647, a bill to amend title

XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize physical therapists to evaluate and treat medicare beneficiaries without a requirement for a physician referral, and for other purposes.

S. 663

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 663, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow self-employed individuals to deduct health insurance costs in computing self-employment taxes.

S. RES. 83

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 83, a resolution commemorating the 65th Anniversary of the Black Press of America.

AMENDMENT NO. 204

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 204 proposed to S. Con. Res. 18, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 696. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding the transfer of students from certain schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with regard to the transfer of students from certain schools. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 includes a requirement that schools not meeting adequate yearly progress—the AYP—for 2 consecutive years must provide transfer within the school district, and if no such schools exist, make efforts to provide transfers between school districts to the extent practical. This is the school choice provision. However, the current law's guidance on school choice does not adequately define practicality or feasibility, and where definitions are provided, they are overly broad.

We have just come off the Easter break. We had an opportunity to talk to a lot of educators and students. We return to our work starting today to make some significant—maybe not significant changes, but little changes to No Child Left Behind to make it more practical and make it more common sense in States such as Montana.

When we start looking at these maps, and as the President pro tempore leaves the Chamber, he understands what rural is when he looks at his State of Alaska. We are not nearly as big as Alaska. However, when we look at the State of Montana—and for those who wonder about distances and sizes, from the Yak, which is up in the northwest corner of the State, to Alzada in the southeast corner, it is farther than it is from Chicago to Washington, DC. So there is a pretty fair chunk of land out here, and we have young folks who go to school in just about every part of the State.

These are the elementary schools I am going to talk about as I speak on No Child Left Behind and the legislation I am introducing today.

The bottom line is No Child Left Behind is not a one-size-fits-all legislation. We have some of the greatest teachers there are in the country, and we have some of the brightest minds to teach. Accordingly, it is imperative that Congress continues to hear the needs and concerns of America's rural education communities.

Just to give my colleagues an idea, I had a little bit to do with the passage and the shaping of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. In that bill, we had a piece included called broadband. Back in those days, most folks had not heard of the Internet, broadband, or digital. There were not very many of us around here who were even computer literate. We are getting better. We are getting a little younger.

I can remember when we put the broadband section in the bill, primarily to do two things in my State: distance learning, allowing these smaller schools in rural areas to access the Internet and classes to be taught via a two-way interact from another location so that their curriculum could be broadened, just like a school, say, located in Billings, Great Falls, Missoula. Just because someone was born way out here and went to school in Jordan, MT, where we have a county the size of Rhode Island—it only has 1,800 folks and only one high school. It used to be a boarding school. I do not think it is anymore. But it used to be when you took your student to school on Monday morning, you did not see them until Friday night after the football game was over. So we deal in a little bit different kind of environment and situation.

The Federal law must recognize the significant differences between urban and rural school districts with regard to student transportation, school spacing, and, of course, the school-of-choice options. Although No Child Left Behind leaves the State of Montana in control of determining the feasibility of transfers between different school districts, it is much less flexible when it comes to transfers within the same school district.

My legislation would add to existing guidelines on the practicality and the feasibility of school choice that a school district would not be required to provide a student with a transfer option to another school if providing the option is impractical due to the distance to be traveled, a geographical barrier or hazard, the duration of the travel, or an unusually high cost of travel. However, if choice is not offered under the latter circumstances, students in affected schools will still receive valuable supplemental education services, and school districts will still have the option to provide students school learning choices through distance learning programs or virtual schools or several other options offered under current law.

We are pretty sparse in eastern Montana. From Miles City to Jordan is about 90 miles. I was talking about Jordan a while ago up on the big dry creek. You heard me say I have a lot of dirt between light bulbs out there. Well, we have a lot of land between schools out there also, and school districts can be quite large. The centers of Billings, Great Falls, Missoula, the Flat Head, or even Bozeman are grouped pretty closely. In eastern Montana, however, they are far apart. We have elementary schools not even on paved roads, still on gravel. I know one that is still on a mud road. If it rains real hard or during the spring thaw, they cannot get a car in there or a pickup truck or even a four-wheel drive vehicle, so they all ride horses, which is not a bad idea. It saves on gas, and as high as gas is, it probably isn't a bad idea at all. This is a map of the elementary schools to give an idea of where they are located way out there.

Now, I want to take a look at the high schools. There are not as many of them. What are you going to do if a school in Miles City is in need of improvement under the current law? Where are you going to send them? To Broadus? I don't think so. That is another 80 or 90 miles. Pretty soon the miles start adding up.

Right now the law requires the schools to pay for students to transfer them in the same district unless doing so is too expensive. In Montana, as with many rural schools in rural States, there are considerations greater than just cost. While the law makes sense in Billings, it does not work in districts where the schools are farther apart.

Take the Broadus County School District in southeastern Montana as an example. As we can see, there is a lot of distance between schools. There are not very many schools out there. These are high schools. These are not elementary schools but high schools. Some may take up to 2 hours one way to drive. It not only hurts the family life of the students, but it disrupts what they do and also has an adverse effect on their academic performance.

Sometimes this type of commute may be necessary. My legislation

makes this decision a matter for rural States to decide instead of the politicians here in Washington, DC, or by a rule written into a law that just is unworkable in my State.

I realize No Child Left Behind had some built-in flexibilities, and I also realize that some States did not take advantage of some of those flexibilities. Now we are locked into a situation where it is almost impossible to change unless we change the legislation and reword it. My legislation simply clarifies what is feasible and practical for school choice transfers within school districts and gives the States, especially my State, the ability to treat schools in rural Broadus differently than it treats schools in more urbanized Billings, MT.

I would imagine the Senator from Florida who is new to this body and a terrific addition to this body has some rural areas in Florida. We think of Florida as more urbanized, but they have some rural areas too, just like Montana. That does not mean there are kids out there whose needs should not be addressed.

When we visit schools, we get all kinds of questions from the students. I was visiting a sixth-grade class the other day. They came up with all kinds of questions. Some of them were pretty good, some were not so good. I did have one that was just a little bit different. This young man stood up in sixth grade, and he said: Senator, what do you want written on your tombstone? My gosh, I never had that question before, and I did not know exactly how to handle it, so I just told him: He's not here yet. That is the only way I could answer him.

These young people are very bright. They like their schools in these areas with distance learning. And we have telemedicine. We are delivering medical care much differently now. We are doing it with broadband services. We have 14 counties that do not have a doctor. It is done by physician assistants and many other people.

The other day a student from our part of the country enrolled at Montana State University at Billings. He had taken enough courses in his senior year in distance learning from MSUB that he has a full semester completed. So when he goes away to school, he already has half a year done.

This is why we have the Telecommunications Act. This is why we have the No Child Left Behind Act. We have to look at schools and libraries and some of the kinks we have to work out in that law so that these smaller schools and libraries can get their moneys so they can offer this online education. This is just another part of tweaking the No Child Left Behind law to make it work in rural areas.

I urge my Senate colleagues, especially those from rural States, to join me in cosponsoring this bill because it is very important. If we are really dedicated to the program of No Child Left Behind, we cannot leave rural children behind either, and we have to make it work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 696

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 ''Rural Schools Geography Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) There are significant differences between urban and rural school districts with regard to student transportation, distances between schools and school districts, and school of choice options. Local educational agencies (LEAs) in rural areas often have only 1 school servicing a particular grade-level, and the distance between these schools is often much greater than in urban areas. These differences are not addressed by existing guidelines under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(2) In 2000, rural schools (those in communities with populations below 2,500) taught 32 percent of the children in the United States, but rural schools accounted for $5,670,000,000 of the Nation's spending on school transportation, or nearly half of such spending.

(3) Rural transportation costs, per-pupil, are double that of urban transportation costs. As a percentage of total spending, rural areas spend 77 percent more than urban areas for education transportation.

(4) Commutes in rural areas are much more likely to be on rougher, unpaved roads. This not only undermines the physical health of the students, but makes transportation during poor weather much more difficult or impossible. Students with longer commutes are more likely to miss school because of inclement weather. School attendance is an important factor in school performance.

(5) School students who have long commutes actively avoid advanced and high-level courses because they do not have time for the extra homework. This self-imposed restriction retards maximization of educational potential.

(6) Students with long commutes are less likely to engage in in-home and out-of-home activities, such as family dinners, after-school jobs, and athletic or musical extracurricular activities. Participation in these activities benefits overall educational progress.

(7) Section 1116(b)(10)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 instructs that the lowest achieving children be given priority for out-of-district transportation. Thus, the negative impacts of long commutes disproportionately affect the very students who need the most help.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

Section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6316) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) GEOGRAPHY LIMITS.—Notwithstanding subsections (b) and (c), a local educational agency shall not be required to provide a student the option to transfer to another school pursuant to this section if providing the option is impractical due to the distance to be traveled, a geographical barrier or hazard, the duration of the travel, or an unusually high cost of travel.''.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

The Secretary of Education, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, shall promulgate such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to implement this Act.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by section 3 shall take effect on the first July 1 that occurs after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 697. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Higher Education Opportunity Through Pell Grant Expansion Act of 2005, or HOPE Act.

Right now, in schools, playgrounds, and backyards across America, children are dreaming about what they want to be when they grow up. As tomorrow's astronauts, doctors, and teachers dream about their futures, their parents know that so many of those dreams are dependent on a college diploma.

The families I have met in Illinois are worried that they might not be able to give their kids a chance at that diploma. Everywhere I go, I hear the same story: we work hard, we pay our bills, we cut corners, and we put away savings, but we just don't know if it is going to be enough when the tuition bill comes in the mail.

The facts and statistics are not encouraging. College tuition is rising at a stunning rate of almost 10 percent a year, and over the last 25 years it is gone up an astounding 519 percent. Because of these rising prices, over 200,000 students were priced out of a college education last year.

In a country with so much wealth and opportunity for education, it is difficult to imagine there are parents who are forced to say to their kids: ''We're sorry. We can't afford to send you to college.'' None of us in the Senate should rest until those parents can start saying ''yes'' to their kids.

This bill would start us down that path by increasing access to Pell grants. Today, these need-based awards are used by 5.3 million undergraduate students to fund their education. Unfortunately, the awards just haven't kept up with the rising price of tuition or even inflation. As a result, the current $4,050 Pell grant maximum is $700 less in real terms than the maximum grant 30 years ago. Pell grants now cover only 23 percent of the total cost of the average 4-year public college.

The HOPE Act would correct this problem by raising the Pell grant maximum to $5,100, and it would continue

to raise this maximum in future years to keep up with inflation. The bill also would make sure that no student sees a reduction in Pell grant assistance due to recent changes in the eligibility formula.

Because working families are already burdened with too many taxes, this bill would not add to the deficit or raise a dime of taxes. Instead, it will close two loopholes that guarantee banks and private lenders an additional $2 billion in taxpayer subsidies every year on top of the interest that college students and their families are already paying on their loans. In a country where 200,000 students were priced out of college last year, our tax dollars shouldn't be spent subsidizing banks that are already making record profits.

When our children dream about their future, they need to know those dreams are within their reach. A college education forms the foundation of the opportunity society that will keep this country strong and growing in the 21st century. I know we can work together to get this done, and I look forward to doing so.

I urge my colleagues to support the HOPE Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 697

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 ''Higher Education Opportunity Through Pell Grant Expansion Act''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Federal Pell Grants are need-based and are used by 5,300,000 undergraduate students to fund their college educations.

(2) Over 90 percent of Federal Pell Grant recipients come from a family with a combined income of less than $40,000.

(3) Because of the rising cost of college tuition, the maximum Federal Pell Grant amount of $4,050 for academic year 2004–2005 is $700 less in real terms than the maximum Federal Pell Grant amount for academic year 1975–1976.

(4) Federal Pell Grants for academic year 2003–2004 cover only 23 percent of the total cost of the average 4-year public college.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) eligible undergraduate students should receive the maximum Federal Pell Grant amount established by the amendment made by section 3(b) of this Act; and

(2) sufficient funds should be appropriated to allow the awarding of the maximum Federal Pell Grant amount for which students are eligible pursuant to the amendment made by section 3(b) of this Act.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

(a) APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.—In addition to any amounts otherwise appropriated to carry out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a) for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, there are authorized to be appropriated and there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, for carrying out such subpart 1, an additional $2,000,000,000.

(b) AUTHORIZATION AMOUNT AND MAXIMUM FEDERAL PELL GRANT.—Section 401(b)(2)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(2)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2)(A)(i) The amount of a Federal Pell Grant for a student eligible under this part shall be $5,100 for academic year 2005–2006, less an amount equal to the amount determined to be the expected family contribution with respect to that student for that year.

''(ii) The Secretary shall cumulatively adjust the amount in clause (i) every 2 academic years beginning with academic year 2006–2007 to account for any percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.''.

SEC. 4. ALLOWANCE FOR STATE AND OTHER TAXES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the annual updates to the allowance for State and other taxes in the tables used in the Federal Needs Analysis Methodology to determine a student's expected family contribution for the award year 2005–2006 under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087kk et seq.), published in the Federal Register on Thursday, December 23, 2004 (69 Fed. Reg. 76926), shall not apply to a student to the extent the updates will increase the student's expected family contribution under such part F.

SEC. 5. TERMINATION OF EXCESSIVE ALLOWANCES.

Section 438(b)(2)(B) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087–1(b)(2)(B)) is amended by striking clause (v) and inserting the following:

''(v) This subparagraph shall not apply to—

''(I) any loan made or purchased after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Opportunity Through Pell Grant Expansion Act;

''(II) any loan that had not qualified before such date of enactment for receipt of a special allowance payment determined under this subparagraph; or

''(III) any loan made or purchased before such date of enactment with funds described in the first or second sentence of clause (i) if—

''(aa) the obligation described in the first such sentence has, after such date of enactment, matured, or been retired or defeased; or

''(bb) the maturity date or the date of retirement of the obligation described in the first such sentence has, after such date of enactment, been extended.''.

SEC. 6. WINDFALL PROFIT OFFSET.

Section 438 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087–1) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) WINDFALL PROFIT OFFSET.—At the end of every fiscal quarter for which an eligible lender does not receive a special allowance payment under this section, the eligible lender shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts a windfall profit offset payment for the fiscal quarter equal to the amount by which—

''(1) the aggregate amount of all payments of interest received by the eligible lender from borrowers on all loans made, insured, or guaranteed under this part during the fiscal quarter; exceeds

''(2) interest guaranteed the lender under this section for the fiscal quarter, irrespective of the amount received under subparagraph (A).''.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the occupational taxes relating to distilled spirits, wine, and beer; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues Senators BUNNING, JOHNSON and TALENT today in introducing legislation that will repeal the special occupational tax on taxpayers who manufacture, distribute, and sell alcoholic beverages.

The special occupational tax is not a tax on alcoholic products, but rather operates as a license fee on businesses. The tax is imposed on those engaged in the business of selling alcohol beverages. Believe it or not, this tax was originally established to help finance the Civil War. That war is over, and this inequitable tax has outlived its original purpose. Repealing the SOT will also simplify the tax code for thousands of small businesses.

The SOT on alcohol dramatically increased during the budget process in 1988 and has unfairly burdened business owners across the country since. From Thompson Falls to Sidney, from Chinook to Billings, small businesses are burdened with yet another tax in the form of the SOT. According to the Alcohol and Tobacco, Tax and Trade Bureau, there are 426,193 locations nationwide that pay the SOT every year, including 399,657 retailers. These retail establishments account for $99 million out of $103 million collected in SOT revenues.

In Montana, there are 2,969 locations which together pay nearly $1 million in the SOT every year. Seasonal resorts in Whitefish and Yellowstone, ''mom and pop'' convenience stores in Butte, and bowling alleys, flower shops, and restaurants across Montana, and the United States, pay the Federal Government over $100 million per year for the privilege of running businesses that sell beer, wine, or alcoholic beverages.

The SOT is extremely regressive. Retailers must annually pay $250 per location; wholesalers pay $500; vintners and distillers pay $1,000. Because the SOT is levied on a per location basis, a sole proprietorship must pay the same amount as one of the nation's largest retailers, and locally-owned chains having to pay per location, would have to pay as much as, if not more than, the nation's largest single site brewery. This is not what Congress had in mind 150 years ago, and I don't believe it's a situation we want today.

Repealing the SOT on alcohol is supported by a broad-based group of business organizations and enjoys widespread bipartisan support on Capitol Hill. Last year, we made progress in ending this burdensome tax on small businesses. We repealed the tax for three years. More can be done. Business owners across the United States deserve assurance that they won't be hit with this antiquated tax down the line.

The legislation preserves the TTB's record-keeping requirements, while removing the agency's enforcement burden, and will save over $2 million per year. The GAO examined SOT efficacy several times, and found it fundamentally flawed. The Joint Committee on Taxation called for the elimination of SOT in its June 2001 simplification study.

More than 90 percent of all SOT revenue comes from retailers—a great majority of those are small businesses. Our small business sector is a great strength of our economy. President Bush has said that the best way to encourage job growth is to let small businesses keep more of their own money, so they can invest in their business and make it easier for somebody to find work. Repealing the SOT would provide an immediate and visible tax cut to small business owners.

In recent months, there has been much talk of tax reform inside the beltway. President Bush has made tax reform one of his key priorities and established a panel that will make recommendations to the Department of Treasury for a better tax system. Getting rid of a tax that has outlived its original purpose is one small step toward reform that makes sense for Montana and our country. We urge our colleagues to join us in this endeavor.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 702

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

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF OCCUPATIONAL TAXES RELATING TO DISTILLED SPIRITS, WINE, AND BEER.

(a) REPEAL OF OCCUPATIONAL TAXES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions of part II of subchapter A of chapter 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to occupational taxes) are hereby repealed:

(A) Subpart A (relating to proprietors of distilled spirits plants, bonded wine cellars, etc.).

(B) Subpart B (relating to brewer).

(C) Subpart D (relating to wholesale dealers) (other than sections 5114 and 5116).

(D) Subpart E (relating to retail dealers) (other than section 5124).

(E) Subpart G (relating to general provisions) (other than sections 5142, 5143, 5145, and 5146).

(2) NONBEVERAGE DOMESTIC DRAWBACK.—Section 5131 of such Code is amended by striking '', on payment of a special tax per annum,''.

(3) INDUSTRIAL USE OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.—Section 5276 of such Code is hereby repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1)(A) The heading for part II of subchapter A of chapter 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the table of subparts for such part are amended to read as follows:

"PART II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

''Subpart A. Manufacturers of stills.
''Subpart B. Nonbeverage domestic drawback claimants.
''Subpart C. Recordkeeping and registration by dealers.
''Subpart D. Other provisions.''.

(B) The table of parts for such subchapter A is amended by striking the item relating to part II and inserting the following new item:

''Part II. Miscellaneous provisions.''.

(2) Subpart C of part II of such subchapter (relating to manufacturers of stills) is redesignated as subpart A.

(3)(A) Subpart F of such part II (relating to nonbeverage domestic drawback claimants) is redesignated as subpart B and sections 5131 through 5134 are redesignated as sections 5111 through 5114, respectively.

(B) The table of sections for such subpart B, as so redesignated, is amended—

(i) by redesignating the items relating to sections 5131 through 5134 as relating to sections 5111 through 5114, respectively, and

(ii) by striking ''and rate of tax'' in the item relating to section 5111, as so redesignated.

(C) Section 5111 of such Code, as redesignated by subparagraph (A), is amended—

(i) by striking ''**AND RATE OF TAX**'' in the section heading,

(ii) by striking the subsection heading for subsection (a), and

(iii) by striking subsection (b).

(4) Part II of subchapter A of chapter 51 of such Code is amended by adding after subpart B, as redesignated by paragraph (3), the following new subpart:

"Subpart C—Recordkeeping by Dealers

''Sec. 5121. Recordkeeping by wholesale dealers.
''Sec. 5122. Recordkeeping by retail dealers.
''Sec. 5123. Preservation and inspection of records, and entry of premises for inspection.''.

(5)(A) Section 5114 of such Code (relating to records) is moved to subpart C of such part II and inserted after the table of sections for such subpart.

(B) Section 5114 of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking the section heading and inserting the following new heading:

"SEC. 5121. RECORDKEEPING BY WHOLESALE DEALERS.",

and

(ii) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) WHOLESALE DEALERS.—For purposes of this part—

''(1) WHOLESALE DEALER IN LIQUORS.—The term 'wholesale dealer in liquors' means any dealer (other than a wholesale dealer in beer) who sells, or offers for sale, distilled spirits, wines, or beer, to another dealer.

''(2) WHOLESALE DEALER IN BEER.—The term 'wholesale dealer in beer' means any dealer who sells, or offers for sale, beer, but not distilled spirits or wines, to another dealer.

''(3) DEALER.—The term 'dealer' means any person who sells, or offers for sale, any distilled spirits, wines, or beer.

''(4) PRESUMPTION IN CASE OF SALE OF 20 WINE GALLONS OR MORE.—The sale, or offer for sale, of distilled spirits, wines, or beer, in quantities of 20 wine gallons or more to the same person at the same time, shall be presumptive evidence that the person making such sale, or offer for sale, is engaged in or carrying on the business of a wholesale dealer in liquors or a wholesale dealer in beer, as the case may be. Such presumption may be overcome by evidence satisfactorily showing that such sale, or offer for sale, was made to a person other than a dealer.''.

(C) Paragraph (3) of section 5121(d) of such Code, as so redesignated, is amended by striking ''section 5146'' and inserting ''section 5123''.

(6)(A) Section 5124 of such Code (relating to records) is moved to subpart C of part II of subchapter A of chapter 51 of such Code and inserted after section 5121.

(B) Section 5124 of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking the section heading and inserting the following new heading:

"SEC. 5122. RECORDKEEPING BY RETAIL DEALERS.",

(ii) by striking ''section 5146'' in subsection (c) and inserting ''section 5123'', and

(iii) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) RETAIL DEALERS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) RETAIL DEALER IN LIQUORS.—The term 'retail dealer in liquors' means any dealer (other than a retail dealer in beer or a limited retail dealer) who sells, or offers for sale, distilled spirits, wines, or beer, to any person other than a dealer.

''(2) RETAIL DEALER IN BEER.—The term 'retail dealer in beer' means any dealer (other than a limited retail dealer) who sells, or offers for sale, beer, but not distilled spirits or wines, to any person other than a dealer.

''(3) LIMITED RETAIL DEALER.—The term 'limited retail dealer' means any fraternal, civic, church, labor, charitable, benevolent, or ex-servicemen's organization making sales of distilled spirits, wine or beer on the occasion of any kind of entertainment, dance, picnic, bazaar, or festival held by it, or any person making sales of distilled spirits, wine or beer to the members, guests, or patrons of bona fide fairs, reunions, picnics, carnivals, or other similar outings, if such organization or person is not otherwise engaged in business as a dealer.

''(4) DEALER.—The term 'dealer' has the meaning given such term by section 5121(c)(3).''.

(7) Section 5146 of such Code is moved to subpart C of part II of subchapter A of chapter 51 of such Code, inserted after section 5122, and redesignated as section 5123.

(8) Subpart C of part II of subchapter A of chapter 51 of such Code, as amended by paragraph (7), is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 5124. REGISTRATION BY DEALERS.

''Every dealer who is subject to the recordkeeping requirements under section 5121 or 5122 shall register with the Secretary such dealer's name or style, place of residence, trade or business, and the place where such trade or business is to be carried on. In case of a firm or company, the names of the several persons constituting the same, and the places of residence, shall be so registered.''.

(9) Section 7012 of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) For provisions relating to registration by dealers in distilled spirits, wines, and beer, see section 5124.''.

(10) Part II of subchapter A of chapter 51 of such Code is amended by inserting after subpart C the following new subpart:

''Subpart D—Other Provisions

''Sec. 5131. Packaging distilled spirits for industrial uses.

''Sec. 5132. Prohibited purchases by dealers.''.

(11) Section 5116 of such Code is moved to subpart D of part II of subchapter A of chapter 51 of such Code, inserted after the table of sections, redesignated as section 5131, and amended by inserting ''(as defined in section 5121(c))'' after ''dealer'' in subsection (a).

(12) Subpart D of part II of subchapter A of chapter 51 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 5132. PROHIBITED PURCHASES BY DEALERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, it shall be unlawful for a dealer to purchase distilled spirits for resale from any person other than a wholesale dealer in liquors who is required to keep the records prescribed by section 5121.

''(b) LIMITED RETAIL DEALERS.—A limited retail dealer may lawfully purchase distilled spirits for resale from a retail dealer in liquors.

''(c) PENALTY AND FORFEITURE.—

''For penalty and forfeiture provisions applicable to violations of subsection (a), see sections 5687 and 7302.''.

(13) Subsection (b) of section 5002 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 5112(a)'' and inserting ''section 5121(c)(3)'',

(B) by striking ''section 5112'' and inserting ''section 5121(c)'',

(C) by striking ''section 5122'' and inserting ''section 5122(c)''.

(14) Subparagraph (A) of section 5010(c)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 5134'' and inserting ''section 5114''.

(15) Subsection (d) of section 5052 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(d) BREWER.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'brewer' means any person who brews beer or produces beer for sale. Such term shall not include any person who produces only beer exempt from tax under section 5053(e).''.

(16) The text of section 5182 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''For provisions requiring recordkeeping by wholesale liquor dealers, see section 5112, and by retail liquor dealers, see section 5122.''.

(17) Subsection (b) of section 5402 of such Code is amended by striking ''section 5092'' and inserting ''section 5052(d)''.

(18) Section 5671 of such Code is amended by striking ''or 5091''.

(19)(A) Part V of subchapter J of chapter 51 of such Code is hereby repealed.

(B) The table of parts for such subchapter J is amended by striking the item relating to part V.

(20)(A) Sections 5142, 5143, and 5145 of such Code are moved to subchapter D of chapter 52 of such Code, inserted after section 5731, redesignated as sections 5732, 5733, and 5734, respectively, and amended by striking ''this part'' each place it appears and inserting ''this subchapter''.

(B) Section 5732 of such Code, as redesignated by subparagraph (A), is amended by striking ''(except the tax imposed by section 5131)'' each place it appears.

(C) Paragraph (2) of section 5733(c) of such Code, as redesignated by subparagraph (A), is amended by striking ''liquors'' both places it appears and inserting ''tobacco products and cigarette papers and tubes''.

(D) The table of sections for subchapter D of chapter 52 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 5732. Payment of tax.

''Sec. 5733. Provisions relating to liability for occupational taxes.

''Sec. 5734. Application of State laws.''.

(E) Section 5731 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (c) and by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(21) Subsection (c) of section 6071 of such Code is amended by striking ''section 5142'' and inserting ''section 5732''.

(22) Paragraph (1) of section 7652(g) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''subpart F'' and inserting ''subpart B'', and

(B) by striking ''section 5131(a)'' and inserting ''section 5111''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2005, but shall not apply to taxes imposed for periods before such date.

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 705. A bill to establish the Interagency Council on Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to establish an Interagency Council on Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors, which will help the Federal Government work with its partners to meet the growing housing and related needs of senior citizens around the country. The Interagency Council will work to better coordinate Federal programs so that seniors and their families can access the programs and the services necessary to allow them to age in place or find suitable housing alternatives.

It is important that we take note of the needs of this rapidly growing senior population. In 2000, the population over 65 years of age was 34.7 million. This number is expected to grow to over 50 million by 2020. By the year 2030, nearly one-fifth of the United States population will be above 65 years of age.

In recognition of the importance of this issue, in 1999 Congress established the Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Facility Needs for Seniors—''Seniors Commission''—to assess the Federal role in senior housing, health and supportive services. The Seniors Commission made a number of significant findings. For example, the commission found that seniors require a wide array of housing options with access to services, including meal preparation, transportation, health care, and assistance with daily activities. According to the Seniors Commission, over 18 percent of senior citizens—over 5.8 million seniors—who do not reside in nursing facilities have difficulty performing their daily activities without assistance. Over a million of these seniors are severely impaired, requiring assistance with many of their basic tasks. Many other seniors, those that can perform their daily functions, still require access to health care, transportation and other services. Without enhanced housing opportunities, such as service-enriched housing or assisted living facilities, these seniors find it increasingly difficult to remain outside of nursing homes or other institutional settings. In fact, the Seniors Commission found that ''many seniors across the income spectrum are at risk of institutionalization or neglect due to declining health and the loss or absence of support and timely interventions.'' For many seniors, in-home care, service-enriched housing, retrofitted homes and apartments, and assisted living-type facilities are sorely needed so that seniors can access necessary services where they live.

While there are numerous Federal programs that assist seniors and their families in meeting these needs, they are fragmented across many government agencies, with little or no coordination. In fact, the Seniors Commission found that ''the most striking characteristic of seniors' housing and health care in this country is the disconnection of one field from another.'' For example, housing assistance is available from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Veterans Affairs, while health care and supportive services are most likely accessed through various branches of the Department of Health and Human Services, such as the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services and the Administration on Aging, as well as through the Department of Transportation and the Department of Labor.

The Seniors Commission concluded that ''the time has come for coordination among Federal and State agencies and administrators.'' The legislation I am introducing today, the ''Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors Act of 2005,'' answers the commission's call to action by implementing the recommendation for better federal coordination.

Through a high-level interagency council the Federal Government will take a simple, but critical, step in addressing this fragmentation. This Council will have a variety of functions. The council will review all Federal programs designed to assist seniors, identify gaps in services, make recommendations about how to reduce duplication, identify best practices for relevant programs and services, and most importantly, work to improve the availability of housing and services for seniors. The council will also monitor, evaluate, and recommend improvements in existing programs and services that assist seniors in meeting their housing and service needs at the

Federal, State, and local level, and will work to more effectively coordinate programs at the federal level, as well as at the state level, where many of the decisions regarding health and service needs are made. In addition, the council will be responsible for collecting and disseminating information, through a variety of means, about seniors and the programs and services relating to their needs. Through collaboration with the Federal Interagency Forum on Aging Statistics and the Census Bureau, the council will consolidate data on these needs and identify and address unmet data needs.

With improved collaboration and coordination among the Federal agencies and our State partners, we can ensure that seniors are better able to access housing and services. To ensure its effectiveness, the council will be comprised of top-level officials who oversee the programs which assist seniors in this country, including the Secretaries of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; the Department of Health and Human Services; the Department of Labor; the Department of Transportation; and the Department of Veterans Affairs; as well as the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration; the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; and the Administrator of the Administration for the Aging.

This is a step we must take. It is essential that we make it easier for seniors and their families to access housing and supportive services together, so that when faced with difficult decisions, they do not have to navigate a confusing maze of programs and services, and work through multiple bureaucracies. We must also make it simpler for developers and providers to link housing and services so that greater supportive housing opportunities are available to the senior population. Through the Interagency Council, it is my hope that we will move toward a model of providing housing and services to seniors around the country.

If we are to successfully address these growing needs, it is clear that much work must be done. The establishment of an Interagency Council on Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors is a critical first step in this endeavor. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill together with letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 705

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 ''Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors Act of 2005''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The senior population (persons 65 or older) in this country is rapidly growing, and is expected to increase from 34,700,000 in 2000 to nearly 40,000,000 by 2010, and then will dramatically increase to over 50,000,000 by 2020.

(2) By 2020, the population of ''older'' seniors, those over age 85, is expected to double to 7,000,000, and then double again to 14,000,000 by 2040.

(3) As the senior population increases, so does the need for additional safe, decent, affordable, and suitable housing that meets their unique needs.

(4) Due to the health care, transportation, and service needs of seniors, issues of providing suitable and affordable housing opportunities differ significantly from the housing needs of other families.

(5) Seniors need access to a wide array of housing options, such as affordable assisted living, in-home care, supportive or service-enriched housing, and retrofitted homes and apartments to allow seniors to age in place and to avoid premature placement in institutional settings.

(6) While there are many programs in place to assist seniors in finding and affording suitable housing and accessing needed services, these programs are fragmented and spread across many agencies, making it difficult for seniors to access assistance or to receive comprehensive information.

(7) Better coordination among Federal agencies is needed, as is better coordination at State and local levels, to ensure that seniors can access government activities, programs, services, and benefits in an effective and efficient manner.

(8) Up to date, accurate, and accessible statistics on key characteristics of seniors, including conditions, behaviors, and needs, are required to accurately identify the housing and service needs of seniors.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term ''housing'' means any form of residence, including rental housing, homeownership, assisted living, group home, supportive housing arrangement, nursing facility, or any other physical location where a person can live.

(2) The term ''service'' includes transportation, health care, nursing assistance, meal, personal care and chore services, assistance with daily activities, mental health care, physical therapy, case management, and any other services needed by seniors to allow them to stay in their housing or find alternative housing that meets their needs.

(3) The term ''program'' includes any Federal or State program providing income support, health benefits or other benefits to seniors, housing assistance, mortgages, mortgage or loan insurance or guarantees, housing counseling, supportive services, assistance with daily activities, or other assistance for seniors.

(4) The term ''Council'' means the Interagency Council on Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors.

(5) The term ''senior'' means any individual 65 years of age or older.

SEC. 4. INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON MEETING THE HOUSING AND SERVICE NEEDS OF SENIORS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the executive branch an independent council to be known as the Interagency Council on Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the Council are as follows:

(1) To promote coordination and collaboration among the Federal departments and agencies involved with housing, health care, and service needs of seniors in order to better meet the needs of senior citizens.

(2) To identify the unique housing and service needs faced by seniors around the country and to recommend ways that the Federal Government, States, State and local governments, and others can better meet those needs, including how to ensure that seniors can find and afford housing that allows them to access health care, transportation, nursing assistance, and assistance with daily activities where they live or in their communities.

(3) To facilitate the aging in place of seniors, by identifying and making available the programs and services necessary to enable seniors to remain in their homes as they age.

(4) To improve coordination among the housing and service related programs and services of Federal agencies for seniors and to make recommendations about needed changes with an emphasis on—

(A) maximizing the impact of existing programs and services;

(B) reducing or eliminating areas of overlap and duplication in the provision and accessibility of such programs and services; and

(C) making access to programs and services easier for seniors around the country.

(5) To increase the efficiency and effectiveness of existing housing and service related programs and services which serve seniors.

(6) To establish an ongoing system of coordination among and within such agencies or organizations so that the housing and service needs of seniors are met in a more efficient manner.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—The Council shall be composed of the following:

(1) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or a designee of the Secretary.

(2) The Secretary of Health and Human Services or a designee of the Secretary.

(3) The Secretary of Agriculture or a designee of the Secretary.

(4) The Secretary of Transportation or a designee of the Secretary.

(5) The Secretary of Labor or a designee of the Secretary.

(6) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs or a designee of the Secretary.

(7) The Secretary of the Treasury or a designee of the Secretary.

(8) The Commissioner of the Social Security Administration or a designee of the Commissioner.

(9) The Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services or a designee of the Administrator.

(10) The Administrator of the Administration on Aging or a designee of the Administrator.

(11) The head (or designee) of any other Federal agency as the Council considers appropriate.

(12) State and local representatives knowledgeable about the needs of seniors as chosen by the Council members described in paragraphs (1) through (11).

(d) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Council shall alternate between the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on an annual basis.

(e) VICE CHAIR.—Each year, the Council shall elect a Vice Chair from among its members.

(f) MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet at the call of its Chairperson or a majority of its members at any time, and no less often

than quarterly. The Council shall hold meetings with stakeholders and other interested parties at least twice a year, so that the opinions of such parties can be taken into account and so that outside groups can learn of the Council's activities and plans.

SEC. 5. FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL.

(a) RELEVANT ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out its objectives, the Council shall—

(1) review all Federal programs and services that assist seniors in finding, affording, and rehabilitating housing, including those that assist seniors in accessing health care, transportation, supportive services, and assistance with daily activities, where or close to where seniors live;

(2) monitor, evaluate, and recommend improvements in existing programs and services administered, funded, or financed by Federal, State, and local agencies to assist seniors in meeting their housing and service needs and make any recommendations about how agencies can better work to house and serve seniors; and

(3) recommend ways—

(A) to reduce duplication among programs and services by Federal agencies that assist seniors in meeting their housing and service needs;

(B) to ensure collaboration among and within agencies in the provision and availability of programs and services so that seniors are able to easily access needed programs and services;

(C) to work with States to better provide housing and services to seniors by—

(i) holding individual meetings with State representatives;

(ii) providing ongoing technical assistance to States in better meeting the needs of seniors; and

(iii) working with States to designate State liaisons to the Council;

(D) to identify best practices for programs and services that assist seniors in meeting their housing and service needs, including model—

(i) programs linking housing and services;

(ii) financing products offered by government, quasi-government, and private sector entities;

(iii) land use, zoning, and regulatory practices; and

(iv) innovations in technology applications that give seniors access to information on available services;

(E) to collect and disseminate information about seniors and the programs and services available to them to ensure that seniors can access comprehensive information;

(F) to hold biannual meetings with stakeholders and other interested parties (or to hold open Council meetings) to receive input and ideas about how to best meet the housing and service needs of seniors;

(G) to maintain an updated website of policies, meetings, best practices, programs, services, and any other helpful information to keep people informed of the Council's activities; and

(H) to work with the Federal Interagency Forum on Aging Statistics, the Census Bureau, and member agencies to collect and maintain data relating to the housing and service needs of seniors so that all data can be accessed in one place and to identify and address unmet data needs.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) BY MEMBERS.—Each year, the head of each agency that is a member of the Council shall prepare and transmit to the Council a report that describes—

(A) each program and service administered by the agency that serves seniors and the number of seniors served by each program or service, the resources available in each, as well as a breakdown of where each program and service can be accessed;

(B) the barriers and impediments, including statutory or regulatory, to the access and use of such programs and services by seniors;

(C) the efforts made by each agency to increase opportunities for seniors to find and afford housing that meet their needs, including how the agency is working with other agencies to better coordinate programs and services; and

(D) any new data collected by each agency relating to the housing and service needs of seniors.

(2) BY THE COUNCIL.—Each year, the Council shall prepare and transmit to the President, the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, the House Financial Services Committee, and the House Committee on Education and the Workforce a report that—

(A) summarizes the reports required in paragraph (1);

(B) utilizes recent data to assess the nature of the problems faced by seniors in meeting their unique housing and service needs;

(C) provides a comprehensive and detailed description of the programs and services of the Federal Government in meeting the needs and problems described in subparagraph (B);

(D) describes the activities and accomplishments of the Council in working with Federal, State, and local governments, and private organizations in coordinating programs and services to meet the needs described in subparagraph (B) and the resources available to meet those needs;

(E) assesses the level of Federal assistance required to meet the needs described in subparagraph (B); and

(F) makes recommendations for appropriate legislative and administrative actions to meet the needs described in subparagraph (B) and for coordinating programs and services designed to meet those needs.

SEC. 6. POWERS OF THE COUNCIL.

(a) HEARINGS.—The Council may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Council considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) INFORMATION FROM AGENCIES.—Agencies which are members of the Council shall provide all requested information and data to the Council as requested.

(c) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Council may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(d) GIFTS.—The Council may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

SEC. 7. COUNCIL PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—All members of the Council who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Council shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Council.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall, without regard to civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an Executive Director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Council to perform its duties.

(2) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Council shall appoint an Executive Director at its initial meeting. The Executive Director shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate of pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) COMPENSATION.—With the approval of the Council, the Executive Director may appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as necessary to carry out the duties of the Council. The rate of compensation may be set without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(d) TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—In carrying out its objectives, the Council may procure temporary and intermittent services of consultants and experts under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(e) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the Council, any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Council without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Housing Urban Development and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide the Council with such administrative and supportive services as are necessary to ensure that the Council can carry out its functions.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, $1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2010.

ELDERLY HOUSING COALITION,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2005

Re support for Interagency Council on Housing and Service Needs of Seniors.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,
Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: The Elderly Housing Coalition (EHC) is comprised of organizations that represent providers of affordable housing and supportive service for the elderly. We are writing in enthusiastic support of your legislation that would establish the Interagency Council on Housing and Service Needs of Seniors. This Council is desperately needed and will help federal, state and local governments better serve the housing and service needs of our elderly population.

According to the Congressional Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Facility Needs for Seniors in the 21st Century, we must integrate our current fragmented system of programs that seniors rely on to find the housing and services they need. As the number of seniors grows exponentially and will, in fact, have doubled by 2030, we must find a way to use our resources more effectively.

Your bill will be a great first step to bringing the key governmental agencies together to identify how they can best work to maximize program efficiency and streamline access. Again, we are pleased to offer our support for this legislation establishing an interagency council and thank you for your leadership on this issue.

If there is anything that the Elderly Housing Coalition can do to help or if you have any questions about the EHC please contact Nancy Libson or Alayna Waldrum at (202) 783–2242.

Sincerely,

Alliance for Retired Americans.
American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging.
American Association of Service Coordinators.
Association of Jewish Aging Services of North America.
B'nai B'rith International.
Catholic Charities USA.
Catholic Health Association of the United States.
Council of Large Public Housing Authorities.
Elderly Housing Development and Operations Corporation.
Kinship Caregiver Resources/Intergenerational Village Project.
Local Initiatives Support Corporation.
National Association of Housing, Cooperatives.
National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.
National Housing Conference.
National Low Income Housing Coalition.
National PACE Association.
Stewards of Affordable Housing for the Future.
Volunteers of America.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF HOMES AND SERVICES FOR THE AGING,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2005.

Re Interagency Council on Housing and Service Needs of Seniors Legislation.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,
Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: On behalf of AAHSA, I am writing to thank you for introducing legislation to establish an Interagency Council on Housing and Service Needs of Seniors. AAHSA members serve two million people every day through mission-driven, not-for-profit organizations dedicated to providing the services people need, when they need them, in the place they call home. Our members offer the continuum of aging services: assisted living residences, continuing care retirement communities, nursing homes, senior housing facilities, and outreach services. AAHSA's mission is to create the future of aging services through quality the public can trust.

Half of our members own or operate federally subsidized senior apartment buildings and work collaboratively with home and community based service providers that operate programs governed by a maze of departmental regulations. This unique perspective gives us and our members a bird's eye view of how important it is for the various federal agencies to work together to ensure the best care in the most responsive and efficient manner possible.

In 2002 the Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Facility Needs for Seniors in the 21st Century reported to Congress that a top priority for the federal government should be integrating the existing fragmented system of programs that seniors rely on to piece together the housing and services they need. Time is precious—the United States is facing exponential growth in our senior population, which will double by 2030. AAHSA members have created a number of successful models for combining services and senior housing. Unfortunately these are limited and difficult to replicate because of the programmatic barriers. Now is the time to get the policymakers to the table to address the barriers and opportunities that exist in our federal programs and how to make them work.

We know that this can be done. AAHSA strongly supports your bill, which will help the Executive branch and Federal agencies better coordinate the successful aging programs, as an important first step. Thank you for your leadership. If there is anything that AAHSA or my staff can do to support you, please do not hesitate to let me know. I can be reached at (202) 783–2242.

Sincerely,

LARRY MINNIX,
President and CEO.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SERVICE COORDINATORS,
Columbus, OH, April 5, 2005.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: On behalf of the 1,600 members of the American Association of Service Coordinators (AASC), I want to express our support for your proposed legislation to establish an Interagency Council on Housing and Service Needs of Seniors. AASC believes that this bill is urgently needed to assist service coordinators and others seeking to bring together the various federal and other programs needed by older persons and other special populations.

In my testimony, before the Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Facility describing the present fragmented system, I stated that ''even for long-time professionals, the current 'crazy-quilt' tapestry of services and shelter options makes it difficult to fully grasp their complexities, let alone try to access them. The results are confusion among consumers, duplication of service delivery, government agencies not knowing who supplies what service or that some services even exist, reduction in qualified service workers, regulations that impede dedicated service providers from providing the service they were hired and want to perform.''

One of AASC recommendations to the Commission was the establishment of a cabinet-level department that would encompass in one entity housing, health care and other federal support programs serving the elderly to better focus federal policy and regulatory efforts, in conjunction with states and communities. AASC believes that your bill is an important step to establish a permanent national platform to address many of the cross-cutting needs and issues confronting increasing numbers of frail and vulnerable older persons.

As you may know, AASC is a national, nonprofit organization representing professional service coordinators who serve low-income older persons and other special populations living in federally assisted and public housing facilities nationwide, their caregivers, and others in their local community. Our dedicated membership consists of service coordinators, case managers and social workers, housing managers and administrators, housing management companies, public housing authorities, state housing finance agencies, state and local area agencies on aging and a broad range of national and state organizations and professionals involved in affordable, service-enhanced housing. Background information on AASC is available on our website: www.servicercoordinators.org.

We are grateful for your leadership on the vital issue. Please let me know how AASC can assist you to expedite enactment of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JANICE MONKS,
President.

ELDERLY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT & OPERATIONS CORPORATION,
Fort Lauderdale, FL, April 5, 2005.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: I am pleased that Elderly Housing Development and Operations Corporation (EHDOC) representing over 40 senior housing facilities in 14 states, is joining with other non-profit organizations involved with federally assisted senior housing to strongly support your bill to establish an Interagency Council on Housing and Service Needs of Seniors. We believe that the establishment of this Interagency Council will provide a cost-effective and efficient means to promote coordination between the various federal agencies involved with senior housing and services, particularly HUD and HHS.

EHDOC is well aware of the need to improve collaboration between the various federal agencies based on our efforts to assist low-income, frail elderly in Council House in Suitland, MD. Unfortunately, it is often difficult to link the various services needed to enable many frail elderly to remain in their homes as they age due to the existing fragmentation of federal housing, services and health care policies and programs.

The difficulty experienced by EHDOC with linking housing and services is repeated by many nonprofit sponsors of federally assisted senior housing throughout the country. As you know, I was I honored to serve as your appointee to the recent Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Care Facilities Needs of Older Persons. We repeatedly heard testimony from public and private agencies involved with senior housing, supportive services and health care, older persons and others, of their difficulties in bringing together these services to meet the needs of older persons.

As stated in the Senior Commissions' final report, ''the very heart of this Commission's work is the recognition that the housing and service needs of seniors traditionally have been addressed in different 'worlds' that often fail to recognize or communicate with each other.'' Findings of the Commission concluded ''while policymakers have struggled to be responsive to the needs of seniors, the very structure of Congressional committees and Federal agencies often makes it difficult to address complex needs in a comprehensive and coordinated fashion. For example: medical needs of seniors are addressed by Medicare and Medicaid; social service needs are addressed by Medicaid, the OAA, and other block grant programs; housing programs are administered by HUD and the Department of Agriculture's RHS; and transportation programs are administered by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).''

We commend you for your leadership in addressing this critical need to effectively

bring together the various federal agencies and others involved with affordable housing and service needs of older persons through the establishment of an Interagency Council on Senior Housing. Please let me if you have any questions or how EHDOC can assist you with the enactment of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

STEVE PROTULIS,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL PACE ASSOCIATION,
April 5, 2005.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: On behalf of the National PACE Association (NPA), I want to express our support for your bill to establish an Interagency Council on Housing and Service Needs of Seniors. NPA believes that this legislation is essential to provide effective linkages between housing, health care and services, and that the proposed Interagency Council will facilitate an effective national forum to promote coordination among key federal agencies involved with these programs, particularly HUD, HHS, CMS, and DOT.

As you may know, NPA represents nonprofit organizations in 21 states, including Hopkins ElderPlus in Baltimore that are providers of PACE—a Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly. PACE programs coordinate and provide all needed preventive, primary, acute and long term care services so that older persons can continue living in the community. PACE serves individuals who are aged 55 or older, certified by their state to need nursing home care, are able to live safely in the community, and live in a state designated PACE service area. PACE provides a ''one stop shop'' for health and long-term care, and our members clearly understand through their extensive experience with the holistic needs of frail elderly, the interrelationship between housing, services, health and long-term care.

While housing is not a direct PACE benefit, our members have long recognized the importance of housing as a vital aspect of promoting wellness and quality of life for older persons. In fact, nearly all PACE programs nationwide serve enrollees who reside in public and federally assisted multifamily senior housing, and nearly one third of our members co-locate their PACE health care centers with senior housing or assisted living. Unfortunately, it is often difficult to link housing, services and health care due to conflicting funding streams, licensing, eligibility, and other factors.

Additional background information on PACE, NPA, and our members are available at our website: *www.npaonline.org*. Our members strongly support your bill and the prompt establishment of an Interagency Council on Senior Housing and Services. We are grateful for your leadership with this effort. Please let me know if you have any questions or how NPA can assist you with this effort to benefit low-income, frail elderly. I can be reached at 703–535–1567 or *shawnbanpaonline.org*.

Sincerely,

SHAWN BLOOM,
President and CEO.

By Mr. COLEMAN:

S. 706. A bill to convey all right, title, and interst of the United States in and to the land described in this Act to the Secretary of the Interior for the Prairie Island Indian Community in Minnestora; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 706

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 ''Prairie Island Land Conveyance Act of 2005''.

SEC. 2. PRAIRIE ISLAND LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b), including all improvements, cultural resources, and sites on the land, subject to the flowage and sloughing easement described in subsection (d) and to the conditions stated in subsection (f), to the Secretary of the Interior, to be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Prairie Island Indian Community in Minnesota; and

(2) included in the Prairie Island Indian Community Reservation in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The land to be conveyed under subsection (a) is the approximately 1290 acres of land associated with the Lock and Dam #3 on the Mississippi River in Goodhue County, Minnesota, located in tracts identified as GO–251, GO–252, GO–271, GO–277, GO–278, GO–284, GO–301 through GO–313, GO–314A, GO–314B, GO–329, GO–330A, GO–330B, GO–331A, GO–331B, GO–331C, GO–332, GO–333, GO–334, GO–335A, GO–335B, GO–336 through GO–338, GO–339A, GO–339B, GO–339C, GO–339D, GO–339E, GO–340A, GO–340B, GO–358, GO–359A, GO–359B, GO–359C, GO–359D, and GO–360, as depicted on the map entitled ''United States Army Corps of Engineers survey map of the Upper Mississippi River 9-Foot Project, Lock & Dam No. 3 (Red Wing), Land & Flowage Rights'' and dated December 1936.

(c) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of conveyance under subsection (a), the boundaries of the land conveyed shall be surveyed as provided in section 2115 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 176).

(d) EASEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corps of Engineers shall retain a flowage and sloughing easement for the purpose of navigation and purposes relating to the Lock and Dam No. 3 project over the portion of the land described in subsection (b) that lies below the elevation of 676.0.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The easement retained under paragraph (1) includes—

(A) the perpetual right to overflow, flood, and submerge property as the District Engineer determines to be necessary in connection with the operation and maintenance of the Mississippi River Navigation Project; and

(B) the continuing right to clear and remove any brush, debris, or natural obstructions that, in the opinion of the District Engineer, may be detrimental to the project.

(e) OWNERSHIP OF STURGEON LAKE BED UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section diminishes or otherwise affects the title of the State of Minnesota to the bed of Sturgeon Lake located within the tracts of land described in subsection (b).

(f) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (a) is subject to the conditions that the Prairie Island Indian Community shall not—

(1) use the conveyed land for human habitation;

(2) construct any structure on the land without the written approval of the District Engineer; or

(3) conduct gaming (within the meaning of section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)) on the land.

(g) NO EFFECT ON ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the conveyance under subsection (a), the land shall continue to be eligible for environmental management planning and other recreational or natural resource development projects on the same basis as before the conveyance.

(h) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section diminishes or otherwise affects the rights granted to the United States pursuant to letters of July 23, 1937, and November 20, 1937, from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of War and the letters of the Secretary of War in response to the Secretary of the Interior dated August 18, 1937, and November 27, 1937, under which the Secretary of the Interior granted certain rights to the Corps of Engineers to overflow the portions of Tracts A, B, and C that lie within the Mississippi River 9-Foot Channel Project boundary and as more particularly shown and depicted on the map entitled ''United States Army Corps of Engineers survey map of the Upper Mississippi River 9-Foot Project, Lock & Dam No. 3 (Red Wing), Land & Flowage Rights'' and dated December 1936.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. 707. A bill to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act, or PREEMIE Act. This bipartisan bill expands research into the causes and prevention of prematurity, babies born 3 weeks or more early, and increases education and support services related to prematurity. I am pleased that Senator DODD is once again my partner on this legislation and we hope the Senate will pass the PREEMIE Act in this Congress.

In June 2004, the Subcommittee on Children and Families, which I chaired, held a hearing to learn about the problem of premature birth. Unfortunately, Tennessee has the fourth highest rate of premature birth in the country. Fourteen percent of Tennessee babies are born prematurely. In an average week in Tennessee, 210 babies are born prematurely. Premature infants are 14 times more likely to die in the first year of life. It is the No. 1 cause of infant death in the first month of life. Premature babies who survive may suffer lifelong consequences including: cerebral palsy, mental retardation, chronic lung disease, and vision and hearing loss.

In February 2004, the National Center for Health Statistics, NCHS, reported the first increase in the U.S. infant mortality rate since 1958, from 6.8 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in 2001 to 7.0 in 2000. This increase is extremely disturbing because the infant mortality rate is a measure of the health of society. NCHS subsequently reported that 61 percent of this increase in infant mortality was due to an increase in the birth of premature and low birthweight babies. Almost half the cases of premature birth have no known cause—any pregnant woman is at risk. We must address this issue.

Finally, this is a costly problem. In 2002, the estimated charges for hospital stays for infants with a diagnosis of preterm birth or low birthweight, LBW, were $15.5 billion. The average hospital charge per infant stay with a principal diagnosis of prematurity/LBW was $79,000, with an average hospital stay of 24.2 days. Hospital charges for newborn stays without complications averaged $1,500 in 2002, with an average hospital stay of 2.0 days. Employers carry much of the burden. Almost half of that $15.5 billion was billed to employers or other private insurers, according to the March of Dimes. The other half is billed to Medicaid.

As a nation, we must address this problem. The PREEMIE Act calls for expanding Federal research related to preterm labor and delivery and increasing public and provider education and support services. It is supported by the March of Dimes, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the Association of Women's Health, Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses, and many others.

I hope my colleagues will join me in the fight to ensure a healthy start for all of American's children by cosponsoring and working with me for passage of the PREEMIE Act during this Congress.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 707

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 ''Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act'' or the ''PREEMIE Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Premature birth is a serious and growing problem. The rate of preterm birth increased 27 percent between 1982 and 2002 (from 9.4 percent to 11.9 percent). In 2001, more than 480,000 babies were born prematurely in the United States.

(2) Preterm birth accounts for 24 percent of deaths in the first month of life.

(3) Premature infants are 14 times more likely to die in the first year of life.

(4) Premature babies who survive may suffer lifelong consequences, including cerebral palsy, mental retardation, chronic lung disease, and vision and hearing loss.

(5) Preterm and low birthweight birth is a significant financial burden in health care. The estimated charges for hospital stays for infants with any diagnosis of prematurity/low birthweight were $15,500,000,000 in 2002. The average lifetime medical costs of a premature baby are conservatively estimated at $500,000.

(6) The proportion of preterm infants born to African-American mothers (17.3 percent) was significantly higher compared to the rate of infants born to white mothers (10.6 percent). Prematurity or low birthweight is the leading cause of death for African-American infants.

(7) The cause of approximately half of all premature births is unknown.

(8) Women who smoke during pregnancy are twice as likely as nonsmokers to give birth to a low birthweight baby. Babies born to smokers weigh, on average, 200 grams less than nonsmokers' babies.

(9) To reduce the rates of preterm labor and delivery more research is needed on the underlying causes of preterm delivery, the development of treatments for prevention of preterm birth, and treatments improving outcomes for infants born preterm.

(b) PURPOSES.—It the purpose of this Act to—

(1) reduce rates of preterm labor and delivery;

(2) work toward an evidence-based standard of care for pregnant women at risk of preterm labor or other serious complications, and for infants born preterm and at a low birthweight; and

(3) reduce infant mortality and disabilities caused by prematurity.

SEC. 3. RESEARCH RELATING TO PRETERM LABOR AND DELIVERY AND THE CARE, TREATMENT, AND OUTCOMES OF PRETERM AND LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS.

(a) GENERAL EXPANSION OF NIH RESEARCH.—Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 409J. EXPANSION AND COORDINATION OF RESEARCH RELATING TO PRETERM LABOR AND DELIVERY AND INFANT MORTALITY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall expand, intensify, and coordinate the activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research on the causes of preterm labor and delivery, infant mortality, and improving the care and treatment of preterm and low birthweight infants.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF RESEARCH NETWORKS.—There shall be established within the National Institutes of Health a Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units Network and a Neonatal Research Units Network. In complying with this subsection, the Director of NIH shall utilize existing networks.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.''.

(b) GENERAL EXPANSION OF CDC RESEARCH.—Section 301 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall expand, intensify, and coordinate the activities of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to preterm labor and delivery and infant mortality.''.

(c) STUDY ON ASSISTED REPRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 1004(c) of the Children's Health Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-310) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) consider the impact of assisted reproduction technologies on the mother's and children's health and development.''.

(d) STUDY ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PREMATURITY AND BIRTH DEFECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall conduct a study on the relationship between prematurity, birth defects, and developmental disabilities.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 2 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(e) REVIEW OF PREGNANCY RISK ASSESSMENT MONITORING SURVEY.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall conduct a review of the Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring Survey to ensure that the Survey includes information relative to medical care and intervention received, in order to track pregnancy outcomes and reduce instances of preterm birth.

(f) STUDY ON THE HEALTH AND ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF PRETERM BIRTH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institutes of Health in conjunction with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences for the conduct of a study to define and address the health and economic consequences of preterm birth. In conducting the study, the Institute of Medicine shall—

(A) review and assess the epidemiology of premature birth and low birthweight, and the associated maternal and child health effects in the United States, with attention paid to categories of gestational age, plurality, maternal age, and racial or ethnic disparities;

(B) review and describe the spectrum of short and long-term disability and health-related quality of life associated with premature births and the impact on maternal health, health care and quality of life, family employment, caregiver issues, and other social and financial burdens;

(C) assess the direct and indirect costs associated with premature birth, including morbidity, disability, and mortality;

(D) identify gaps and provide recommendations for feasible systems of monitoring and assessing associated economic and quality of life burdens associated with prematurity;

(E) explore the implications of the burden of premature births for national health policy;

(F) identify community outreach models that are effective in decreasing prematurity rates in communities;

(G) consider options for addressing, as appropriate, the allocation of public funds to biomedical and behavioral research, the costs and benefits of preventive interventions, public health, and access to health care; and

(H) provide recommendations on best practices and interventions to prevent premature birth, as well as the most promising areas of research to further prevention efforts.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the contract is entered into under paragraph (1), the Institute of Medicine shall submit to the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the results of the study conducted under such paragraph.

(g) EVALUATION OF NATIONAL CORE PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration shall conduct an assessment of the current national core performance measures and national core outcome measures utilized under the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant under title V of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 701 et seq.) for purposes of expanding such measures to include some of the known risk factors of low birthweight and prematurity, including the percentage of infants born to pregnant women who smoked during pregnancy.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the results of the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 4. PUBLIC AND HEALTH CARE PROVIDER EDUCATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 399O. PUBLIC AND HEALTH CARE PROVIDER EDUCATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, directly or through the awarding of grants to public or private nonprofit entities, shall conduct a demonstration project to improve the provision of information on prematurity to health professionals and other health care providers and the public.

''(b) ACTIVITIES.—Activities to be carried out under the demonstration project under subsection (a) shall include the establishment of programs—

''(1) to provide information and education to health professionals, other health care providers, and the public concerning—

''(A) the signs of preterm labor, updated as new research results become available;

''(B) the screening for and the treating of infections;

''(C) counseling on optimal weight and good nutrition, including folic acid;

''(D) smoking cessation education and counseling; and

''(E) stress management; and

''(2) to improve the treatment and outcomes for babies born premature, including the use of evidence-based standards of care by health care professionals for pregnant women at risk of preterm labor or other serious complications and for infants born preterm and at a low birthweight.

''(c) REQUIREMENT.—Any program or activity funded under this section shall be evidence-based.

''(d) NICU FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall conduct, through the awarding of grants to public and nonprofit private entities, projects to respond to the emotional and informational needs of families during the stay of an infant in a neonatal intensive care unit, during the transition of the infant to the home, and in the event of a newborn death. Activities under such projects may include providing books and videos to families that provide information about the neonatal intensive care unit experience, and providing direct services that provide emotional support within the neonatal intensive care unit setting.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.''.

SEC. 5. INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL ON PREMATURITY AND LOW BIRTHWEIGHT.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to stimulate multidisciplinary research, scientific exchange, and collaboration among the agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services and to assist the Department in targeting efforts to achieve the greatest advances toward the goal of reducing prematurity and low birthweight.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish an Interagency Coordinating Council on Prematurity and Low Birthweight (referred to in this section as the Council) to carry out the purpose of this section.

(c) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of members to be appointed by the Secretary, including representatives of—

(1) the agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services; and

(2) voluntary health care organizations, including grassroots advocacy organizations, providers of specialty obstetrical and pediatric care, and researcher organizations.

(d) ACTIVITIES.—The Council shall—

(1) annually report to the Secretary of Health and Human Services on current Departmental activities relating to prematurity and low birthweight;

(2) plan and hold a conference on prematurity and low birthweight under the sponsorship of the Surgeon General;

(3) establish a consensus research plan for the Department of Health and Human Services on prematurity and low birthweight;

(4) report to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the appropriate committees of Congress on recommendations derived from the conference held under paragraph (2) and on the status of Departmental research activities concerning prematurity and low birthweight;

(5) carry out other activities determined appropriate by the Secretary of Health and Human Services; and

(6) oversee the coordination of the implementation of this Act.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senator ALEXANDER in reintroducing the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers Who Deliver Infants Early (PREEMIE) Act—legislation intended to address the growing crisis of premature birth in our nation.

I think when many of us hear about a baby being born early, we don't give much thought to what it means. After all, it is not all that uncommon—I'm sure that almost all of my colleagues knows someone born prematurely. Thanks to modem medicine it is also not uncommon for a baby born early to end up healthy and happy.

But this feeling that prematurity is somehow ''normal'' or to be expected masks a growing health crisis. Prematurity has real consequences in health and economic terms. We need to bring to light this issue that affects some of the most vulnerable members of our society: newborn babies.

As a member of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee I, along with my colleagues, have devoted much time and effort to improving the health of our nation's children and infants. And yet despite our efforts, the problem of prematurity continues to persist and even grow. What is so striking about prematurity is how many parents face these enormous emotional and financial burdens. Nearly 1 out of every 8 babies in the United States is born prematurely—that's 1,300 babies each day, and over 470,000 each year (including more than 4,000 in my home state of Connecticut).

Despite all of the health care advances of the last decades, the problem of prematurity is not in any way abating. According to recent data released by the National Center for Health Statistics, in 2002 the infant mortality rate actually increased for the first time since 1958. Much of this increase is attributable to infant death in the first month of life—of which prematurity is the leading cause. Since 1981, the premature birth rate has increased by 27 percent. This stands in stark contrast to some of the breathtaking medical discoveries of the past two decades. We can now treat and even cure many types of cancer, but we can't prevent babies from being born too soon.

Mr. President, the consequences of prematurity are devastating. As I mentioned earlier, it is the leading cause of neonatal death—a tragedy that no family should have to face. For those infants that survive, a lifetime of severe health problems is not uncommon. Prematurity has been linked to such long-term health problems as cerebral palsy, mental retardation, chronic lung disease, and vision and hearing loss. Premature babies have the deck stacked against them from the moment they are born. And even in the fortunate cases where there are no life-long health consequences, the experience of a premature birth takes an enormous emotional toll on a family.

Prematurity also carries a significant economic cost. According to a recent study conducted by the March of Dimes, hospitalizations due to prematurity cost a total of $15.5 billion during the year 2002—accounting for nearly half of all hospital charges for infants in this country. And this number does not even include the cost of care for problems later in life resulting from a premature birth. Much of this cost falls on employers who are already bearing the weight of skyrocketing health care costs.

Given the emotional and economic toll that prematurity takes on this

country, we know remarkably little about why it happens, and how it can be prevented. Some of the risk factors associated with preterm birth are known, including advanced age of the mother, smoking, and certain chronic diseases. But nearly 50 percent of all premature births have no known cause. And because we know so little about the causes of prematurity, we also do not know how to prevent it.

For such a large (and growing) problem, it is astounding how little we know. It is critical that we make a national commitment to solving this puzzle. We must do everything we can to expand research—both public and private—into the root causes of prematurity.

Senator ALEXANDER and I are introducing the PREEMIE Act for precisely this reason. Our bill would coordinate and expand research related to prematurity at the Federal level. It would also educate health care providers and the general public about the risks of prematurity, and measures that can be taken before and during pregnancy to prevent it. Pregnant mothers need to know the warning signs and symptoms of premature labor—and they need to know what to do if they begin to notice those signs.

Finally, because we will never eliminate prematurity completely, our legislation would provide support services to families impacted by a premature birth. As we're investigating the causes of prematurity and increasing awareness in expectant parents, we need to reach out to the mothers and fathers across our country whose children are born too soon. We need to give them emotional support during the difficult days, weeks, and months that often follow a premature birth. We need to make sure that the doctors, nurses, and other hospital staff who care for premature babies are sensitive to the needs of their parents, their brothers, and their sisters. And we need to make sure that when the time finally comes to bring a premature baby home, parents have all the information they need to make that transition.

It is my hope that this legislation will complement and support some of the efforts going on in the private sector—such as the March of Dimes ambitious campaign to increase public awareness and reduce the rate of preterm birth. I urge all of my colleagues to join us in support of this important legislation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH):

S. 708. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide medicare beneficiaries with access to information concerning the quality of care provided by skilled nursing facilities and to provide incentives to skilled nursing facilities to improve the quality of care provided by those facilities by linking the amount of payment under the medicare program to quality reporting and performance requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Long Term Care Quality and Consumer Information Improvement Act of 2005. Medicare spending for skilled nursing facilities grew rapidly during the late 1980s and 1990s increasing from almost $4 billion in 1992 to $12.9 billion in 1997. While spending has increased under Medicare, there has not been an effort to reward skilled nursing facilities that have provided exceptional care to seniors.

The bill I am introducing today with my colleague from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, will establish a system to reward skilled nursing facilities that provide exceptional care. We should take steps to ensure that skilled nursing facilities that are providing the best care be rewarded. We must also create incentives for other facilities to strive to provide excellent care.

The Long Term Care Quality and Consumer Information Improvement Act of 2005 directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish 10 to 15 quality measures for skilled nursing facilities. While establishing these measures, the Secretary must consult with residents of skilled nursing facilities, patient advocacy organizations, state regulatory representatives, representatives from the skilled nursing facility industry and quality measure experts. The quality ratings for the facilities will then be published on the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' website and published in newspapers with a national circulation.

The quality measures created by this bill will be used as an incentive for facilities to provide excellent care. Skilled nursing facilities that submit data shall receive a full market basket update and starting in fiscal year 2006 skilled nursing facilities that are in the top 10 percent of facilities will receive a 2 percent payment bonus. Skilled nursing facilities that are below the top 10 percent, but within the top 20 percent shall receive a one percent payment bonus.

The increased public disclosure of facility-specific quality data and the financial incentives included in this bill will spur competition and improved performance in skilled nursing facilities. I believe that we need to help the 77 million elderly and disabled Americans who are in nursing homes by making sure they receive the highest quality care possible.

Mr. President, I look forward to working with my fellow Senators and with the chairman of the Finance Committee on this important bill in the upcoming months, and I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this legislation.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a bill I am introducing today, ''The Long Term Care Quality and Consumer Information Act''.

As we begin discussions on how to assure that we reward quality health care, I believe we need to include long term care as part of that discussion. Nursing homes sever some of the most vulnerable among us, and assuring quality of care is encouraged and rewarded is important. I hope that this bill will spark a serious debate about how we pay for quality care. This proposal establishes a voluntary system under which nursing homes providing better quality of care would receive higher payment and in turn would provide more information about the quality of care provided. Information would include nurse staffing ratios and would be made public to consumers and their families.

Historically, Americans have been paying the same for quality health care as for mediocre care. Efforts have been made by some in the private sector to better recognize and provide incentives for those providers who consistently provide a higher level of care. The Institute of Medicine in its report ''Leading by Example,'' declared the government should take the lead in improving health care by giving financial rewards to hospitals and doctors who improve care for beneficiaries in six Federal programs, including Medicare and Medicaid and the Veterans Health Administration. The IOM report also said the government should collect and make available to the public data comparing the quality of care among poviders. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has begun pilot programs. I think nursing homes should also be an area in which we explore payment policies that regard those providing a higher quality of care.

I look forward to continuing the discussion with all stakeholders about these concepts so we can assure a high level of care and find ways to help providers improve the level of care they provide.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. BURR, and Mr. DODD):

S. 709. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to provide supportive services in permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, today I rise with my colleague, Senator JACK REED, to reintroduce the Services for Ending Long-Term Homelessness Act. I would like to thank Senator REED for his support in introducing this bill and for his dedication and commitment to this issue. I also would like to thank Senator BURR for his work on this bill. Senator BURR introduced a similar

version of this bill when he was a member of the House of Representatives. I appreciate his support and the support of Senator DODD, as well. Both are cosponsors of this legislation.

The chronically homeless represent about 10 percent of the entire homeless population, but consume a majority of the services. There are approximately 200,000 to 250,000 people who experience chronic homelessness. Those numbers include the heads of families, as well.

Tragically, for these individuals, the periods of homelessness are measured in years—not weeks or months. They tend to have disabling health and behavioral health problems: 40 percent have substance abuse disorders, 25 percent have a physical disability, and 20 percent have serious mental illness. These factors often contribute to a person becoming homeless, in the first place, and are certainly an impediment to overcoming it.

The President has set a goal of ending chronic homelessness in 10 years. The President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health, chaired by the Ohio Department of Mental Health Director, Mike Hogan, recommended that a comprehensive program be created to facilitate access to permanent supportive housing for individuals and families who are chronically homeless. This recommendation is so important because affordable housing, alone, is not enough for this hard to reach group. And, temporary shelter-housing does not provide the stability and services needed to provide long-term positive outcomes. Only supportive housing, where the chronically homeless can receive shelter and services, such as mental health and substance abuse treatment, has been effective in decreasing their chances of returning to the streets and increasing their chances for leading productive lives.

Not only is it right to help this group of hard to reach individuals, but it is also fiscally responsible. This group is one of the most expensive groups to serve. As I mentioned previously, they represent 10 percent of the overall homeless population, however, they consume a majority of homeless services. They consume the most emergency housing and health care services, which are also the most costly to provide. By encouraging supportive housing, we are providing the services necessary for these individuals and families to really get back on their feet. We can either continue to provide expensive emergency services to these needy people or we can give them the right kind of help—the type of help they need for their long-term well-being and the long-term well-being of our communities.

Unfortunately, current programs for funding services in permanent supportive housing, other than those administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were not designed to be coordinated with housing programs. These programs also were not designed to meet the challenging needs of this specific subgroup of the homeless. That is why the bill we are introducing today would provide the authorization to fund services for supportive housing by providing grants which can be used with existing programs through HUD and state and local communities.

Our bill also would encourage those who provide services to the chronically homeless, such as SAMHSA within the Department of Health and Human Services, to work with and coordinate their efforts with those who provide the physical housing, such as HUD. Under the current administration, these two departments have started to truly coordinate their efforts, and this bill would encourage and support that continued collaboration.

This is a good bill, Mr. President, and it could make a real difference in the lives of so many individuals in need. I ask my colleagues to join us in support.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 709

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 ''Services for Ending Long-Term Homelessness Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Nationally, there are approximately 200,000 to 250,000 people who experience chronic homelessness, including some families with children. Chronically homeless people often live in shelters or on the streets for years at a time, experience repeated episodes of homelessness without achieving housing stability, or cycle between homelessness, jails, mental health facilities, and hospitals.

(2) The President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health recommended the development and implementation of a comprehensive plan designed to facilitate access to 150,000 units of permanent supportive housing for consumers and families who are chronically homeless. The Commission found that affordable housing alone is insufficient for many people with severe mental illness, and that flexible, mobile, individualized support services are also necessary to support and sustain consumers in their housing.

(3) Congress and the President have set a goal of ending chronic homelessness in 10 years.

(4) Permanent supportive housing is a proven and cost effective solution to chronic homelessness. A recent study by the University of Pennsylvania found that each unit of supportive housing for homeless people with mental illness in New York City resulted in public savings of $16,281 per year in systems of care such as mental health, human services, health care, veterans' affairs, and corrections.

(5) Current programs for funding services in permanent supportive housing, other than those administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were not designed to be closely coordinated with housing resources, nor were they designed to meet the multiple needs of people who are chronically homeless.

SEC. 3. DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATOR OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

Section 501(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (17), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (18), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(19) collaborate with Federal departments and programs that are part of the President's Interagency Council on Homelessness, particularly the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and with other agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services, particularly the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Administration on Children and Families, and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, to design national strategies for providing services in supportive housing that will assist in ending chronic homelessness and to implement programs that address chronic homelessness.''.

SEC. 4. GRANTS FOR SERVICES FOR CHRONICALLY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS IN SUPPORTIVE HOUSING.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART J—GRANTS FOR SERVICES TO END CHRONIC HOMELESSNESS

''SEC. 596. GRANTS FOR SERVICES TO END CHRONIC HOMELESSNESS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall make grants to entities described in paragraph (2) for the purpose of carrying out projects to provide the services described in subsection (d) to chronically homeless individuals in permanent supportive housing.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), an entity described in this paragraph is—

''(A) a State or political subdivision of a State, an Indian tribe or tribal organization, or a public or nonprofit private entity, including a community-based provider of homelessness services, health care, housing, or other services important to individuals experiencing chronic homelessness; or

''(B) a consortium composed of entities described in subparagraph (A), which consortium includes a public or nonprofit private entity that serves as the lead applicant and has responsibility for coordinating the activities of the consortium.

''(b) PRIORITIES.—In making grants under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants demonstrating that the applicants—

''(1) target funds to individuals or families who—

''(A) have been homeless for longer periods of time or have experienced more episodes of homelessness than are required to meet the definition of chronic homelessness under this section;

''(B) have high rates of utilization of emergency public systems of care; or

''(C) have a history of interactions with law enforcement and the criminal justice system;

''(2) have greater funding commitments from State or local government agencies responsible for overseeing mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment, medical care, and employment (including commitments to provide Federal funds in accordance with subsection (e)(2)(B)(ii));

''(3) will provide for an increase in the number of units of permanent supportive housing that would serve chronically homeless individuals in the community as a result of an award of a grant under subsection (a); and

''(4) have demonstrated experience providing services to address the mental health and substance abuse problems of chronically homeless individuals living in permanent supportive housing settings.

''(c) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that consideration is given to geographic distribution (such as urban and rural areas) in the awarding of grants under subsection (a).

''(d) SERVICES.—The services referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

''(1) Services provided by the grantee or by qualified subcontractors that promote recovery and self-sufficiency and address barriers to housing stability, including but not limited to the following:

''(A) Mental health services, including treatment and recovery support services.

''(B) Substance abuse treatment and recovery support services, including counseling, treatment planning, recovery coaching, and relapse prevention.

''(C) Integrated, coordinated treatment and recovery support services for co-occurring disorders.

''(D) Health education, including referrals for medical and dental care.

''(E) Services designed to help individuals make progress toward self-sufficiency and recovery, including benefits advocacy, money management, life-skills training, self-help programs, and engagement and motivational interventions.

''(F) Parental skills and family support.

''(G) Case management.

''(H) Other supportive services that promote an end to chronic homelessness.

''(I) Coordination or partnership with other agencies, programs, or mainstream benefits to maximize the availability of services and resources to meet the needs of chronically homeless persons living in supportive housing using cost-effective approaches that avoid duplication.

''(J) Data collection and measuring performance outcomes as specified in subsection (k).

''(2) Services, as described in paragraph (1), that are delivered to individuals and families who are chronically homeless and who are scheduled to become residents of permanent supportive housing within 90 days pending the location or development of an appropriate unit of housing.

''(3) For individuals and families who are otherwise eligible, and who have voluntarily chosen to seek other housing opportunities after a period of tenancy in supportive housing, services, as described in paragraph (1), that are delivered, for a period of 90 days after exiting permanent supportive housing or until the individuals have transitioned to comprehensive services adequate to meet their current needs, provided that the purpose of the services is to support the individuals in their choice to transition into housing that is responsive to their individual needs and preferences.

''(e) MATCHING FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A condition for the receipt of a grant under subsection (a) is that, with respect to the cost of the project to be carried out by an applicant pursuant to such subsection, the applicant agree as follows:

''(A) In the case of the initial grant pursuant to subsection (j)(1)(A), the applicant will, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3), make available contributions toward such costs in an amount that is not less than $1 for each $3 of Federal funds provided in the grant.

''(B) In the case of a renewal grant pursuant to subsection (j)(1)(B), the applicant will, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3), make available contributions toward such costs in an amount that is not less than $1 for each $1 of Federal funds provided in the grant.

''(2) SOURCE OF CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), contributions made by an applicant are in accordance with this paragraph if made as follows:

''(A) The contribution is made from funds of the applicant or from donations from public or private entities.

''(B) Of the contribution—

''(i) not less than 80 percent is from non-Federal funds; and

''(ii) not more than 20 percent is from Federal funds provided under programs that—

''(I) are not expressly directed at services for homeless individuals, but whose purposes are broad enough to include the provision of a service or services described in subsection (d) as authorized expenditures under such program; and

''(II) do not prohibit Federal funds under the program from being used to provide a contribution that is required as a condition for obtaining Federal funds.

''(3) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED.—Contributions required in paragraph (1) may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services. Amounts provided by the Federal Government, or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government, may not be included in determining the amount of non-Federal contributions required in paragraph (2)(B)(i).

''(f) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A condition for the receipt of a grant under subsection (a) is that the applicant involved agree that not more than 10 percent of the grant will be expended for administrative expenses with respect to the grant. Expenses for data collection and measuring performance outcomes as specified in subsection (k) shall not be considered as administrative expenses subject to the limitation in this subsection.

''(g) CERTAIN USES OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding other provisions of this section, a grantee under subsection (a) may expend not more than 20 percent of the grant to provide the services described in subsection (d) to homeless individuals who are not chronically homeless.

''(h) APPLICATION FOR GRANT.—A grant may be made under subsection (a) only if an application for the grant is submitted to the Secretary and the application is in such form, is made in such manner, and contains such agreements, assurances, and information as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section.

''(i) CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—A condition for the receipt of a grant under subsection (a) is that the applicant involved demonstrate the following:

''(1) The applicant and all direct providers of services have the experience, infrastructure, and expertise needed to ensure the quality and effectiveness of services, which may be demonstrated by any of the following:

''(A) Compliance with all local, city, county, or State requirements for licensing, accreditation, or certification (if any) which are applicable to the proposed project.

''(B) A minimum of two years experience providing comparable services that do not require licensing, accreditation, or certification.

''(C) Certification as a Medicaid service provider, including health care for the homeless programs and community health centers.

''(D) An executed agreement with a relevant State or local government agency that will provide oversight over the mental health, substance abuse, or other services that will be delivered by the project.

''(2) There is a mechanism for determining whether residents are chronically homeless. Such a mechanism may rely on local data systems or records of shelter admission. If there are no sources of data regarding the duration or number of homeless episodes, or if such data are unreliable for the purposes of this subsection, an applicant must demonstrate that the project will implement appropriate procedures, taking into consideration the capacity of local homeless service providers to document episodes of homelessness and the challenges of engaging persons who have been chronically homeless, to verify that an individual or family meets the definition for being chronically homeless under this section.

''(3) The applicant participates in a local, regional, or statewide homeless management information system.

''(j) DURATION OF INITIAL AND RENEWAL GRANTS; ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS REGARDING RENEWAL GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the period during which payments are made to a grantee under subsection (a) shall be in accordance with the following:

''(A) In the case of the initial grant, the period of payments shall be not less than three years and not more than five years.

''(B) In the case of a subsequent grant (referred to in this subsection as a 'renewal grant'), the period of payments shall be not more than five years.

''(2) ANNUAL APPROVAL; AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS; NUMBER OF GRANTS.—The provision of payments under an initial or renewal grant is subject to annual approval by the Secretary of the payments and to the availability of appropriations for the fiscal year involved to make the payments. This subsection may not be construed as establishing a limitation on the number of grants under subsection (a) that may be made to an entity.

''(3) ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS REGARDING RENEWAL GRANTS.—

''(A) COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM STANDARDS.—A renewal grant may be made by the Secretary only if the Secretary determines that the applicant involved has, in the project carried out with the grant, maintained compliance with minimum standards for quality and successful outcomes for housing retention, as determined by the Secretary.

''(B) AMOUNT.—The maximum amount of a renewal grant under this subsection shall not exceed an amount equal to—

''(i) 75 percent of the amount of Federal funds provided in the final year of the initial grant period; or

''(ii) 50 percent of the total costs of sustaining the program funded under the grant at the level provided for in the year preceding the year for which the renewal grant is being awarded;

as determined by the Secretary.

''(k) STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES AND REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, as a condition of the receipt of grants under subsection (a), require grantees to provide data regarding the performance outcomes of the projects carried out under the grants. Consistent with the requirements and procedures established by the Secretary, each grantee shall measure and report specific performance outcomes related to the long-term goals of increasing stability within the community for people who have been chronically homeless, and decreasing the recurrence of periods of homelessness.

''(2) PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES.—The performance outcomes described under paragraph (1) shall include, with respect to individuals who have been chronically homeless—

''(A) improvements in housing stability;

''(B) improvements in employment and education;

''(C) reductions in problems related to substance abuse;

''(D) reductions in problems related to mental health disorders; and

''(E) other areas as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(3) COORDINATION AND CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER HOMELESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—

''(A) PROCEDURES.—In establishing strategic performance outcomes and reporting requirements under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall develop and implement procedures that minimize the costs and burdens to grantees and program participants, and that are practical, streamlined, and designed for consistency with the requirements of the homeless assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

''(B) APPLICANT COORDINATION.—Applicants under this section shall coordinate with community stakeholders, including participants in the local homeless management information system, concerning the development of systems to measure performance outcomes and with the Secretary for assistance with data collection and measurements activities.

''(4) REPORT.—A grantee shall submit an annual report to the Secretary that—

''(A) identifies the grantee's progress towards achieving its strategic performance outcomes; and

''(B) describes other activities conducted by the grantee to increase the participation, housing stability, and other improvements in outcomes for individuals who have been chronically homeless.

''(l) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, directly or through awards of grants or contracts to public or nonprofit private entities, shall provide training and technical assistance regarding the planning, development, and provision of services in projects under subsection (a).

''(m) BIENNIAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of the Services for Ending Long-Term Homelessness Act, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on projects under subsection (a) that includes a summary of information received by the Secretary under subsection (k), and that describes the impact of the program under subsection (a) as part of a comprehensive strategy for ending long term homelessness and improving outcomes for individuals with mental illness and substance abuse problems.

''(n) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

''(1) The term 'chronically homeless' means an individual or family who—

''(A) is currently homeless;

''(B) has been homeless continuously for at least one year or has been homeless on at least four separate occasions in the last three years; and

''(C) has an adult head of household with a disabling condition, defined as a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability, or chronic physical illness or disability, including the co-occurrence of two or more of these conditions.

''(2) The term 'disabling condition' means a condition that limits an individual's ability to work or perform one or more activities of daily living.

''(3) The term 'homeless' means sleeping in a place not meant for human habitation or in an emergency homeless shelter.

''(4)(A) The term 'permanent supportive housing' means permanent, affordable housing with flexible support services that are available and designed to help the tenants stay housed and build the necessary skills to live as independently as possible. Such term does not include housing that is time-limited. Supportive housing offers residents assistance in reaching their full potential, which may include opportunities to secure other housing that meets their needs and preferences, based on individual choice instead of the requirements of time-limited transitional programs. Under this section, permanent affordable housing includes but is not limited to permanent housing funded or assisted through title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and section (8) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'affordable' means within the financial means of individuals who are extremely low income, as defined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

''(o) FUNDING.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

''(2) ALLOCATION FOR TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Of the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Secretary may reserve not more than 3 percent for carrying out subsection (l).''.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues, Senators DEWINE, DODD and BURR to introduce the Services for Ending Long-Term Homelessness Act, (SELHA).

It is estimated that two to three million Americans experience a period of homelessness in a given year. While the majority of these individuals find themselves homeless for a brief period of time, a growing segment are experiencing prolonged periods of homelessness. Roughly 200,000 to 250,000 Americans fall under the category of chronically homeless.

In March 2003, former Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson issued a report from a work group and an interagency subcommittee that was assembled to define the issues and challenges facing the chronically homeless and develop a comprehensive approach to bringing the appropriate services and treatments to this population of individuals who typically fall outside of mainstream support programs.

Similarly, the President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health recommended the development of a comprehensive plan to facilitate access to permanent supportive housing for individuals and families who are chronically homeless. However, affordable housing, alone, is not enough for many chronically homeless to achieve stability. This population also needs flexible, mobile, and individualized support services to sustain them in housing.

The legislation we are introducing today is critical to the development and implementation of more effective strategies to combat chronic homelessness through improved service delivery and coordination across Federal agencies serving this population. It directs the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to coordinate their efforts not only with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, but with other Federal departments and the various agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services that provide supportive services.

Mr. President, SELHA is an important bipartisan measure which will help to ensure that the growing number of Americans experiencing chronic homelessness have access to the range of supportive services they need to get them back on their feet, living in permanent supportive housing and taking the steps necessary to become productive and active members of our communities again.

I look forward to working with my colleagues toward expeditious passage of this legislation.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 711. A bill to amend the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000 to reauthorize that Act and to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to re-authorize a critical program for our energy future. It is widely believed that the U.S. must diversify its energy portfolio and explore new domestic sources and technologies for energy to curb our dependence on foreign oil. As a senior member of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, I know we have been assessing the potential for a variety of energy sources for the future including natural gas, clean coal technology, nuclear energy, renewable energy, and others. This bill, the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Reauthorization Act of 2005, will reauthorize a small but important program on methane hydrate research and development, a key and abundant non-conventional source of energy.

I would like to extend my appreciation to my cosponsors, Senators MURKOWSKI and STEVENS, who share my interest and determination in exploring the potential of methane hydrates for energy production. We share a common goal to see that we fully understand the prospects for this domestic energy resource. This new legislation will foster the research and development needed to expand our knowledge to better assess both the opportunities and challenges this potential energy resource presents. Our legislation provides for a higher level of scientific research and partnering between government agencies, academic institutions, and industry.

The United States and the world will require substantially increased quantities of natural gas, electricity, and transportation fuels over the next 20 years. Global competition for tightening supplies of oil and natural gas with emerging economies such as China and India will drive energy prices higher, and makes it apparent that the United States needs to capitalize upon its domestic energy resources. The United States must continue to diversify and expand the Nation's access to natural gas supplies through continuing research and development efforts in technologies for tapping non-conventional natural gas supplies, such as methane hydrates.

Methane hydrates were discovered in the 1960s and consist of methane gas trapped in lattice-like ice. They are found largely in ocean bottom sediments lying below 450 meters and in permafrost. There are several published estimates of the total amount of methane stored in gas hydrates worldwide. These estimates vary. However, it is widely believed that there is more energy potentially stored in methane hydrates than in all other known fossil fuel reserves, combined. The National Commission on Energy Policy's December 2004 report, Ending the Energy Stalemate—A Bipartisan Strategy To Meet America's Energy Challenges, estimated that the United States could possess one quarter of the world's supply of methane hydrates.

The United States will consume increasing volumes of natural gas well into the 21st century. United States natural gas consumption is expected to increase from approximately 22 trillion cubic feet in 2003 to more than 32 trillion cubic feet in 2020—a projected increase of 40 percent. Natural gas is expected to take on a greater role in power generation, largely because of the increasing demand for clean fuels and the relatively low capital costs of building new natural gas-fired power equipment. The National Commission on Energy Policy reported that the United States resource base may contain up to two hundred thousand trillion cubic feet of methane, onshore in the Alaskan permafrost, and offshore on much of the Nation's deep continental shelf. If even one percent of the estimated domestic resource base proves commercially viable, it would roughly double the Nation's technically recoverable natural gas reserves, according to the Department of Energy's Office of Fossil Energy.

Given the growing demand for natural gas, the development of new, cost-effective supplies can play a major role in moderating price increases and ensuring consumer confidence in the long-term availability of reliable, affordable fuel. Today, the potential to extract commercially-relevant quantities of natural gas from hydrates is not yet viable. With no incentive to fund its own research and development, the private sector is not vigorously pursuing the research currently needed that could make methane hydrates technically and economically viable. Therefore, cooperation between the federal government and private industry remains the best effort in which the United States can explore the viability of an energy resource whose long-range possibilities might one day dramatically change the world's energy portfolio.

Uncertainties exist regarding the nature of these deposits and, in particular, how best to extract the enormous quantity of natural gas they contain in an economic and environmentally sensitive manner. However, some alternatives are worse. For example, transporting natural gas from foreign gas fields to the United States by shipping it in liquid form at negative 162 degrees Celsius is an expensive undertaking and one that is attractive to terrorists. Methane hydrates, on the other hand, can be found domestically, in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico, and with our ally to the north, Canada. Hydrates are likely to provide commercially viable natural gas supplies by 2025. Their long term potential to meet United States energy demands for natural gas is considerable.

The Methane Hydrate Research Act of 2000 invigorated methane hydrate research in the United States. The act also mandated that the National Research Council study the program initiated by the act and to make recommendations for future research and development needs. Without a doubt, the National Research Council concluded in its 2004 report, Charting the Future of Methane Hydrate Research in the United States, that the U.S. must continue its investment in hydrates research and development because of the size of the resource. Furthermore, the report commended the program's excellent coordination and cooperation between federal agencies, industry, and academia involved in methane hydrates research. The legislation I am introducing incorporates the recommendations of the National Research Council, and improves upon the act by requiring external scientific peer reviews, strengthening the advisory panel, broadening the field work proposals to include test wells, increasing the appropriations needed to conduct the research, and emphasizing the need to promote education and training in the field of methane hydrate research and resource development. The bill also incorporates comments from the Department of Energy.

Mr. President, science and technology have and will continue to help us learn more about our world, and I believe, help us solve some of our toughest problems, not only domestically but globally. These are complex and significant problems relating to the impact of human activities on our environment, our heavy dependence on finite fossil fuels from sources that may not prove reliable, and limited energy supplies in the face of growing demands of expanding national economies that are increasingly intertwined in a global economic network. I believe the Federal Government must continue to foster the needed research and development in the field of methane hydrate research.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 711

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 ''Methane Hydrate Research and Development Reauthorization Act of 2005''.

SEC. 2. METHANE HYDRATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

The Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000 (30 U.S.C. 1902 note; Public Law 106–193) is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

''This Act may be cited as the 'Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000'.

"SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

''Congress finds that—

''(1) in order to promote energy independence and meet the increasing demand for energy, the United States will require a diversified portfolio of substantially increased quantities of electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuels;

''(2) according to the report submitted to Congress by the National Research Council entitled 'Charting the Future of Methane Hydrate Research in the United States', the total United States resources of gas hydrates have been estimated to be on the order of 200,000 trillion cubic feet;

''(3) according to the report of the National Commission on Energy Policy entitled 'Ending the Energy Stalemate - A Bipartisan Strategy to Meet America's Energy Challenge', and dated December 2004, the United States may be endowed with over 1/4 of the methane hydrate deposits in the world;

''(4) according to the Energy Information Administration, a shortfall in natural gas

supply from conventional and unconventional sources is expected to occur in or about 2020; and

''(5) the National Academy of Science states that methane hydrate may have the potential to alleviate the projected shortfall in the natural gas supply.

''SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act:

''(1) CONTRACT.—The term 'contract' means a procurement contract within the meaning of section 6303 of title 31, United States Code.

''(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The term 'cooperative agreement' means a cooperative agreement within the meaning of section 6305 of title 31, United States Code.

''(3) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

''(4) GRANT.—The term 'grant' means a grant awarded under a grant agreement (within the meaning of section 6304 of title 31, United States Code).

''(5) INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISE.—The term 'industrial enterprise' means a private, nongovernmental enterprise that has an expertise or capability that relates to methane hydrate research and development.

''(6) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' means an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)).

''(7) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy.

''(8) SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—The term 'Secretary of Commerce' means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

''(9) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The term 'Secretary of Defense' means the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Secretary of the Navy.

''(10) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The term 'Secretary of the Interior' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and the Director of the Minerals Management Service.

''SEC. 4. METHANE HYDRATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) COMMENCEMENT OF PROGRAM.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Reauthorization Act of 2005, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director, shall commence a program of methane hydrate research and development in accordance with this section.

''(2) DESIGNATIONS.—The Secretary, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director shall designate individuals to carry out this section.

''(3) COORDINATION.—The individual designated by the Secretary shall coordinate all activities within the Department of Energy relating to methane hydrate research and development.

''(4) MEETINGS.—The individuals designated under paragraph (2) shall meet not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Reauthorization Act of 2005 and not less frequently than every 180 days thereafter to—

''(A) review the progress of the program under paragraph (1); and

''(B) coordinate interagency research and partnership efforts in carrying out the program.

''(b) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, INTERAGENCY FUNDS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS, AND FIELD WORK PROPOSALS.—

''(1) ASSISTANCE AND COORDINATION.—In carrying out the program of methane hydrate research and development authorized by this section, the Secretary may award grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, institutions of higher education and industrial enterprises to—

''(A) conduct basic and applied research to identify, explore, assess, and develop methane hydrate as a commercially viable source of energy;

''(B) identify methane hydrate resources through remote sensing;

''(C) acquire and reprocess seismic data suitable for characterizing methane hydrate accumulations;

''(D) assist in developing technologies required for efficient and environmentally sound development of methane hydrate resources;

''(E) promote education and training in methane hydrate resource research and resource development through fellowships or other means for graduate education and training;

''(F) conduct basic and applied research to assess and mitigate the environmental impact of hydrate degassing (including both natural degassing and degassing associated with commercial development);

''(G) develop technologies to reduce the risks of drilling through methane hydrates; and

''(H) conduct exploratory drilling, well testing, and production testing operations on permafrost and non-permafrost gas hydrates in support of the activities authorized by this paragraph, including drilling of 1 or more full-scale production test wells.

''(2) COMPETITIVE PEER REVIEW.—Funds made available under paragraph (1) shall be made available based on a competitive process using external scientific peer review of proposed research.

''(c) METHANE HYDRATES ADVISORY PANEL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory panel (including the hiring of appropriate staff) consisting of representatives of industrial enterprises, institutions of higher education, oceanographic institutions, State agencies, and environmental organizations with knowledge and expertise in the natural gas hydrates field, to—

''(A) assist in developing recommendations and broad programmatic priorities for the methane hydrate research and development program carried out under subsection (a)(1);

''(B) provide scientific oversight for the methane hydrates program, including assessing progress toward program goals, evaluating program balance, and providing recommendations to enhance the quality of the program over time; and

''(C) not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Reauthorization Act of 2005, and at such later dates as the panel considers advisable, submit to Congress—

''(i) an assessment of the methane hydrate research program; and

''(ii) an assessment of the 5-year research plan of the Department of Energy.

''(2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—In appointing each member of the advisory panel established under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the appointment of the member does not pose a conflict of interest with respect to the duties of the member under this Act.

''(3) MEETINGS.—The advisory panel shall—

''(A) hold the initial meeting of the advisory panel not later than 180 days after the date of establishment of the advisory panel; and

''(B) meet biennially thereafter.

''(4) COORDINATION.—The advisory panel shall coordinate activities of the advisory panel with program managers of the Department of Energy at appropriate national laboratories

''(d) CONSTRUCTION COSTS.—None of the funds made available to carry out this section may be used for the construction of a new building or the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of an existing building (including site grading and improvement and architect fees).

''(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—In carrying out subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall—

''(1) facilitate and develop partnerships among government, industrial enterprises, and institutions of higher education to research, identify, assess, and explore methane hydrate resources;

''(2) undertake programs to develop basic information necessary for promoting long-term interest in methane hydrate resources as an energy source;

''(3) ensure that the data and information developed through the program are accessible and widely disseminated as needed and appropriate;

''(4) promote cooperation among agencies that are developing technologies that may hold promise for methane hydrate resource development;

''(5) report annually to Congress on the results of actions taken to carry out this Act; and

''(6) ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, greater participation by the Department of Energy in international cooperative efforts.

''SEC. 5. NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL STUDY.

''(a) AGREEMENT FOR STUDY.—The Secretary shall offer to enter into an agreement with the National Research Council under which the National Research Council shall—

''(1) conduct a study of the progress made under the methane hydrate research and development program implemented under this Act; and

''(2) make recommendations for future methane hydrate research and development needs.

''(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2009, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing the findings and recommendations of the National Research Council under this section.

''SEC. 6. REPORTS AND STUDIES FOR CONGRESS.

''The Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate copies of any report or study that the Department of Energy prepares at the direction of any committee of Congress.

''SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act, to remain available until expended—

''(1) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

''(2) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

''(3) $30,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

''(4) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and

''(5) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.''.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am proud to come to the floor today to introduce legislation of vital importance to our Nation. Enactment of the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Reauthorization Act of 2005 will provide the authorizations necessary to unlock a potentially huge supply of domestic natural gas, enough gas to supply our Nation for generations.

However, before I introduce this legislation, I would first like to thank my good friend and colleague, Senator AKAKA, for his dedication to helping address our Nation's energy crisis through legislation that should dramatically increase our domestic supply of environmentally friendly, clean burning natural gas. Without Senator AKAKA's hard work and focus on this issue we would not be introducing this legislation today.

Mr. President, our Nation is facing an energy crisis. Oil and natural gas prices are at historic or near historic high levels. Oil prices are over $50 a barrel. Natural gas prices are over $7.00 a MMBtu. Indeed, United States natural gas prices have increased by almost 350 percent since 1998 and are currently the highest in the world. Despite this huge increase in cost, domestic natural gas production has declined by almost 5 percent and Canadian imports have declined by almost 25 percent from 2001 to 2004. Estimates are that during the past 5 years United States natural gas consumers have paid nearly $200 billion more for natural gas than they paid in the preceding 5 years.

These extraordinarily high natural gas prices are having a profound impact on every segment of our economy. Chairman Greenspan identified our current natural gas price and supply situation as a crisis that could have a devastating impact on the United States economy. In fact, estimates are that the natural gas crisis has significantly contributed to the loss of 2.5 million United States manufacturing jobs. Indeed, the ongoing ''demand destruction'' caused by current gas prices with its devastating impact on United States manufacturing will only continue unless we address the current natural gas supply shortage and high prices.

Today, the United States produces about 22 trillion cubic feet of natural gas each year. By 2025, the Energy Information Administration estimates that United States natural gas consumption will reach 31 trillion cubic feet. That's an increase of more than 40 percent. Much of the new electric generation that will come on line during the next two decades will require natural gas according to a study by the American Gas Foundation. Indeed, clean burning natural gas remains the premium fossil fuel for electric power generation.

The EIA estimates that by 2025 the United States will produce only 21.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas meeting just 70 percent of the Nation's expected demand. Thus, absent securing a new domestic supply of gas, the United States will have to import 30 percent of its natural gas supply. We have already gone down this path with our petroleum supplies. We have witnessed the unacceptable national security, balance of payments and general economic consequences of this level of reliance on foreign sources for our nation's critical supply of oil. We must not repeat this reality with natural gas.

This is why I am proud to introduce the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Reauthorization Act of 2005. As stated in the findings section of the legislation, the National Research Council has estimated the total United States methane hydrate resource base to be on the order of 200,000 trillion cubic feet. Alaska alone is thought to have potential hydrate resources of 32,000 trillion cubic feet. Indeed, a report issued by the National Commission on Energy Policy states that the United States may be endowed with over one-fourth of the methane hydrate deposits in the world. This is an immense supply of secure, domestic energy that could supply our country for many, many years.

The Methane Hydrate Reauthorization Act of 2005 builds upon the success of the original Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000. The new act incorporates certain changes to the 2000 legislation suggested by the National Research Council of the National Academies and the Department of Energy. The 2000 act established an advisory panel to advise the Secretary of Energy on potential applications of methane hydrate and to assist in developing recommendations and priorities for methane hydrate research and development programs. The new act strengthens the role of the advisory panel to ensure that the research funds are put to their most effective use. The 2005 act also increases the use of a scientific peer review process in determining which projects will be funded. Further, the new legislation directs the funding of fellowships and graduate education and training programs to establish a solid, scientific foundation of expertise in the United States on methane hydrates. Finally, the 2005 act authorizes increased funding for the methane hydrate program. The increased funding is critical in order to allow for the transition from a largely research oriented program to one that will foster the beginning of the commercialization of our Nation's methane hydrate resources.

Again, I thank Senator AKAKA and his staff for their hard work and commitment to this legislation that is so important to our nation's future.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 95—RELATING TO THE DEATH OF THE HOLY FATHER, POPE JOHN PAUL II

Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANTORUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BURR, Mr. BYRD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 95

Whereas Pope John Paul II was one of the greatest spiritual leaders and moral teachers of the Modern Era; and

Whereas he set an extraordinary example of personal integrity and courage, not only for his fellow Catholics but for people of every religious and philosophical viewpoint; and

Whereas throughout the course of his pontificate he campaigned tirelessly for human rights and human dignity throughout the world; and

Whereas he practiced and inspired resistance to the great totalitarian systems and tyrannies that rose and, with his help, fell in the 20th Century; and

Whereas he fostered harmony between Catholics and Eastern Orthodox and Protestant Christians, reached out in friendship to Jews, Muslims and members of other faiths, and warmly promoted interfaith understanding and cooperation; and

Whereas he dedicated himself to the defense of the weakest and most vulnerable members of the human family; and

Whereas on his visits to our country he has called all Americans to be true and faithful to the great principles of liberty and justice inscribed in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution; and

Whereas his selfless service to God and man has been an inspiration to Americans and men and women of goodwill across the globe; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States joins the world in mourning his death, and pays tribute to him by pledging to be ever faithful to our national calling to be ''one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all,'' and to help our neighbors in immeasurable ways.

SENATE RESOLUTION 96—COMMEMORATING THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ATTACK ON THE ALFRED P. MURRAH FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 96

Whereas on April 19, 1995, at 9:02 a.m. Central Daylight Time, in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, the United States was attacked in one of the worst terrorist attacks on United States soil, which killed 168 people and injured more than 850 others;

Whereas this dastardly act of domestic terrorism affected thousands of families and horrified millions of people across the State of Oklahoma and the United States;

Whereas the people of Oklahoma and the United States responded to this tragedy through the remarkable efforts of local, State, and Federal law enforcement, firefighters, and emergency services, search and rescue teams from across the United States, public and private medical personnel, and thousands of volunteers from the community who saved lives, assisted the injured and wounded, comforted the bereaved, and provided meals and support to those who came to Oklahoma City to help those endangered and affected by this terrorist act;

Whereas the people of Oklahoma and the United States pledged themselves to build and maintain a permanent national memorial to remember those who were killed, those who survived, and those changed forever;

Whereas this pledge was fulfilled by creating the Oklahoma City National Memorial, which draws hundreds of thousands of visitors from around the world every year to the site of this tragic event in United States history;

Whereas the Oklahoma City National Memorial brings comfort, strength, peace, hope, and serenity to the many visitors who come to the memorial and its museum each year to remember and to learn;

Whereas the mission of the National Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism, to aid the Nation's emergency responders in preventing terrorist attacks, or mitigating their effects, should be promoted; and

Whereas the tenth anniversary of the terrorist bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, is on April 19, 2005: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) joins with the people of the United States in sending best wishes and prayers to the families, friends, and neighbors of the 168 people killed in the terrorist bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma;

(2) sends Congress' best wishes and thoughts to those injured in the bombing and its gratitude for their recovery;

(3) thanks the thousands of first responders, rescue workers, medical personnel, and volunteers from the Oklahoma City community and across the Nation who answered the call for help that April morning and in the days and weeks thereafter;

(4) resolves to work with the people of the United States to promote the goals and mission established by the Oklahoma City National Memorial on the tenth anniversary of that fateful day;

(5) supports the resolve for the future, written on the wall of the memorial, ''We come here to remember those who were killed, those who survived, and those changed forever. May all who leave here know the impact of violence. May this memorial offer comfort, strength, peace, hope, and serenity.'';

(6) designates the week of April 17, 2005, as the National Week of Hope, commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing;

(7) calls on the people of the United States to participate in the events scheduled for each day of that week to teach a lesson of hope in the midst of political violence and to teach that good endures in the world even among those who commit bad acts and further to teach that there is a way to resolve differences other than resorting to terrorism or violence, including the—

(A) Day of Faith;

(B) Day of Understanding;

(C) Day of Remembrance;

(D) Day of Sharing;

(E) Day of Tolerance;

(F) Day of Caring; and

(G) Day of Inspiration;

(8) congratulates the people of Oklahoma City for making tremendous progress over the past decade and demonstrating their steadfast commitment to the ability of hope to triumph over violence;

(9) applauds the people of Oklahoma City as they continue to persevere and to stand as a beacon to the rest of the Nation and the world attesting to the strength of goodness in overcoming evil wherever it arises in our midst; and

(10) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Memorial Foundation, as an expression of appreciation.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise today along with my colleague, TOM COBURN, to introduce a resolution to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building. The attack occurred at 9:02 a.m. Central Daylight Time on April 19, 1995, in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. 168 Americans lost their lives while more than 850 others were injured. This terrible act of domestic terrorism affected thousands of families across the State of Oklahoma and the United States. I thank the local, State and Federal law enforcement, firefighters and emergency services and search and rescue teams across the United States, public and private medical personnel, and thousands of volunteers from the community who saved lives, assisted the injured, comforted the grieving, and provided meals and support to those who came to help the people of Oklahoma. I applaud the people of Oklahoma for making tremendous progress over the past decade and for demonstrating their steadfast commitment to triumph over violence and stand behind them as they continue to persevere. I am privileged to be from the great state of Oklahoma and encourage my colleagues to join me in commemorating the tenth anniversary of the attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 266. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes.

SA 267. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KYL, Mr. CORZINE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BURNS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 268. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 269. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 270. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 271. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 272. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 273. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 274. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 275. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 276. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 277. Mr. LUGAR (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 278. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. CORZINE, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 279. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 280. Mr. LUGAR (for Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 281. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 282. Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 281 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 283. Mr. DODD proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 284. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 285. Mr. INOUYE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 286. Mr. BIDEN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 287. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 288. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 289. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 290. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 291. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 266. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 55, strike lines 3 through 11.

SA 267. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KYL, Mr. CORZINE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BURNS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 277, after line 8, add the following:

TITLE XXIX—TRADE TREATMENT OF UKRAINE

SEC. 2901. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that Ukraine has__

(1) made considerable progress toward respecting fundamental human rights consistent with the objectives of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974;

(2) adopted administrative procedures that accord its citizens the right to emigrate, travel freely, and to return to their country without restriction; and

(3) been found to be in full compliance with the freedom of emigration provisions in title IV of the Trade Act of 1974.

SEC. 2902. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO UKRAINE.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

(1) determine that such title should no longer apply to Ukraine; and

(2) after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to Ukraine, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of that country.

(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV.—On and after the effective date of the extension under subsection (a)(2) of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of Ukraine, title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

SA 268. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 59, strike lines 16 though 25 and insert the following:

''(a) AUTHORITY.—Grants authorized under section 305 shall be available to make annual grants to Middle East Broadcasting Networks for the purpose of carrying out radio and television broadcasting.

''(b) FUNCTION.—Middle East Broadcasting Networks shall provide radio and television programming consistent with the broadcasting standards and broadcasting principles set forth in section 303.

SA 269. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 60, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

''(C) not more than 5 officers or employees of the Middle East Broadcasting Networks may be provided a rate of basic compensation at such rate authorized for Level II of the Executive Schedule provided in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, and such compensation shall be subject to the provisions of section 5307 of such title.

SA 270. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 64, strike lines 3 through 6, and insert the following:

(4) CREDITABLE SERVICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 8332(b)(11) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''the Middle East Broadcasting Networks;'' after ''the Asia Foundation;''.

(B) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—With regard to creditable service with the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall—

(i) pay into the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount determined by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to be necessary to reimburse such Fund for any estimated increase in the unfunded liability of such Fund that results from the amendment made by subparagraph (4), computed using dynamic assumptions; and

(ii) pay the amount required by clause (i) in 5 equal annual installments, together with interest on such amount computed at the rate used in the computation required by such clause.

SA 271. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 110, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 812. UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

Section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) is amended by striking ''October 1, 2005'' and inserting ''October 1, 2008''.

SA 272. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 47, line 13, strike ''and'';

On page 47, line 15, strike the period at the end and insert as semicolon and ''and''.

On page 47, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(3) by striking ''or allowances'' and inserting ''allowances, or annuities''.

SA 273. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 12, strike lines 11 through 13, and insert the following:

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) FISCAL YEAR 2006.—Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2006 are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2007.

(B) FISCAL YEAR 2007.—Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2007 are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2008.

SA 274. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 1, after line 2, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Affairs Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007''.

SA 275. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 150, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 151, line 4, and insert the following:

(a) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2348) is amended by adding at the end ''Such assistance

may also include assistance for demining activities, clearance of unexploded ordnance, destruction of small arms and related ammunition when determined to be in the national security interest of the United States, and related activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law.''.

SA 276. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 272, line 15, strike ''weapons,'' and insert ''weapons and related ammunition when determined to be in the national security interest of the United States,''.

SA 277. Mr. LUGAR (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 74, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 603. PASSPORT FEES.

Section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920 (22 U.S.C. 214) is amended in the third sentence by striking ''or from a widow, widower, child, parent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member'' and inserting ''or from a widow, widower, child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member or to attend a funeral or memorial service for such member''.

SA 278. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. CORZINE, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 172, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 2227. GLOBAL DEMOCRACY PROMOTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, regulation, or policy, in determining eligibility for assistance authorized under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), foreign nongovernmental organizations—

(1) shall not be ineligible for such assistance solely on the basis of health or medical services including counseling and referral services, provided by such organizations with non-United States Government funds if such services do not violate the laws of the country in which they are being provided and would not violate United States Federal law if provided in the United States; and

(2) shall not be subject to requirements relating to the use of non-United States Government funds for advocacy and lobbying activities other than those that apply to United States nongovernmental organizations receiving assistance under part I of such Act.

SA 279. Mr. LUGAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 24, strike lines 1 through 5.

SA 280. Mr. LUGAR (for Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

(Purpose: To impose an economic sanction on foreign countries that owe parking fines and penalties or property taxes to Washington, D.C. or New York City)

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE FOR PARKING FINES AND REAL PROPERTY TAXES OWED BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES. (a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), of the funds made available by this Act for assistance for a foreign country, an amount equal to 110 percent of the total amount of the unpaid fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes owed by the central government of such country shall be withheld from obligation for assistance for the central government of such country.

(b) PAYMENT.—Funds withheld from obligation for a country under subsection (a) shall be paid to the jurisdiction to which the unpaid fully adjudicated parking fines or penalties or unpaid property taxes are owed.

(c) AMOUNTS WITHHELD TO BE ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—Subsection (a) shall not include amounts that have been withheld under any other provision of law.

(d) WAIVER.—(1) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to parking fines and penalties no sooner than 60 days from the date of enactment of this Act, or at any time with respect to a particular country, if the Secretary determines that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

(2) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to the unpaid property taxes if the Secretary of State determines that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the initial exercise of the waiver authority in subsection (d), the Secretary of State, after consultations with the City of New York, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees describing a strategy, including a timetable and steps currently being taken, to collect the parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes and interest owed by nations receiving foreign assistance under this Act.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

(2) The term ''fully adjudicated'' includes circumstances in which the person or government to whom the vehicle is registered—

(A)(i) has not responded to the parking violation summons; or

(ii) has not followed the appropriate adjudication procedure to challenge the summons; and

(B) the period of time for payment of or challenge to the summons has lapsed.

(3) The term ''parking fines and penalties'' means parking fines and penalties—

(A) owed to—

(i) the District of Columbia; or (ii) New York, New York; and

(B) incurred during the period April 1, 1997 through September 30, 2005.

(4) The term ''unpaid property taxes'' means the amount of unpaid taxes and interest determined by a court or other tribunal to be owed by a foreign country on real property in the District of Columbia or New York, New York.

SA 281. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 277, after line 8, add the following:

TITLE XXIX—AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

SEC. 2901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Agricultural Export Facilitation Act of 2005''.

SEC. 2902. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The export sector of United States agriculture makes an important positive contribution to this country's trade balance.

(2) The total value of United States exports of agricultural products shipped to Cuba since 2000 when such sales were first authorized by Congress is approximately $1,000,000,000, including transportation, port fees, and insurance costs. In December 2001, Cuba purchased approximately $4,300,000 in food and agricultural products. In 2002, Cuba purchased approximately $138,600,000 in food and agricultural products. In 2003, Cuba purchased approximately $256,900,000 in food and agricultural products. In 2004, Cuba purchased approximately $380,000,000 in food and agricultural products. Cuba ranked at the bottom of 226 agricultural export markets for United States companies in 2001; ranked 50th of 226 in 2002; ranked 35th of 219 in 2003; and ranked approximately 25th of 228 in 2004. Cuba is therefore an important source of revenue for United States agriculture and its affiliated industries, such as manufacturers and distributors of value-added food products.

(3) To be competitive in sales to Cuban purchasers, United States exporters of agricultural products and their representatives, including representatives of United States air or sea carriers, ports and shippers, must have ready and reliable physical access to

Cuba. Such access is currently uncertain because, under existing regulations, United States exporters and their representatives must apply for and receive special Treasury Department licenses to travel to Cuba to engage in sales-related activities. The issuance of such licenses is subject to both administrative delays and periodic denials. A blanket statutory authorization for sales and transport-related travel to Cuba by United States exporters will remove the current bureaucratic impediment to agricultural product sales endorsed by Congress when it passed the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000.

(4) On many occasions United States visas have been delayed and often denied to prospective Cuban purchasers of products authorized under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000. The result has been that family farmers and other small producers and distributors of agricultural products who lack the resources to fund sales delegations to Cuba have been denied access to potential purchasers in that country. A simple solution is for the Department of State to issue visas to Cuban nationals who demonstrate an itinerary of meetings with prospective United States exporters of products authorized under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000. In addition, visas should be issued to Cuban phytosanitary inspectors who require entry into the United States to conduct on-premise inspections of production and processing facilities and the products of potential United States exporters.

(5) The Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 requires ''payment of cash in advance'' for United States agricultural exports to Cuba. Some Federal agencies responsible for the implementation of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 have expressed the view that ''cash in advance'' requires that payment be received by a United States exporter in advance of shipment of goods to Cuba. Indeed, late last year payments due United States exporters from purchasers in Cuba were frozen in United States banks while the terms of those payments were reviewed unnecessarily. This action by the Department of the Treasury has created a climate of commercial uncertainty that has inhibited agricultural sales under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 to Cuba.

(6) There is nothing in either the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 itself or its legislative history to support the view that Congress intended payment to be made in advance of the shipment of goods from this country to Cuba. It was and is the intent of Congress that a seller of a product authorized under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 receive payment only before a Cuban purchaser takes physical possession of that product.

(7) At present it is the policy of the United States Government to prohibit direct payment between Cuban and United States financial institutions. As a result, Cuban purchasers of products authorized under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 must route their payments through third country banks that charge a fee for this service. Allowing direct payments between Cuban and United States financial institutions will permit the United States exporters to receive payment directly to their financial institutions within hours instead of days and will eliminate an unnecessary transactional fee, thereby allowing Cuban purchasers to purchase more United States origin agricultural products.

(8) Trademarks and trade names are vital assets of the United States companies that export branded food products, including those who today or in the future may sell such products to Cuba under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000. Hundreds of United States companies have registered their trademarks in Cuba in order to ensure the exclusive right to use those trademarks when the United States trade embargo on that country is lifted. Moreover, following the enactment of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, many United States companies are today exporting branded food products to Cuba where they hope to establish their brands with Cuban purchasers in order to benefit from current sales under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, as well as position themselves for the larger post-embargo market for United States goods in Cuba.

(9) Sales to Cuba of branded products of United States companies contribute to the livelihoods of American workers and the balance sheets of United States businesses. Those sales depend on the security of United States trademarks and trade names protected in Cuba by reciprocal treaties and agreements for the protection of intellectual property. Among such treaties and agreements are the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and the Inter-American Convention for Trademark and Commercial Protection.

(10) The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York ruled that section 211 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 abrogates, with respect to Cuba, the Inter-American Convention on Trademarks and Commercial Protection. The court's ruling was affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

(11) Cuba's international remedy under customary international law (as codified by Article 60 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on Treaties), for a breach by the United States of the Inter-American Convention, is to suspend or revoke the protections Cuba currently affords United States trademarks and trade names.

(12) In order to preserve the rights of United States nationals holding trademarks in Cuba, including those engaged in authorized sales under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 now and in the future, the United States must repeal section 211 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 and the United States must comply with all treaty obligations owed Cuba as they relate to trademarks and trade names.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to remove impediments to present and future sales of United States agricultural products to Cuba under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 and to otherwise facilitate such sales.

SEC. 2903. TRAVEL TO CUBA IN CONNECTION WITH AUTHORIZED SALES ACTIVITIES.

Section 910 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7209) is amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) GENERAL LICENSE AUTHORITY FOR TRAVEL-RELATED EXPENDITURE IN CUBA BY PERSONS ENGAGING IN TSREEA OF 2000 SALES AND MARKETING ACTIVITIES IN THAT COUNTRY AND TSREEA-RELATED TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall authorize under a general license the travel-related transactions listed in subsection (c) of section 515.560 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, for travel to, from, or within Cuba in connection with activities undertaken in connection with sales and marketing, including the organization and participation in product exhibitions, and the transportation by sea or air of products pursuant to this Act.

''(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the term 'sales and marketing activities' means any activity with respect to travel to, from, or within Cuba that is undertaken by a United States person in order to explore the market in that country for the sale of products pursuant to this Act or to engage in sales activities with respect to such products. The term 'sales activities' includes exhibiting, negotiating, marketing, surveying the market, and delivering and servicing products pursuant to this Act. Persons authorized to travel to Cuba under this section include full-time employees, executives, sales agents and consultants of producers, manufacturers, distributors, shippers, United States air and sea ports, and carriers of products authorized for sale pursuant to this Act, as well as exhibitors and representatives and members of national and State trade organizations that promote the interests of producers and distributors of such products.

''(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.''.

SEC. 2904. SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT VISAS SHOULD BE ISSUED.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should issue visas for temporary entry into the United States of Cuban nationals whose itinerary documents an intent to conduct activities, including phytosanitary inspections, related to purchasing United States agricultural goods under the provisions of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000.

(b) PERIODIC REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 months thereafter the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Finance, Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Agriculture, Ways and Means, and International Relations of the House of Representatives a report on the issuance of visas described in subsection (a).

(2) CONTENT OF REPORTS.—Each report shall contain a full description of each application received from a Cuban national to travel to the United States to engage in purchasing activities pursuant to the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 and shall describe the disposition of each such application.

SEC. 2905. CLARIFICATION OF PAYMENT TERMS UNDER TRADE SANCTIONS REFORM AND EXPORT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000.

Section 908(b)(1) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7207(b)(1)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term 'payment of cash in advance' means the payment by the purchaser of an agricultural commodity or product and the receipt of such payment by the seller prior to—

''(i) the transfer of title of such commodity or product to the purchaser; and

''(ii) the release of control of such commodity or product to the purchaser.''.

SEC. 2906. AUTHORIZATION OF DIRECT TRANSFERS BETWEEN CUBAN AND UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the President may not restrict direct transfers from a Cuban financial institution to a United States financial institution executed in payment for a product authorized for sale under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000.

SEC. 2907. ADHERENCE TO INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS FOR THE MUTUAL PROTECTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, INCLUDING REPEAL OF SECTION 211.

(a) REPEAL OF PROHIBITION ON ENFORCEMENT OF RIGHTS TO CERTAIN UNITED STATES INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES AND TRANSFER OF SUCH PROPERTIES.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 211 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (section 101(b) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–2688) is repealed.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out the repeal made by paragraph (1), including removing any prohibition on transactions or payments to which subsection (a)(1) of section 211 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 applied.

(3) FURTHER REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall amend the Cuban Asset Control Regulations (part 515 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations) to authorize under general license the transfer or receipt of any trademark or trade name subject to United States law in which a designated national has an interest. The filing and prosecution of opposition and infringement proceedings related to any trademark or trade name in which a designated national has an interest and the prosecution of any defense to such proceedings shall also be authorized by general license.

SA 282. Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 281 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the matter proposed to be added, strike section 2905 and insert the following:

SEC. 2905. CLARIFICATION OF PAYMENT TERMS UNDER TRADE SANCTIONS REFORM AND EXPORT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 908(b)(1) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7207(b)(1)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term 'payment of cash in advance' means the payment by the purchaser of an agricultural commodity or product and the receipt of such payment by the seller prior to—

''(i) the transfer of title of such commodity or product to the purchaser; and

''(ii) the release of control of such commodity or product to the purchaser.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on February 22, 2005.

SA 283. Mr. DODD proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following new section:

SEC. . (a) FINDINGS.—

(1) During most of last four years relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China have been relatively stable;

(2) The recently released 2004 State Department Country Report on Human Rights continues to characterize China's human rights as poor;

(3) Bilateral economic and trade relations are important components of the US/Chinese relationship,

(4) China's growing international economic and political influence has implications for the United States competitive position and for maintaining a strong domestic industrial base;

(5) Taiwan remains an extremely sensitive and complex bilateral issue between the US and the Peoples Republic of China;

(6) The US decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China in 1979 was based upon the premise that the future of Taiwan would be determined solely by peaceful means and in a manner that was mutually satisfactory;

(7) The Taiwan Relations Act makes clear that peace and stability in the region are in the political, security and economic interests of the United States;

(8) The United States has consistently urged restraint by both China and Taiwan with respect to their actions and declarations; and

(9) The anti-succession law adopted by the Chinese National People's Congress on March 14, 2005 targeted at Taiwan's independence advocates was a provocative action which has altered the status quo in the region.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

1. China's anti-succession law is destabilizing to regional peace and stability, and is therefore of grave concern to the United States;

2. The United States Government should employ all diplomatic means to encourage the repeal of that law so the regional stability can be restored;

3. The United States Government should continue to speak out with respect to China's human rights practices and advocate the release from detention of all political and human rights activists;

4. The United States Government should more effectively promote United States economic and trade interests by insisting that the People's Republic of China lives up to its international trade obligations to respect and safeguard US intellectual property rights and cease artificially pegging its currency exchange rates; and

5. The United States Government should undertake a comprehensive review of the implications of China's growing international economic and political influence that are byproducts of its expanding network of trade agreements, its aggressive shipbuilding programs, its efforts to cement scientific and technological cooperation arrangements, and secure additional oil and gas contracts; and should determine what steps should be taken to safeguard the United States industrial base and maintain and enhance U.S. economic competitiveness and political interests.

SA 284. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 16, strike lines 13 through 21 and insert the following:

(1) INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS.—For ''International Broadcasting Operations,'' $620,050,000 for the fiscal year 2006 and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year 2007.

(2) BROADCASTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS.—For ''Broadcasting Capital Improvements,'' $10,893,000 for the fiscal year 2006 and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year 2007.

(3) PROHIBITION ON TELEVISION BROADCASTING TO CUBA.—None of the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in paragraph (1) or (2) may be used to provide television broadcasting to Cuba.

SA 285. Mr. INOUYE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, line 18, strike ''$13,024,000'' and insert ''$20,300,000''.

SA 286. Mr. BIDEN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken, insert the following:

''Section 404(b)(2)(B) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (P.L. 103–236) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) For assessments made during calendar years 2005, 2006, and 2007, 27.1 percent.''

SA 287. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and

for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, line 20, striking ''There'' and insert the following:

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There

On page 12, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(2) NO GROWTH BUDGET.—Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in paragraph (1), $80,000,000 shall be withheld for each of the calendar years 2006 and 2007 unless the Secretary submits a certification to the appropriate congressional committees for each such calendar year that states that the United Nations has taken no action during the preceding calendar year to increase funding for any United Nations program without identifying an offsetting decrease elsewhere in the United Nations budget during that calendar year and that for such calendar years the United Nations will not exceed the spending limits of the initial 2004–2005 United Nations biennium budget adopted in December, 2003.

SA 288. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 59, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 405. UNITED NATIONS OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) WITHHOLDING OF PORTION OF CERTAIN ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS.—Twenty percent of the funds made available in each fiscal year under section 102(a) for the assessed contribution of the United States to the United Nations shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure until a certification is made under subsection (b).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification under this subsection is a certification by the Secretary in the fiscal year concerned that the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) ACTIONS BY THE UNITED NATIONS.—

(A) The United Nations has met the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 401(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236; 108 Stat. 446).

(B) The Office of Internal Oversight Services has fulfilled the directive in General Assembly Resolution 48/218B to make all of its reports available to the General Assembly, with modifications to those reports that would violate confidentiality or the due process rights of individuals involved in any investigation.

(C) The Office of Internal Oversight Services has an independent budget that does not require the approval of the United Nations Budget Office.

(D) The length of the fixed, non-renewable term of the Under-Secretary-General of the Office of Internal Oversight Services is seven years.

(2) ACTIONS BY THE OIOS.—The Office of Internal Oversight Service has authority to audit, inspect, or investigate each program, project, or activity funded by the United Nations, and each executive board created under the United Nations has been notified in writing of that authority.

SA 289. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XXII of Division B, add the following new section:

SEC. 2227. ASSISTANCE TO THE PHILIPPINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On May 19, 2003, President George W. Bush and President of the Philippines Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo issued a joint statement that stated that ''[t]he Presidents agreed that relations are deeper and warmer today than at any time in recent history and noted that those ties are rooted in shared history, shared values, and a common interest in global peace and prosperity. President Bush and President Macapagal-Arroyo paid tribute to a revitalized and maturing bilateral alliance and pledged to strengthen the partnership further in the years ahead.''

(2) According to the Department of State, ''[t]he U.S. has important security, commercial and political interests in the Philippines, a treaty ally that straddles important air and sea lanes. . . . In recognition of the critical nature of Philippine support to the Global War on Terrorism, President Bush designated the Philippines as a major Non-NATO ally.''

(3) On February 16, 2005, the Director of Central Intelligence stated: ''In the Philippines, Manila is struggling with prolonged Islamic and Communist rebellions. The presence of Jemaah Islamiyah terrorists seeking safe haven and training bases adds volatility and capability to terrorist groups already in place.''

(4) According to the United States Agency for International Development, ''[c]orruption and conflict continue to impede the Philippines' economic and social development. Forty-six percent of the country's population lives on $2 per day or less. . . . The Philippines continues to suffer some of the worst effects of underdevelopment: a 2.36 percent rate of population growth; destructive exploitation of natural resources; and vulnerability to political instability. . . . Nevertheless, the Philippines has maintained its democratic institutions and its market-based economic system, as well as its historic ties with the United States.''

(5) Despite the importance of the bilateral relationship between the United States and the Philippines, the budget request submitted by the President for fiscal year 2006 contains decreases in assistance to the Philippines in several important foreign assistance accounts.

(b) ASSISTANCE TO THE PHILIPPINES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for assistance for the Philippines the following amounts for fiscal year 2006:

(1) For ''Development Assistance'' to carry out the provisions of sections 103, 105, 106, and 496 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151a, 2151c, 2151d, and 2293), $27,576,000.

(2) For ''Child Survival and Health Programs Fund'' to carry out the provisions of sections 104 and 496 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b and 2293), $26,800,000.

(3) For ''Economic Support Fund'' to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.), $34,720,000.

(4) For ''International Narcotics and Law Enforcement'' to carry out the provisions of section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291), $2,000,000.

(5) For ''Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs'', $5,150,000.

(6) For ''International Military Education and Training'' to carry out the provisions of section 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347), $1,000,000.

(7) For ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' grants to carry out the provision of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763), $55,000,000.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing a 10-year strategy for providing assistance to the Philippines.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include projected funding levels to help the Government of the Philippines deal effectively with a number of issues facing the country, including poverty, corruption, military reform, economic development, environmental damage, international terrorism, democracy building, and narcotics trafficking.

SA 290. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 110, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 812. REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR OATH PRIOR TO OBTAINING VISA.—Section 222 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) Every alien applying for a nonimmigrant visa shall, prior to obtaining such visa, swear or affirm an oath stating that—

''(1) the alien shall adhere to the laws and to the Constitution of the United States;

''(2) the alien will not attempt to develop information for the purpose of threatening the national security of the United States or to bring harm to any citizen of the United States;

''(3) the alien is not associated with a terrorist organization;

''(4) the alien has not and will not receive any funds or other support to visit the United States from a terrorist organization;

''(5) all documents submitted to support the alien's application are valid and contain truthful information;

''(6) the alien will inform the appropriate authorities if the alien is approached or contacted by a member of a terrorist organization; and

''(7) the alien understands that the alien's visa shall be revoked and the alien shall be removed from the United States if the alien is found—

''(A) to have acted in a manner that is inconsistent with this oath; or

''(B) provided fraudulent information in order to obtain a visa.''.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR OATH PRIOR TO ADMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security or an individual designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security shall require an alien seeking admission to the United States pursuant to a nonimmigrant visa to swear or affirm an oath reaffirming all the information provided by the alien for the purpose of obtaining the nonimmigrant visa.

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF OATH.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall administer the oath required by paragraph (1) to an alien in the United States prior to the admission of such alien.

(3) FALSE STATEMENTS.—An alien who knowingly and willfully makes a false statement in swearing or affirming the oath required by paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties imposed for making a false statement under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(4) ADMISSION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''admission'' shall have the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

SA 291. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 318.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 5, 2005, at 2:30 p.m., in open session to receive testimony on active component, reserve component, and civilian personnel programs, in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2005.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session on Tuesday, April 5, 2005, at 10 a.m., to hear testimony on ''Charities and Charitable Giving: Proposals for Reform''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Subcommittee on Education and Early Childhood Development, be authorized to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 5, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. in SD–430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 5, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing on S. 113, a bill to modify the date as of which certain tribal land of the Lytton Rancheria of California is deemed to be held in trust.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Tuesday, April 5, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. on ''Oversight of the USA PATRIOT Act.'' The hearing will take place in the Hart Senate Office Building room 216.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Witness List

Alberto Gonzales, United States Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC; and Robert S. Mueller III, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 5, 2005 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 5, 2005 at 10 a.m. for a hearing entitled, ''Monitoring CMS' Vital Signs: Implementation of the Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subommittee on Surface Transportation/Merchant Marine be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Tuesday, April 5, 2005 at 10 a.m. on Highway, Motor Carrier, and Hazardous Materials Transportation Safety, and Transportation of Household Goods in SR–253.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be granted to Rexon Ryu, a detailee with Senator HAGEL's office, during consideration of S. 600, the State Department authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent that Jennifer Gergen and Joseph Bowab, two detailees from the State Department who are serving with the Foreign Relations Committee staff, receive floor privileges during consideration of S. 600.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, at the request of Senator LIEBERMAN, I ask unanimous consent that Andrew Young, a fellow in his office, be granted the privilege of the floor during the consideration of the State Department authorization and all votes thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO APPOINT A COMMITTEE

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Viktor Yushchenko, President of Ukraine, into the House Chamber for the joint meeting tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2005

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 6. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then resume consideration of calendar No. 48, S. 600, the State Department authorization bill, provided that the time until 10 a.m. be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member, provided further that at 10 a.m. the Senate proceed to the vote in relation to Biden amendment No. 286 as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that immediately

following the vote tomorrow morning, the Senate stand in recess until 12 noon so that the Senate may proceed as a body to the House Chamber for a joint meeting to hear an address by Ukrainian President Yushchenko.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. KYL Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will resume debate on the State Department authorization bill. The leader has announced that under the previous order, we will vote in relation to the Biden amendment at 10 a.m., and that will be the first vote of the day.

Following that vote, the Senate will continue working through amendments to the bill. There are six additional amendments currently pending, and it is the leader's hope that we can work out time agreements on these, plus any other amendments offered tomorrow.

Again, we will have an abbreviated week due to the events at the Vatican. It is the leader's intention to complete action on the State Department reauthorization bill this week. Therefore, it is paramount that we make strides on this bill during tomorrow's session. Senators should expect rollcall votes throughout the day and into tomorrow evening.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment following the scheduled debate with respect to Social Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, let me make a couple of comments and then I will yield to Senator DORGAN a couple of minutes as respective chairmen of the policy committees of both parties to describe what is going to happen briefly.

Sometimes, people watching C–SPAN will see a lone Senator giving a speech on the floor of the Senate and that passes for debate, and they ask, Where is the debate? Where is the joinder of the issues with one side asking the other a question and one side responding to the other's questions?

As a result of the fact that we don't have enough of that real debate in the Senate, what Senator DORGAN and I and our respective parties have agreed to is to conduct real debate, such as high school or college debates that many are familiar with, where there is a set time—in this case, 70 minutes—and each of four speakers, two on the Republican side and two on the Democratic side, have a few minutes, in this case 6 minutes, to make a presentation. Then when those presentations are over, each will ask the other questions. They will take a minute to ask the question with 2 minutes to respond; then, when the questions are over, there will be a brief summing up period of time. That can allow the positions of the parties to be articulated well and yet permit an exchange of rebuttal and surrebuttal, which actually enables the parties to question each other, to challenge each other's premises and then to respond; in effect, conduct a real debate. The exact time limits are known to the parties.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent, without reading the agreement which has been agreed to by both parties respecting the relative time and order of presentation, that the agreement be deemed read and agreed to, and that it be deemed self-executing in the event that either Senator DORGAN or I should not be on the floor for purposes of yielding time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, for the next 70 minutes, as soon as Senator DORGAN is done with his preliminary comments, we will conduct this debate on the subject of Social Security. I invite those who are watching C–SPAN, as well as our colleagues, to tune in here because this may be one of the few real debates that we have until this subject actually is taken up on the floor of the Senate.

Finally, the subjects are chosen by mutual agreement, and we hope to have more of these debates this year and the following year, conducted roughly in this same kind of format so we can engage on other subjects as well.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. We are the chairmen of our respective policy committees, Republican and Democratic parties. We have on previous occasions decided to arrange some debates on the floor of the Senate about some significant issues. I participated in previous debates. For this evening, however, the debate will occur between Senator DURBIN and Senator STABENOW on the Democratic side, Senator DEMINT and Senator SANTORUM on the Republican side. This debate is about Social Security, the larger issue, and also the merits of private accounts in Social Security.

I assume this will be a spirited discussion because it is a discussion that has been moving around the country at a very significant pace in recent weeks. It was said once that when everyone in the room is thinking the same thing, no one is thinking very much. I happen to think debate strengthens this democracy of ours.

I recall several years ago I picked up the Washington Post and there was a big debate going on about something very controversial, and someone was quoted in the Washington Post. They said, This whole thing has degenerated into a debate about principles. I read that, and I guess that is why I came here. I hope so. I hope that is what debate is about.

Tonight, we will one more time begin a discussion and a debate, in this case on a subject that is very important in this country. I thank the two Republicans and the two Democrats, distinguished colleagues, who have agreed to participate in this debate. As my colleague Senator KYL indicated, this debate will be self-executing. The rules are known to all participants.

With that, let me turn this debate period over to the participants who have agreed to begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader or his designee is now recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank both chairmen for structuring this debate.

I am here to talk about the problems confronting the Social Security system. Then my colleague Senator DEMINT will talk about in more detail the solutions we are putting forth—many of us on the side of the aisle are putting forward.

The problem with Social Security is it is driven by demographics. Social Security is a pay-as-you-go system. That means the people working pay into the system for those who are retired. The system worked well when you had a lot of people working and only a few people retiring. But that has fundamentally changed over the years. As a result of that change, what you see in the red line is a dramatic increase in taxes—from 2 percent, which is what the tax was on Social Security in 1936, now up to 12.4 percent. It was 2 percent on the first $3,000 you made. That is the green bar. Now it is up to 12.4 percent of the first $90,000 you make. If you are working in the system now, that is when you start, high based; in other words, almost every dollar most people make is going be taxed at a very high rate.

This is a big tax burden on future generations of America as we stand today. But this tax right now doesn't pay for the benefits that are going to be provided for future generations. Why? Demographics are changing.

The first thing to happen is the fact that we are not having as many children. There are some exceptions to that. But we are not having as many children as we had in previous years. You see the baby boom generation, 6.3 children of women of childbearing age.

We are now going to be below a sustainable birth rate. But for immigration, we would be losing population in America.

We see a gradual decline in the number of workers going into the system. That is No. 1.

No. 2, we have a problem—a good problem. People are living longer. Life expectancy at the time Social Security started was age 61. Truly, at the time, Social Security was an old-age program. What does that mean? It was for people who could no longer work. People didn't live to age 65 back in 1936. Now we are seeing seniors living to age 77, and increasing 1 month every 2 years.

What we are going to be asking future generations of Americans to do—these workers, fewer of them—is to support seniors up to almost one-third of their lifespan in ''retirement'' on Social Security.

People are living longer, fewer people paying benefits, and the final big blow to the demographic perfect storm is the number of people turning 65.

If you look back over the last 40 years, back and beyond 1982, the average number of people turning 65 in America was 2 million. When boomers start to retire, as you can see in the year 2011, the average going out over the next 40 years is going to be 4 million people. We are going to double the number of people retiring, and they are going to be living longer, and fewer people are coming into the workplace to pay for those benefits. As a result of this combination of three factors, we see this very important distinction. This is what is driving the personal accounts. That is what is driving the need for changes in the Social Security system. It worked fine when you had a lot of people paying 42 to 1.

Now we have a system where almost one person is paying for one person in retirement; it is two to one. Franklin Roosevelt would never design a system where workers were paying for retirees if you only had two workers paying for one retiree. No one designing a system today would design a system with demographics looking like this. In a sense you are almost paying for one person's retirement.

If you do that, anyway, why not have a personal account? Why not have the money paid to you and accrue that money over time, earn interest, have the miracle of compound interest being used to benefit from the taxes you are paying, instead of simply paying it to someone who is getting a transfer payment from you as you work today.

Franklin Roosevelt was right; Members never thought a Republican would say that. He was right to design a system such as this because it made sense. There was a very small burden on taxpayers. But we have changed. America has changed. And as a result of that change we need to look at the system differently.

Here is what happens now because of this demographic. Huge deficits in the future. Why? Fewer people paying and more people retired live longer. We have a short window of 10 or 12 years when we are paying more into the system than we need to pay benefits.

Why don't we lockbox that? How do you lockbox it? You can't lockbox it. Every Senator I have ever talked to says the money goes to pay for other Government programs. The answer is right. How do we lockbox it? Put it into personal savings accounts for their benefits in later years. That is how you lockbox Social Security today. That surplus that is there right now, put it into personal accounts. If we don't do that, we will have a cashflow problem in our ability to pay benefits. We cannot pay benefits with IOUs. The President showed that today in Parkersburg, WV. You have to pay benefits with cash. That is the cash deficits we will be running in the Social Security Program alone: $63 billion in 10 years, $250 billion cashflow. What does that mean? Someone will have to pay more in taxes in 10 or 15 years, someone will get less benefits, or we will have huge borrowing to pay current benefits—not doing anything about saving money, not doing anything about having a better benefit, just to pay the current benefits being promised and that we cannot deliver on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleagues.

Sometimes by accident the Senate lapses into something which perilously resembles debate. This may be one of those moments.

For those who are following it, welcome to the Senate as I hoped it would be. I congratulate my colleagues on the Republican side and my colleague Senator STABENOW for engaging in this debate.

The first question the American people ought to ask is a very basic question: Congress, if you did nothing, if you didn't change one word in the Social Security law, how long would the Social Security system make payments to every retiree with a cost-of-living adjustment every single year? To listen to my colleague from Pennsylvania, it sounds as though doomsday for Social Security is right around the corner. But the professionals tell us it is 35 to 45 years away; 35 to 45 years if we do nothing.

President Bush and Senator SANTORUM and others have said, but what about beyond that date? That is a legitimate challenge to all of us. When I came to Congress in 1983, I faced that challenge on a bipartisan basis. We met that challenge. We extended the life of Social Security for 59 years with commonsense changes. That is what we should do again.

Yet the President comes to us and proposes privatization. Now I have said it. I said the word which drives the Republicans into a rage. They don't want to use ''privatization.'' It is as Senator Bumpers said, they hate privatization like the devil hates holy water. But the fact is when the Cato Institute dreamed up this scheme, that is exactly what they called it.

So now the Republicans have a softer side of privatization; they call it personal accounts. But it comes down to the same thing. If you are going to take money out of the Social Security trust fund to invest it in the stock market, the first and obvious question you have to ask is, does this strengthen Social Security? The President has already answered that question: It doesn't. It weakens Social Security. It means the Social Security trust fund will run out of money sooner. That is obvious. You are taking money out of the trust fund.

What else does it do? It forces you to cut benefits for Social Security retirees. There is less money in the trust fund. You cannot pay out as much in a pay-as-you-go system. That is fairly obvious.

How would they achieve that? The White House memo that was released said they would move to this new price index. Wage index to price index does not mean much to the average person until you sit down and ask, what does that mean in realistic terms? So we ask, what does that mean for today's retirees? What if we had dealt with a price index instead of a wage index?

The yellow line on the chart suggests current law; the red line price indexing. What it tells us is 20 or 30 years from now, under the President's approach, we would see a 40-percent cut in benefits paid to Social Security, forcing millions of seniors below the poverty line. That is part of privatization. The other part, the part which they hate to talk about, is that as you drag these trillions of dollars out of the Social Security trust fund, the only way to make it up is to add it to our national debt, $2 trillion to $5 trillion of national debt over 20 years, debt that is financed by Japan, China, Korea, and Taiwan, debt our children would carry.

So there we have the perfect storm. All three have come together: A privatization plan that doesn't strengthen Social Security but weakens it; a privatization plan that is going to cut benefits dramatically in the outyears; and a privatization plan that is going to create a deficit of $2 trillion to $5 trillion.

If we moved to the President's plan immediately, the Social Security system would go bankrupt even sooner, be insolvent even sooner. How can that be the right approach?

Now, let's get down to the politics of this situation. This is all about

choices. We have made some choices. We had a vote as to whether we were going to cut taxes in America or save Social Security. Look at these Bush tax cut votes where we asked our Republican friends who wanted to join us in saving Social Security, are you willing to sacrifice a penny in tax cuts to make Social Security stronger. Time after time after time, to amendments offered by Senator BYRD, Senator HARKIN, Senator CONRAD, Senator REID, Senator Hollings, they have said no, we would prefer tax cuts even for the wealthiest people in this country rather than to strengthen the Social Security trust fund. The reason the Social Security trust fund may be in peril in the outyears is we have taken so much out of it to finance tax cuts.

I have a chart which shows what the tax cuts mean, the Social Security shortfall and the cost of other administration politics over the next 75 years. The Social Security shortfall is about the same as the President's tax cuts for the top 1 percent of Americans. If we took the money we are giving in tax cuts to the wealthiest people in America and put it back into the Social Security system, we would not be having this debate. We would be talking about other issues that are equally if not more important.

Look at this chart. As a percentage of gross domestic product, Social Security will be at 48 percent in the year 2075. Look at Medicare and look at Medicaid. As we talk about this light at the end of the tunnel, 35 or 45 years from now, there is a locomotive looming, about to run over us, called Medicaid and Medicare and cost of health insurance.

So why aren't we sitting down on a bipartisan basis as we did in 1983, working out commonsense solutions that don't privatize Social Security, weakening it, cutting benefits, creating a massive debt for our children? Why don't we work on a bipartisan basis to make it stronger?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired. There is 6 minutes for the minority.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Ms. STABENOW. First, thanks to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for arranging in this incredibly important debate, Senator KYL and Senator DORGAN, for bringing us together in this way.

Social Security is a great American success story. Senator DURBIN and I, while we were not around when it was created, are very proud of the fact that we as Democrats led the way to create a great American success story. Our goal today is to keep the security in Social Security. That is the fundamental issue, I believe, for each American family.

We are very proud of the fact that Social Security is a great American success story because prior to Social Security, half of the seniors in our country, half of older Americans, were in poverty. Today it is about 10 percent. We still need to work on the 10 percent but this is a great American success story. We want to make sure nothing is done to unravel this.

It is important we have this debate, though, and we talk about the fact that Social Security is America's insurance policy. It is our families' insurance policy because it is more than just retirement, which is so critical. But it is also a disability policy. Most of us do not have a private disability policy. In fact, 75 percent of us do not. It is a disability policy; it is a survivors policy.

Heaven forbid if mom or dad lose their life, where they are not there to care for their children. In fact, in my husband's own family, when he was 10 years old, his father died. His mom was older and not well, and he and his mom literally survived on Social Security.

This is a great American success story. Anything we do that pulls dollars out of an insurance policy will cut those who are left. No matter how forcefully the President or our colleagues say that somehow some folks can be protected, when you pull dollars out of an insurance system, it is not possible. I think it is very important for us to understand that as well.

Also, we can each have our own opinions but not our own facts. There are a couple of different numbers floating around, but I would suggest to you that the folks whom we are obligated to look to, the Congressional Budget Office—the folks where nobody is appointed by the President, such as the Social Security trustees—those who are the nonpartisan folks we refer to all the time, they tell us, as has been said, that the trust fund can pay 100 percent of its obligations until 2052, and after that, if nothing was done, it would be about 80 percent, maybe 78, 80 percent the trust fund could pay.

There is no question there is a gap, and we are here to say we want to work with you to address that gap. That is what we ought to be doing.

What we know, and the President has already admitted, as have others, is the privatization scheme proposed does nothing to fix this; nothing. It does not add a day, does not add an hour to 2052. In fact, it makes it worse.

There is a solution. In fact, there are a number of things we can talk about. But 2 weeks ago we had a vote on the floor on the budget resolution. This was a vote based on an amendment that Senator KENT CONRAD and I had to put Social Security first. I know people are concerned about Social Security, those who support continuing it. But the reality is, we had a vote 2 weeks ago on an amendment that simply said, before we permanently extend tax cuts predominantly to those most blessed in our country, who are the least worried about Social Security, or before we add new mandatory spending, we should secure Social Security first.

It is staggering when we look at the differences in values and priorities in this Congress and with the administration. Mr. President, $3.7 trillion is a lot of money; $3.7 trillion would secure Social Security for 75 years. That is, what, a third, a third maybe, of what we are going to be asked to vote on later this year and beyond to extend tax breaks predominantly for the wealthiest Americans for 75 years.

What are our values? What are our priorities? What does this say about us as a country? We can easily, by putting Social Security first, fill that gap for 75 years. And I believe we ought to do it.

Specifically, on why privatization is something that does not make sense. Privatization does three things we are concerned about: It increases the national debt drastically; it increases administrative costs; and it adds deep benefit cuts. No matter who says, ''We'll protect this group or that group, these folks will be OK,'' if you take money out of the insurance system, everybody gets cut. That is the reality.

The first thing is the budget deficit, the deficit for the country. When we look at what is happening right now, it is astounding. We have the largest Federal deficit right now in the history of the country. We should all be extremely concerned about it. It is $4.6 trillion, projected. This adds, over 20 years, another $4.9 trillion. It more than doubles the national deficit in order to do privatization.

One of the things I am particularly worried about, both as a member of the Banking Committee and a member of the Budget Committee, is who is buying that debt? Who is buying that debt from us? This is at a time when we are concerned about national security and trade deficits and what is happening around the world.

Well, the top two folks buying it are Japan and China. But can you imagine, South Korea and OPEC own some of our deficit. What happens when we add more to that deficit? And what happens when foreign countries buy more and more of our debt? This is a bad idea to add more to our debt.

Let me add a couple of points.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. STABENOW. I will do that later. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority is now recognized for 6 minutes.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my colleagues as well.

This is a great opportunity to discuss such an important program. I appreciate all three of my colleagues who have spoken who have stressed how important it is that we keep the promise

of Social Security. We have heard a lot of numbers and different information. If I could, I would like to try to make it a little simpler so at least I could understand it.

I am reminded, as I hear some of the information, of a TV commercial I have seen that the AARP has sponsored. Some of you may have seen that commercial. The Presiding Officer may have seen it as well. In the commercial they have a wrecking ball that is tearing down a house and a Caterpillar tractor tearing down the walls and a family fleeing, and they are saying: This is what the President is trying to do to our Social Security system, to tear it down completely when all it takes is a few simple adjustments.

I think the real truth here is the house is more like one I saw on the news during the rains and the mud slides in California: a beautiful big house sitting on the mountainside, and from the front it looked perfect. It was perfect in the inside. The roof was perfect. It did not leak. But when you looked around the back, from the air with a helicopter, you could see that half of the foundation had been washed away, and it was precariously perched there on the side of the mountain. But it looked perfect from the front. A few hours later they showed a clip from the air where the whole house went down the side of the mountain.

Unfortunately, what we have happening today is we have a Social Security program that has worked, and it looks good, just like that house, but the foundations have been eroded for many years, and we are coming to the point where we have to rebuild those foundations.

I appreciate what the President is doing. This President has been willing to confront the most difficult issues of our generation. He has confronted terrorism head on. He is the world leader now in exporting freedom and democracy. He has taken the education issue on, recognizing we were leaving children behind, and made it more accountable. He saw that seniors were not able to buy prescriptions, and he has worked with the Congress to make sure they could. He sees that Social Security is like the house on the cliff and that we need to fix it.

Now, I am afraid my Democrat colleagues and the AARP and some other groups are still showing people around the house and telling them it looks fine. And it does. But, folks, the real truth is, the foundation of our Social Security system has been eroded. The President is trying to show us the truth, that we need to rebuild the foundation.

Senator SANTORUM painted a clear picture. The foundation of our current Social Security system was based on a lot of workers and few retirees, a lot of workers putting in $60 or less a year. Today, we have the average family putting in over $5,000 a year. The problem with that foundation and why it is being washed away by today's demographics is there is no savings. We have not saved 1 penny. Even though the average American family puts in over $5,000—some dual-income families over $15,000 a year—we are not saving any money in the Social Security system.

I am afraid while the trust fund is a nice idea, it is no more real than Santa Claus or the Easter Bunny. The President today pointed out that the trust fund is simply a file cabinet with a bookkeeping record of how much the Federal Government has borrowed from Social Security. This money was being borrowed before our tax cuts. It is being borrowed today. This year, there is $75 billion in Social Security surpluses. It is being spent. And if we had not had the tax cuts, it would have all been spent because there is no way in our current Social Security system to save real money. That is all the President is talking about, rebuilding the foundation of our Social Security system with real savings. And that is what we are trying to do.

I will put up a chart. I want to point something out that is very important. So much has been said that we are taking money out of the Social Security system. But what we are doing with personal accounts is welding them to the current Social Security system.

As you will see with the first bar on the chart, this year, in 2005, all of the benefits to today's retirees are being paid from the current system. But what we are proposing, since the current system is running out of money, is to begin to add personal savings within the Social Security system. By 2025, over half of the benefits that will be paid—and it is important to see that the benefits will be the same—will be paid in part by personal savings and in part by the traditional system.

Now, by the time my children retire, in 2045, all of the benefits will be paid from a funded Social Security system, from real savings, and people will actually get better benefits in the future than they do today.

Let me point out on a second chart, it is important to recognize no money is going out of the system. It is all part of a system that has a new foundation of real savings.

This is something we require of every corporation in the country that offers a pension plan, that they have real money in it. That is what we need to do to Social Security.

One of the benefits of this—in addition to structuring a program where we can guarantee benefits; we don't change disability; survivors benefits can be even better—is the average American worker, if you look at 2035, average median income at 35, it is already close to $400,000 that they can work with their current system. The benefit there is that if you die before you are 65 instead of today when you have nothing, it is left to your heirs. It is part of your estate. More people can inherit wealth.

We can continue to talk about this as we go through the questions and answers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority is now recognized and has 1 minute to pose a question.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will ask the first question. If you take up to 2 percent out of the Social Security trust fund—and it is a pay-as-you-go system—it is clear you don't have enough money to pay the benefits. The White House memo suggested that the way to deal with this is to reduce the amount of benefits paid to Social Security retirees. So I would like to ask my Republican friends if they support the White House memo that called for the price index that would cut benefits for Social Security retirees in years to come up to 40 percent.

Mr. SANTORUM. I would answer that and say that as you see, we have a surplus right now that can be used to fund these accounts for the next 10 years. After that we run a deficit in the Social Security Program, and we would have to come up with a way of financing that deficit.

What the President has suggested is that with Social Security, if we fix it the old-fashioned way, the way you did in 1938, which was increase taxes and cut benefits, workers would be paying more and getting less. With personal accounts, you have the opportunity of getting more because you use the compound interest, you use the miracle of the markets, and a balanced investment portfolio that is being used by pension funds all over the country to fund their accounts. And so what we would suggest is you initially use the surplus money and then you balance for future workers—again, no reduction in benefits today, but you balance for future workers.

What the President has talked about is a promise, a lower promise of benefits but a better opportunity for a return because you have the personal savings accounts which can exceed the promised benefit. So you have at least the opportunity to do as well as the current system promises but cannot pay—promises but cannot pay—and you have the opportunity of not having to have future tax increases, again, because you are able to compensate with the amount of money that is earned in these accounts, again, because of the compounding of interest and because of the diversified portfolio of investments you have.

To me, this is a balanced approach. It takes the good part of the Social Security system which is the security of having money go into this old system, keeps that in place for about two-thirds of the money, and a third of the money will be able to offset what

would have to be a future reduction of benefits with the growth in the personal account.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The majority is now recognized for 1 minute to ask a question.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Chair. I would like to ask a question about the 6 percent of the workforce that does not participate in Social Security. They are State and local workers. My first question is, Do you support requiring—just as you did in 1983 by requiring Federal workers to participate in Social Security—those State and local workers to participate in Social Security? And if you do not, then why would you deny current workers who are in the Social Security system the opportunity to have a personal account like those workers do and allow them to continue to have their funded pension system and funded Social Security system, not allow current workers to have at least a partially funded Social Security system?

Mr. DURBIN. I might say that many of these people are teachers and firefighters and policemen who pay into their pension systems. They understood the arrangements when they went in and usually pay as much or more than Social Security requires. And for us to now change their system and bring them into Social Security fails on two counts. First, it doesn't solve the Social Security solvency problem. It is worth about 20 percent of the total that we are dealing with. And second, it is going to demolish their own pension plans. So you are going to find these people who are being interrupted into their current employment paying into pension plans who will now either pay more into Social Security and/or less into their pension plans.

Is that what we want to achieve? Do we want to take pension plans that people paid into for a lifetime and weaken them? Is that our way to solve the Social Security crisis? I don't think so. I listened to my friends on the Republican side likening the Social Security trust fund to Santa Claus, the Easter Bunny, and a file cabinet. They may not recall it, but it hasn't been that long ago, 6 or 7 years ago, when we generated surpluses in the Federal budget. The Social Security Program was stronger. We were borrowing less money from it.

Since President Bush arrived we have borrowed $800 billion out of the Social Security trust fund. The so-called file cabinet has been very generous to the President when he wanted to finance his tax cuts. If he hadn't given tax cuts to the wealthiest people, that file cabinet would have been full of money for Social Security recipients, lengthening the life of this program.

Also, this whole thing about the miracle of the markets,

I commend my colleague from Pennsylvania. Thank you for finally saying the words. You said we are talking about lower benefits but the opportunity to do better. That is what it is all about. So there is a guarantee of lower benefits to Social Security and the possibility of making more money on your investment.

Does the phrase ''past performance is no indication of future results'' ring a bell? That is what you see at the bottom of every ad for stocks and bonds and mutual funds. There is risk involved. Some may profit, others may not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority now has 1 minute to pose a question of the majority. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, to follow up on the fact that we are hearing that there is no money in the trust fund, I am quite shocked to hear that because back in the 1980s, when the decision was made to come together, President Reagan, based on Alan Greenspan's commission, with Bob Dole and Tip O'Neill, they came together and on purpose designed a system to create surpluses for all of us baby boomers so there would be more dollars available in a surplus. And, in fact, what the President looks at, of course, just like when you go to a bank, you don't look in and just see dollars because there are investments being made and so on.

In the Social Security trust fund, individuals have been given secured bonds, the equivalent of a secured bond, an IOU, each one of us as individuals, with the full faith and credit of the United States behind it.

My question is this: We are giving those same kinds of assurances to those who buy our foreign debt, that we have the full faith and credit of the United States behind it. Would you suggest that we would pay China back and Japan back and our foreign creditors before we would pay back the people of America who have paid into the Social Security trust fund and have been given a secured IOU?

Mr. DEMINT. An excellent question. Those are legal obligations of the Federal Government which we have to honor. But the Supreme Court has said Americans have no legal right to a Social Security benefit. It is not their money. They don't own it. Unfortunately, the Social Security trust fund could not write one check to a Social Security retiree today. There is no money.

The only place the money can come from for the trust fund is if it comes back from the general fund to the trust fund. In other words, these cash deficits that we have talked about are the money that has to come out of the General Treasury, out of our education fund, our transportation fund, out of our military, in order to pay these IOUs that are in this so-called trust fund. And we don't have the money to do that.

And the talk of tax cuts hurting the Social Security trust fund, I am afraid, is ridiculous. The money was all being spent anyway. If we had not had a tax cut, more would have been spent. This year there is $75 billion in a Social Security surplus that we are spending.

My question to the Senator is, would the Senator support a proposal that actually saved the Social Security trust fund—that is all we do—save the money that is surplus between now and the time that runs out in 2017—and that is when the program is in trouble because that is when we have to start pulling money out of the general fund. But my question to both of my Democratic colleagues is, would they support a proposal to save the Social Security surplus today?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first I say to my friend and colleague, I am shocked to hear him say the people of America who have paid into the Social Security trust fund, the baby boomers, do not have a secured obligation by all of us. Is the Senator saying whether it is moral or whether it is legal, or is he saying we do not have to pay those benefits? He is actually saying that for the folks who have paid in as baby boomers that we are not obligated to pay those benefits?

Mr. DEMINT. That is what the Supreme Court——

Ms. STABENOW. I want to make it clear that we Democrats believe with all our hearts and souls we have a responsibility to pay and we will pay those obligations. To somehow say that it is different to pay a foreign country than it is to pay our own people the obligations when they are both secured obligations—this is not something written down on a little piece of paper. This is a secured obligation with the full faith and credit of the United States of America behind it.

So I ask my colleague in return, the simple thing to do here, the very simple thing to do would be to go back and vote again on simply making a policy statement. Why didn't my colleagues, either of my colleagues, vote to say ''put Social Security first,'' let's make sure we secure the obligation, keep it secure for 75 years, and then we can give 70 percent of the tax cuts; to say to those most blessed in this country, will you take 70 percent of $11.6 trillion rather than 100 percent so every single person cannot only have retirement, but have a disability policy, have survivor benefits?

Isn't that based on the great values of America in terms of paying into a system, knowing it is going to be there, working hard all your life and creating a way for people to care about each other and have community? To me this would be the easiest thing, and we could do it tomorrow if we had the votes to do it.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I suggest the chart is not accurate. According to the Congressional Budget

Office, extending the tax cuts would cost about .7 percent of the gross domestic product between now and 2050, whereas the Social Security deficit is 1.4 percent of GDP. Even if we repeal all the tax cuts, not just on the wealthiest but on everybody that we provided—that is child credit, that is marriage penalty, all of those things—if you take all of those tax reductions the President has put forward, they only make up half, according to the Congressional Budget Office, of the shortfall. It does not solve the problem, No. 1, and it also would be mixing apples and oranges.

We have never in the history of this system had a general fund tax transfer to Social Security. We have always funded Social Security within the Social Security system through payroll taxes, and I showed the increases of taxes over time. So now we are talking about something fundamentally different. We are talking about general fund revenue to fund Social Security. I do not think most people would see that as an insurance policy anymore. I think they start to see it as a transfer program looking more like a welfare program than what has historically been a social insurance program.

I do not think we want to head down that road. I think we want to keep the integrity of the Social Security system in place. That is why what we are suggesting, which is personal retirement accounts, where the money stays in the system—there is a lot of talk saying you are taking money out to put in these accounts. Remember, these accounts pay Social Security benefits. The money stays in the system. It does not come out of the system. It is used as a way of actually saving and capturing this money that right now is going to the Federal Government to spend, and in exchange we are getting this IOU.

Is the IOU an obligation to pay? Yes. How does the Government pay benefits? It pays benefits on the ability to take either tax revenue or borrow money and pay out benefits.

What we are suggesting with this chart of showing the cashflow problems is the deficits are going to be huge in the future, and that is going to be a problem of cash-flowing benefit payments in the future. It is not that we will not pay them; it is the deficits are going to be huge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The majority has 1 minute to pose a question to the minority.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask either of my colleagues, they have heard of the solution we have put forward, and I guess the question I have is, the Senator from Illinois suggested we can fix it the way we fixed it in the past. The way it was fixed in the past is we raised the payroll tax from about 10.4 percent to 12.4 percent and we raised the base and indexed it. And then secondly, we increased the retirement age from 65 to 67. Also, we taxed benefits for the first time on higher income individuals. We taxed benefits, increased the retirement age, and we raised taxes.

So my question is: If my colleagues do not want to go the personal account route, and if they accept at some point—pick the time—at some point there will be a shortfall in the system, how are we going to solve this problem? What tax are we going to increase or by how much? How much are we going to cut benefits, or how much are we going to tax benefits?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I think it is an honest question, and it is one we should face honestly. The last time we did, in 1983, Mr. Greenspan's commission came up with a list of recommendations and said: Choose from this chart and you will lengthen the life of Social Security dramatically.

Finally, we came up with a package, as the Senator from Pennsylvania described. A final vote in the House of Representatives included 81 Republicans voting with 158 Democrats. When it came to the Senate, there were more Republicans than Democrats supporting the Greenspan Commission proposal.

Yes, it gets down to basic math, and that is what troubles me about some of the statements made by my colleagues on the floor. It seems we think we can defy the laws of gravity and the laws of mathematics, and it simply gets down to this: If you want to strengthen a program such as this, you are either going to raise taxes, cut benefits, or find some new way to generate money into that system. My colleagues' program is not a way that puts money into the system. It takes money out of the system that then can be invested, that may have a good return, and if it has a very good return, you are going to be the winner. If it goes soft on you, if you happen to have a bad investment, you are a loser. You have fewer benefits under Social Security, less money from your investments. The risk is there.

But I think we need to get down to basics. The Senator from South Carolina suggested earlier that we might as well have tax cuts; otherwise, we will spend the money. But in the years when we were generating surpluses under President Clinton, before President Bush was elected, we had the largest increase in longevity in Social Security in modern history. In a matter of 3 years, as we are building up surpluses, not spending the money on tax cuts or new programs, Social Security is getting stronger by 8 years because we are being fiscally responsible.

Now with President Bush, with the largest deficits in the history of the United States brought on by a Republican President and a Republican Congress, Social Security is going the wrong way. The latest estimate says it has lost a year in solvency. They are connected.

You cannot take the money and overspend on programs or on tax cuts and not have a negative impact on the Social Security trust fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 1 minute to address a question to the majority.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, given the fact the President has indicated that the privatized accounts do not solve the solvency problem for Social Security, and given the fact that at this point colleagues have said they are not interested in putting Social Security first before additional tax cuts or new mandatory spending, what would my colleagues' proposals be at this point? Assuming the privatized accounts, as has been said—that is a philosophical difference; folks may or may not wish to privatize Social Security, but it does not add a day to the solvency of the Social Security trust fund.

I ask my colleagues, what would your proposals to protect and secure Social Security be for the future?

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I appreciate the question because I actually do have a proposal. The fact is, if you add personal savings within the current system, you do fix the system permanently. The example on this chart is while right now the traditional benefits are paying 100 percent of our promise, and Social Security is a promise we need to keep—Republicans are committed to it, and the President is, and that is why we are looking at this house that is on a cliff. We want to figure out how to build a foundation that will keep it there for our children and grandchildren.

But if we allow personal accounts to work with the traditional system, when we get out to the year 2045, we not only have a permanently solvent system, we have one that is completely funded. In other words, it would meet the legal criteria of pension plans today.

I think all of my colleagues know that if corporate America asked us to set up a plan such as Social Security where we take workers' money today, we spend it all, and then we try to pay benefits out of future revenues, we would say no and we would probably put them in jail.

The plans we are talking about eliminate risks. They guarantee a future benefit and they are slanted toward giving the poor a better deal than they have had under the current system. We can design a Social Security system with personal accounts that eliminate risk and help the poor more than this current program and make the program permanently solvent.

My question back to the Senator would be, if the Senator is not for personal accounts—and I guess if the Senator is thinking the trust fund is going to pay benefits after 2017 even though last week the Social Security actuaries in their report said in 2017 payroll taxes will no longer be enough to pay promised benefits, so we will have to start pulling money from the general fund—my question to the Senator is if the Senator does not want to put personal accounts into the system, which we continue to stress we are not taking money out, we are adding new money to the Social Security system, we are saving it in personal accounts, we are welding it to the traditional system so that it will be stronger in the future, how is the Senator going to fix Social Security and pay benefits in 2018?

Ms. STABENOW. With all due respect, I am trying to figure out the new math in my head because the math that the Senator is talking about certainly does not add up to anything that I have seen. I would encourage folks who are watching to go to democrats.gov and use the calculator based on a 6-percent rate of growth that some financial folks put together where they can put in their date of birth and their average yearly earnings and find out for themselves how they would do. So far we have not found anybody who does better under these privatized accounts.

So when one is talking about what we ought to do, we need to start with the reality that the privatized accounts turn Social Security from a guaranteed benefit into a guaranteed gamble, No. 1. Secondly, there is nothing in what the Senator is talking about that has a relationship to what we are hearing about these private accounts.

I said to Secretary Snow in a committee hearing that I understand folks have to pay some of this back, so let me give an example. My daughter is 25. Let us say I give her $1,000. At retirement I tell her I want the $1,000 back, 3-percent interest, plus inflation. Is that what you are talking about? And he basically said yes. He did not disagree with that.

What we are seeing is a lot of hocus-pocus, a lot of where is the pea on the table moving things around. Of course, we have nothing specifically in writing yet from the President, which is one of the problems. But what we are seeing is a lot of talk that does not have a relationship to reality. The reality is that for the first time, in 2017 we begin to dip into the surplus that the Senator and I have been paying into as baby boomers all of our working lives. It is a commitment. It is a secured obligation and we are going to pay that to folks.

So the question is, what happens in 2052 when that surplus is no longer available? And if we can take privatization off the table, the Senator has very willing and able colleagues on this side of the aisle who want to work with the Senator to do those things that will secure it for the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The minority now has 1 minute to pose a question to the majority.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. President Bush created a commission that was stacked to be for privatization and personal accounts, but notwithstanding that the closest option to what the President has described, option 2 from that Commission, says in the first 10 years $2 trillion would be added to the national debt, in the second 10 years $4.9 trillion to the national debt. We have asked the administration repeatedly how are they going to deal with doubling America's national debt, doubling our indebtedness to the rest of the world. How can they believe America will be stronger in years to come when America's mortgage grows and America's mortgage holders, Japan, China, OPEC, Korea, and Taiwan, if they end their love affair with the dollar, will sink us by demanding higher interest rates to continue to finance our debt? How can this be fiscally conservative, I ask my Republican friends?

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator. This is really an interesting question, and I think everyone admits that there is a gap between the amount of money coming in and the amount of money that we are going to need to pay, and that is shown by this cash deficit. The fact is, we have to somehow or another in Social Security bring these two lines together. I think everyone would agree that is the option.

Right now, the shortfall over the life of the program is $11 trillion between the revenue line and the benefit line—the benefit line being up here, the revenue line down here. How do we bring those lines together, and how do we keep it solvent in the future?

What the President suggested is that if we do some—let us assume it is all borrowing. We cannot make any spending cuts. We borrow up to—again, according to Alan Greenspan—$1 trillion to $2 trillion over the next 15 to 20 years to prefund Social Security, just like we prefund every other retirement system in America. In fact, they are required by law to prefund. We put the money into a diversified portfolio of investments and then that borrowing at the beginning creates an elimination of the $11 trillion long-term problem. So I would ask, is a $2 trillion investment now worth saving $11 trillion and making the system permanently solvent in the future?

I would answer that question with a resounding yes, and we put the Social Security system on stable funding forever and have it supported by ownership. Of course, we all know ownership has its privileges. One of the things is it can be passed to the next generation. One can do better than the current system promises and cannot pay for. Let me repeat that. The promised benefits we cannot pay for for my generation and for future generations of Americans.

What we want to give is ownership to future generations. We want to give them a good chance. This gamble—go to every union pension plan and tell them their union is gambling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SANTORUM. Now my question. I asked this question, Senator DEMINT asked the same question of both of my colleagues, and in neither instance did we get a response. So I will give my colleagues one last try. We asked, what would my colleagues do, what is their plan? I just want to get the transcript. In neither case did either my colleague from Michigan or my colleague from Illinois put forward specifically what increases in taxes do they recommend, what reduction in benefits do they propose, or how much are we going to tax existing Social Security benefits to make up the shortfall. Pick the date as to when my colleagues want to solve the problem, whether they want to wait until 2018 or 2042 or 2052, whatever the case may be. How are they going to solve this problem that at least some on their side of the aisle admit exists?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I will answer that for my colleague. As Senator DURBIN just said to me on the side, it will not be privatization, and that is absolutely true. The American people, American families, can absolutely count on the fact that it will not be privatizing Social Security.

I would argue that the amendment we put up 2 weeks ago that simply says in the overall budget process, which is the value system for our country, the blueprint, is represented in what we do in our Federal checkpoint. The reality is, if we said we were going to take about 30 percent of what is being given over the next 75 years to those most blessed in this country, who are not worried about Social Security or Medicare or other kinds of opportunities, if we just ask them to take a little bit less, we would be able to secure Social Security for 75 years.

The other thing I would say about the issue of asking folks about pensions, we have all been told by our folks that retirement is about a three-legged stool: Social Security, pension, and savings. When it comes to savings, the risk is with us to save. I believe we ought to create more opportunities for that. When it comes to pensions today for workers, it is becoming more of a risk for the worker, not a defined benefit but a defined contribution.

The leg of the stool that has been secure, that we will fight to keep secure,

is Social Security. I will never forget people working for Enron who came into my office 2 years ago, men in their fifties who worked all their lives and played by the rules and invested in their company, and one man with tears in his eyes said to me: Thank God for Social Security. It is the only thing I have left, and I never thought I would be in this situation.

Social Security is not a 401(k). It is not meant to be a pension system. It is America's families' life insurance policy, retirement disability, and survivor's benefits. It has worked now for years and years. The issue is how do we keep it going.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The minority now has 2½ minutes to close.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you to my colleagues for taking time for this debate. I don't know how much we have lit up the place with our brilliance, but at least we did our very best to explain our points of view.

My colleague from South Carolina uses an interesting analogy of the house sliding off the hill. What they have suggested for that house that is starting to slide off the hill in privatizing Social Security is, before it slides off the hill, let's rip the roof off and start a fire in the kitchen. That is what privatization does. It doesn't create a stronger foundation for Social Security or for that house. It makes it weaker. It weakens Social Security, it cuts benefits, it drives more seniors into poverty, and it creates $2 trillion to $5 trillion more in debts.

If you want to make that house stronger, you have to backfill. You have to take the money you took out of the Social Security trust fund, money you took out for tax cuts, money you took out for things we couldn't afford to pay, money that has driven us into the deepest deficits we have ever seen in America under this President. That is how you backfill a foundation to save this house on the hill.

This debate is not about solvency. I think we know now that it is about the legitimacy of Social Security. I believe in it. Most Americans believe in it. It is a safety net we have counted on for almost 65 years and we will continue to count on.

But some of my friends on the Republican side see the world much differently. They have what they call the so-called ownership society. If you can just own it, then it has to be great. The model of the ownership society is, just remember, we are all in this alone.

But we are not in this alone. When Franklin Roosevelt created Social Security, he said the American family, all workers, will contribute through their payroll to make sure, if all bets fail, if your pension system fails, if you don't have enough in savings, you can always count on Social Security. That, he said, is what the American family needs.

They need it today more than ever. Pension systems are failing. These corporations are going bankrupt and throwing their shareholders and retirees and employees to the wolves. We cannot do the same with Social Security.

We ought to be able to stand together and make even difficult choices, as we did in 1983, when a larger number of Republican Senators joined Democratic Senators to find a bipartisan solution. Privatization is not the answer. Ripping the roof off that house and starting a fire in the kitchen is not going to make it any safer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority is now recognized for 2½ minutes to close. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Thank you again. I have enjoyed this tonight. Our talk, I guess, has gone in some interesting directions. My opinion is that Social Security is now too expensive to be just an insurance policy. When Americans paid $60 a year when the program started, yes, maybe it was an insurance policy. But today, with Americans averaging over $5,000 a year, for many it is their only savings plan. We cannot assume that the average American can save, after we take 12.5 percent of their income, additional money for retirement. We have to transform Social Security into a program that is not only secure but helps people create real savings to build a foundation of the program.

We are as committed to Social Security as you are. In fact, we wouldn't be here talking today if Social Security was secure. In fact, we see that it is running out of money, and the best way to fix it is to save some of the money that we are putting into Social Security.

I know there are plans that don't put people at risk because I have one and several other Republicans do. The plan I have introduced, which has been scored by the Social Security Administration, guarantees that no American will ever receive less from Social Security than is promised by the current system. It gives the poor larger accounts. It reduces the deficit for Social Security by two-thirds. It is a program that makes every American a saver and investor.

In this country today, with so many Americans who do not own anything, the opportunity to own something, and for that ownership to grow in wealth so that they can participate in a country as our economy flourishes, this is what Social Security can be in the future—just as secure, but it can contain real savings for the first time.

That is all we are asking today. Let's not cut benefits. We don't want to cut benefits. Let's not raise taxes. The problem with Social Security is that the foundation does not include real savings, and that is what we are proposing. Let's save Social Security with real savings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority is now recognized for 2½ minutes to close.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank you and my colleagues very much. This is an important debate, and I appreciate being able to participate in it.

The President's privatized accounts, we know, will do three things, and that is why my colleagues and I are opposed to the privatized accounts.

First of all, they will greatly increase the national debt. In fact, do you know what folks are going to own with this? Seventeen thousand dollars more in debt for every man, woman, and child in the United States. That is what they are going to own. It is a lot more debt and a lot higher interest rates as a result of this plan. This is a bad idea.

The other thing that doesn't make any sense to me is that right now Social Security, which is retirement—and we do have a secured obligation to make sure that we pay it, but it is retirement, disability, and it is a life insurance policy. For that we pay about a half a percent in administration. On average we are told that it could be upwards of 20 percent, maybe 10, maybe 25, but we are told by the experts, 20 percent in order to administer an annuity or other kind of private account.

One of the things I find interesting is that among folks who are really pushing for this idea around here are those folks who would be paid to administer these accounts. I understand we now have something like five financial services lobbyists for every one Senator now here on Capitol Hill. Certainly there are folks who will make a lot of money from this, but it is wrong. This system works right now and we pay a half a percent.

The final thing I would say is it is estimated that the average person over 20 years, the average retiree, will lose $152,000 under the approach the President is talking about. This is wrong. This is not better for people. This is, in fact, worse.

I agree with my colleagues, and in fact let me also say I would welcome folks going to my Web site or any of my colleagues' Web sites to learn more about Social Security and the facts. We do need to be working together, not only to secure Social Security for the future past 2052, but we also need to work on those other ideas that create opportunity for people. One of my great concerns is that one-third of the cuts proposed by the President in the budget are in education. That is opportunity. That is the opportunity for ownership in the future. Why don't we

focus on jobs and health care and those things immediately that need to be addressed?

We welcome those debates as well and we welcome working with our colleagues to keep the security in Social Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The majority has 2½ minutes to close. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank my colleagues from Illinois and Michigan, and my colleague from South Carolina and my colleague in the chair on this debate. I think it was a good and spirited debate. Hopefully, we added a little light to the issue. Let me try to focus a little bit.

The Senator from Illinois used a quote: We are not in it alone. If you are a 20-year-old today, you are feeling pretty lonely because there are only two of you going to be paying for every one retiree. When FDR said that, there were 42, and he could say we are not in it alone. You are pretty close to being in it alone today, and that is why we need a different system, a system that prefunds, that actually uses the money, the surplus today, and saves it for future retiree benefits.

We are not taking money out of the system. We are putting the money, instead of for the Government to spend and giving an IOU to replace it, we are putting it in real assets that will be real benefits when real workers really retire.

Second, I want to comment on the cost of administering the program. The cost of administering the program has been estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, not at 20 percent—I can maybe understand the difference—it is 20 basis points. That is .2 percent, not 20 percent. It is 20 basis points, which is .2 percent of the amount of money. So I believe that is a dramatic difference. It is actually less expensive to administer this system than to administer the current Social Security system.

The other thing I would like to mention, if we can go to the next chart, three times we asked the question, How are you going to fix the Social Security system? The only answer we got was to repeal the Bush tax cuts which, of course, does nothing to the Social Security system because that money is not paid to the Social Security system. So repealing the Bush tax relief would simply put more money in the general fund, but it would have no impact at all, no actuarial impact at all on the Social Security system. So when the Senator from Illinois said we had to make difficult choices in 1983, that may have been the case in 1983, but so far we have not heard word one of the difficult choices that the other side would like to present to the American people.

Several Republicans have come forward with plans, plan after plan after plan of details of how we are going to save this program, and all we have gotten from the other side is sniping at the plan that we put forward and no answers. If we do not solve the problem——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SANTORUM [continuing]. Of what the promised benefits are, we are looking at taxes of 18 to 20 percent if we wait until 2041 or later. That is not a plan fair to future generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SANTORUM. I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for morning business with 10 minutes equally divided between Senators CORNYN and DURBIN, and following the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate stand in adjournment as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

COURTHOUSE VIOLENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity for Senator DURBIN and me to speak for a few minutes.

The purpose for my rising is to follow up on some remarks I made yesterday, Monday, on the floor of the Senate. The full transcript of those remarks, which has to do with judges and recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court is available, of course, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but it is also available on my official Web site for anybody who would care to read it.

As a former judge myself for 13 years, who has a number of close personal friends who still serve on the bench today, I am outraged by recent acts of courthouse violence. I certainly hope no one will construe my remarks on Monday otherwise. Considered in context, I don't think a reasonable listener or reader could.

As I said on Monday, there is no possible justification for courthouse violence. Indeed, I met with a Federal judge, a friend of mine in Texas, this past week to make sure we are doing everything we can to help protect our judges and courthouse personnel from further acts of violence. And like my colleague from Illinois, I personally know judges and their families who have been victims of violence and have grieved with those families. But I want to make one thing clear. I am not aware of any evidence whatsoever linking recent acts of courthouse violence to the various controversial rulings that have captured the Nation's attention in recent years.

My point was, and is, simply this: We should all be concerned that the judiciary is losing respect that it needs to serve the interests of the American people well. We should all want judges who interpret the law fairly—not impose their own personal views on the Nation. We should all want to fix our broken judicial confirmation process. And we should all be disturbed by overheated rhetoric about the judiciary from both sides of the aisle. I regret that my remarks have been taken out of context to create a wrong impression about my position, and possibly be construed to contribute to the problem rather than to a solution.

Our judiciary must not be politicized. Rhetoric about the judiciary and about judicial nominees must be toned down. Our broken judicial confirmation process must be fixed once and for all.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in morning business.

First, let me commend my colleague from Texas. I think his remarks yesterday were subject to interpretation which he obviously does not want them to be, and I think he has clarified his position, and I am glad he has.

Some of the quotes in the newspapers were difficult to resolve, and they seemed inconsistent with my knowledge of him, his service on the court of Texas, and his service with me in the Senate Judiciary Committee. I think he would understand, as I do, that I have a personal interest in this issue.

I recommended the nomination of Joan Lefkow to the Federal bench in Chicago. On February 28, a bitter plaintiff in a medical malpractice lawsuit murdered her husband and her 89-year-old mother. Judge Lefkow had dismissed that individual's lawsuit. She was not engaged in judicial activism.

This tragic incident in my home State has been a wake-up call about the need for more judicial security. I met with the Director of the U.S. Marshals Service to discuss it, and sent a letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee today urging that we allocate more funds to protect our judges.

In mid-March, at a trial for rape in Georgia, a man took a gun, killed a deputy, a court reporter, and a judge presiding over the rape trial.

In both of those tragedies, the killers were driven not by political philosophy but by inner demons. Neither of these incidents appear to be politically motivated in any way whatsoever. They were horrible deeds committed by deranged men.

A recent New York Times article indicated that 10 State and Federal judges have been murdered since 1970. None were related to the judges' politics or ideology. Rather, the murders were committed by embittered or mentally ill litigants in emotion-laden cases, many of which involved notions of self-esteem.

I hope Senator CORNYN's clarification now will make it clear to everyone who has followed this debate that we need to respect our judiciary and its independence, even when we disagree with their decisions. I disagreed strongly with the decision of the Supreme Court in Bush v. Gore after the 2000 election. But never, ever did it cross my mind, nor should it have crossed the mind of anyone feeling as I did, that you should take it out on the judges. They are doing their duty. I may disagree with them, but to suggest that they should pay a price for it is wrong.

Notwithstanding what I consider to be a very positive statement made by the Senator from Texas clarifying his position, I am afraid there is another member of Congress from his State who has made even more troubling remarks during the past week. Congressman TOM DELAY is the majority leader in the House. In response to the death of Terri Schiavo, the House majority leader from Texas said:

> We will look at an unaccountable, arrogant, out-of-control judiciary that thumbed their nose at Congress and the President.

He went on to say:

> The time will come for the men responsible for this to answer for their behavior, but not today.

Mr. DELAY was asked whether the House would consider impeachment against the judges involved in the Schiavo case, and he said:

> There's plenty of time to look into that.

This is not an isolated statement by Congressman DELAY. He has said things such as this time and time again. He has said:

> It's a sad day for America . . . The legal system failed Terri Schiavo.

According to the New York Times, he said:

> Congress for many years has shirked its responsibility to hold the judiciary accountable. No longer.

Earlier this year, Mr. DELAY publicly condemned members of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals for ''writing laws instead of interpreting laws.''

When he was asked a few years ago about Federal judges by a reporter, he said:

> I woke up one day realizing the judiciary had turned themselves into a regulatory branch.
>
> We can impeach judges who get drunk, so why not impeach those who get drunk with power?

In 1997, in reference to Federal judges, he said:

> As part of our conservative efforts against [this] judicial activism, we are going after judges.

DELAY also said the House Republican leadership was prepared to go after activist judges ''in a big way.''

Then he went on to say in the Houston Chronicle:

> For too long we've let the judicial branch act on its own, unimpeded and unchallenged. And Congress' duty is to challenge the judicial branch.

He went on to say in the Houston Chronicle in 1997:

> I want to bring one (an impeachment) to prove my point. And I want to make sure that one sticks.

He said he and other Republicans had a ''whole, big file cabinet full'' of judges who may be candidates for removal.

This type of intemperate rhetoric, sadly, does great harm to the reputation of our judiciary, and the relationship between the legislative branch and the judicial branches.

I have felt as strongly, I am sure, as he has about decisions made by judges, but those of us in positions of leadership should be careful about the words we use, and that the actions we threaten are entirely consistent with the law at every moment. What we have heard from Congressman DELAY when it comes to judges crosses that line way too often.

I think we understand that deranged people, for reasons beyond political speeches, beyond differences on political issues, will do tragic things, and often that violence is visited on public servants doing their duty as judges serving America.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 6, 2005.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:50 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 6, 2005, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FIRST BIODIESEL FACILITY IN THE 26TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the City of Denton, under the leadership of Mayor Euline Brock, for its commitment to renewable energy. The City of Denton has teamed up with Biodiesel Industries, Inc., to construct the world's first renewable biodiesel facility. This facility opened at the City of Denton Landfill on March 29, 2005.

Biodiesel is a nontoxic, biodegradable alternative to petroleum diesel that substantially reduces air pollution. The Denton facility demonstrates a further commitment to clean energy by powering the facility by renewable biogas extracted from the adjacent City of Denton Landfill. The facility's expected initial production capacity will be approximately three million gallons of pure biodiesel per year. The fuel will be used by the City of Denton's entire diesel fleet and will also be sold through regional distribution channels to promote private participation.

The City of Denton's use of a biodiesel fuel mix is expected to reduce emissions by twelve tons per year. The opening of this facility demonstrates Denton's dedication to cleaning up the air we breathe—this is especially important in the North Texas region as we work to comply with Clean Air Act requirements. Additionally, this opening shows Denton's commitment to reducing air pollution, foreign oil dependency and generating local economic development.

As a nation, we need to look for affordable renewable fuel sources for our future. The City of Denton has shown how partnerships between local governments and private firms can help to protect the environment in an economical feasible way. I would like to applaud the City of Denton for their leadership on this issue.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANDREW J. MAIR

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary American, Andrew "Andy" Mair. Through Andy's incredible careers, he has traveled the world and had many exciting experiences. I am glad to take this opportunity to share with you his life.

At age twenty-two, Andrew J. Mair married his wife Norma Asmus. In the following several years they had two daughters, purchased a farm, and settled in Fort Collins. He became President of the Larimer County Farm Bureau. He was a member of the Boxelder School Board, and Elder in the Fort Collins Presbyterian Church.

At age thirty-three, Andy sold his farm and moved to Denver so he could attend the University of Denver. After graduating he took a job with the Colorado Farm Bureau. Andy also worked for the United States Department of Agriculture as the Director of the Denver Office of Conservation and Stabilization. Three years later, he was transferred to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, DC.

With the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Andy made his first trip around the world. One year later, Andy was appointed as Administrative officer in the American Embassy in Rome, Italy. There, Andy met Pope John Paul VI and handled logistics for President John F. Kennedy, including three trips for Jacquelyn Kennedy, and two trips for Vice President Johnson.

Another exciting point in Andy's career was when he was appointed as the Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs. He served as the head of the United States Delegation to all United Nations Food and Agricultural organizations in Rome. He also represented the United States at the United Nations headquarters in New York for their World Food Program.

Through his vast experiences while working for the government, Andy has earned several awards including the U.S. State Department's Meritorious Honor Award, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Award of Distinguished Service. He received his most cherished award in 1983, the National Farm Bureau Award. To this day, Andy is still the only Coloradan to have received this award.

Andy's accomplishments are numerous and ongoing. Just this year, Andy was approached by Colorado State University's Agriculture Department requesting his papers, records and letters to be placed in the CSU Agriculture Archives. Andy's philosophy is to make the most of every opportunity.

I ask my colleagues to join me to recognize the outstanding acts of service by Andrew J. Mair.

A TRIBUTE TO MADELEINE GOLDE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Madeleine Golde who has dedicated her career to strengthening our health care system for hard working Americans across this country.

As the Deputy Director for Health Care Legislation and Senior Legislative Advocate for the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) national office in Washington, DC, Madeleine has been a key healthcare advocate on Capitol Hill regarding federal policy. After nearly 7 years of service, Madeleine is retiring from SEIU. SEIU represents 1.8 million working people in the areas of health care, public service, building service, industrial and allied trades.

Madeleine has been instrumental in fashioning both the strategy and substantive health care policy to advance the goals of SEIU. She has made countless visits to Capitol Hill on the behalf of American workers to meet with congressional staff on important health care policy issues. She has also worked with numerous organizations that share SEIU's goal of improving our nation's health care system.

Most important, Madeleine has been an important partner with the City of New York in advancing several important health care issues, including fiscal relief for Federal Medicaid matching rates, bioterrorism, Bioshield I and II, Ryan White Title I, Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) funding, smallpox vaccinations, indigent care costs for undocumented immigrants, Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) Commission, disaster response capabilities, immunizations for children, the adult vaccine program, and Medicare.

Most recently, she worked with New York City to insure the passage of the Smith Bingaman amendment, which blocked Senate passage of $14 billion in budget resolution cuts to Medicaid and called for Congress to have a bipartisan commission on Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, Madeleine Golde has been a leader in advocating for a health care system that ensures all Americans have quality and affordable health care coverage. As such, she is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

HONORING SODUS SPARTANS' BOYS BASKETBALL CLASS C STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Sodus Spartans for their victory over Faith Heritage to capture the 2005 Class C State Championship title. The 76–65 win marked the first state championship for the boys' basketball team as well as the Sodus School athletic program.

Emanuel Reaves and Gregory Logins led the team, scoring 17 and 22 points, respectively. They are currently 27–0 and are looking to capture the number one spot in the state within their class. Coach Jim Sergeant and the

team deserve recognition for their consistent hard work and attaining the championship title.

Coaches Jim Sergeant, Alan H. Granger, and Robert Miranda, as well as players Robert McDowell, Emanuel Reaves, Johnny McCray, Roderick Johnson, Gregory Logins, Matthew Sombathy, Antonio Parker, Jeffrey Kuhn, Dennis Gorobtschuk, Jaroslaw Konikiewicz, Hauke Bruns, Brian Hanagan, Lionel Webber, and Paul Morales were all instrumental in reaching state champion status.

I commend the Sodus basketball team for their determination and exceptional season. Their outstanding achievements have set a standard that other teams should follow. Congratulations and good luck on future seasons.

HONORING THE RETURN OF SOLDIERS FROM IRAQ

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor several members of our Nation's military who have recently returned home after serving our country with distinction in Iraq.

Specialist Rocky Padgett, Specialist Chad Sumner, Specialist James Tyson Zigler, Specialist Bud Rath, Specialist Bradrick Graves, Specialist James Arnold, Specialist Jason Yanna, Specialist Michael Easdon, Corporal Jason W. Fitzgerald, Sergeant Christopher Callaway, and Sergeant John L. Tetty all deserve our deepest appreciation and respect. In the face of tremendous danger, these 11 men bravely answered the call of duty to fight our enemies abroad so that we would not have to fight them here at home. Because of their efforts, America is safer today than it was just 2 years ago.

On behalf of the grateful citizens of the Fifth District of Texas, it is my pleasure to welcome these heroes home. America owes these men, and all who serve beside them in the War on Terror, a tremendous debt, one that we will probably never be able to fully repay. Today, we thank them for their courage, their patriotism, their service, and their sacrifice.

As these men return to their families, friends, and the lives they left behind, I want to ensure that they do so secure in the knowledge that it is through their service that America will one day be free from the horrors of terrorism. It is because of their service, that future generations of Americans will be able to enjoy freedom, peace, prosperity, and the many other blessings that God has bestowed upon this great land, the United States of America.

Gentlemen, on behalf of a grateful Nation, welcome home.

JOHN LAFALCE'S VIEWS ON BASEL II

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor as the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Financial Services, John LaFalce, made enormous contributions during his tenure in Congress to our deliberations on financial services issues, and as a private citizen, he continues to do so. I have myself benefited in a number of conversations from his knowledge and wisdom about a range of issues. One of those about which he is most concerned is the current plan for a change in international financial regulations known as Basel II. On March 11, John LaFalce published a very thoughtful, well-informed article in the American Banker, outlining his concerns about the implications of Basel II. This is a subject currently before us in the Financial Services Committee, and while not widely known, is of great importance to our financial system. Because of that, I ask that the article by John LaFalce expressing his deep reservations about Basel II be printed here.

BASEL II PLAN IS A CRISIS IN THE MAKING

In the coming year Congress and U.S. bank regulators will decide whether to adopt new capital regulations that would impact the entire U.S. banking system.

Current discussions about Basel II are focusing on the minute details, rather than the more important question of whether the proposed accord makes any sense at all. In my view, Basel II is fundamentally flawed, and actually dangerous, for numerous reasons.

First, it is based on a fanciful premise that sophisticated risk-management models enable banks to allocate capital to each asset that is neither too low, nor too high, but just right. I hope my former colleagues and others do not gamble the stability of our domestic and global financial system on this theory.

Recent financial crises, such as at Long-Term Capital Management, should serve as stark reminders that all models, no matter how sophisticated, are subject to unpredictable market forces and, most important, human judgments, mistakes, and even manipulation.

With every large bank in the world lining up to play the Basel II capital game, and a financial system that is increasingly interdependent, the consequences of even an inadvertent mistake could be devastating. The odds are too high that Basel II, if adopted, could trigger a systemic financial crisis.

Second, Basel II's proponents have been too quiet about the most fundamental tenet of banking regulation—safety and soundness—and the critical role that an adequate capital cushion plays in the safe and sound operation of our banks and banking system. A Basel II regime would be reckless, unsafe, and unsound, inter alia, because:

It would allow banks to use complex risk-based models that few if any corporate executives or directors will ever comprehend adequately, if at all, and models that the regulators will lack the resources and technical skills to supervise adequately.

It is an ominous sign that the regulators recently published a formula that would have caused banks to underestimate their capital needs for retail credits by 60 to 70%.

Banks will implement Basel II only if they know their capital requirements will decline. That will also create powerful incentives, competitive pressures, and irresistible temptations for the nation's largest banks to revise their models over time to achieve the lowest amount of capital reserves possible.

Banks will be able to artificially improve their performance by manipulating capital levels, much as we have seen some companies manipulate earnings.

The new capital regime will seriously undermine the competitive viability of small to medium-size banks because of the dramatically lower capital levels that the largest banks will achieve. We now know that two former Federal Reserve economists came to that very conclusion in a paper that is being published independently.

Third, Basel II is overly optimistic about the ability and resources of regulators to supervise the new and complex capital rules. As Standard & Poor's has pointed out, ''National bank regulators could be overwhelmed by the implementation of Basel II, with its intensive need for verification of the internal systems and databases of individual banks.''

In addition, although the new accord allows regulators to make discretionary capital adjustments, banks will likely resist or seek to influence these adjustments, particularly after spending tens and even hundreds of millions of dollars developing their models.

As for market oversight, I discount that almost entirely. We are already seeing resistance by banks to making public disclosures about their models, ostensibly because of concern over the potential litigation exposure. Neither the markets nor the regulators nor most corporate officers or directors will be in any position to comprehend the underlying assumptions and idiosyncrasies built into the banks' models or to react quickly enough to emerging crises.

Fourth, some in the Federal Reserve would like us to believe that adoption of Basel II is necessary and inevitable. It is neither. Despite the perceived momentum behind Basel II, the accord seems to have little support beyond a few forceful players at the Federal Reserve and the handful of the largest banks that stand to gain the most because of reduced capital requirements.

I am convinced that the seasoned executives of some, if not most, of the nation's largest banks would themselves, in private conversation, acknowledge the folly of Basel II. Many former regulators have expressed serious reservations about, if not outright opposition to, Basel II, including Jerry Hawke, Bill Isaac, Bill Seidman, and others. Powell is apparently sufficiently concerned that he has reignited the debate over the FDIC's authority to examine banks already being examined by other federal regulators.

The fact that the chairmen and ranking members of both the House Financial Services Committee and its financial institutions subcommittee introduced legislation Thursday that could slow down or even prevent adoption of Basel II should also send a strong signal to the regulators.

Fifth, I am not even convinced that the Federal Reserve itself fully embraces Basel II, or even adequately understands many of its implications. Some prominent members of the Federal Reserve may still mistakenly believe that regulatory capital does not affect competition or the pricing and strategic decisions that banks make. This misconception could help explain their preference for

theoretical models rather than practical realities.

Chairman Greenspan has been largely silent in the Basel II debate, although the irony is that he prudently questions the sufficiency of the capital levels at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. But Basel II would actually allow banks to hold less capital for the same mortgage assets than Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are required to hold.

Current estimates of the capital that Basel II banks would have to hold for mortgage assets would also be at or below the capital level that led to the savings and loan crisis.

Some at the Federal Reserve appear to be more attuned to the importance of maintaining adequate regulatory capital reserves. Timothy Geithner, the president and CEO of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, remarked recently that it was important for the nation's largest financial institutions to ''maintain an ample capital cushion over and above the high regulatory thresholds.''

He added that ''because of the broader implications of a failure for the financial system and for the economy as a whole, the supervisory framework for the largest systematically significant banking organizations . . . needs to produce a higher level of financial soundness than might be indicated by measures of economic capital or expected by shareholders and creditors of the institution.''

Sixth, proponents like to argue that Basel II is necessary to create competitive equity among internationally active banks. No capital accord will ever accomplish that objective, both because of significant differences in accounting standards and the wide disparity in the quality of regulation abroad, as Jerry Hawke has stated.

Global regulatory consistency will never be achieved, particularly when foreign banks abroad are examined only sporadically and without anywhere near the same thoroughness as U.S. banks. The reality is that U.S. banks have proven stronger, more profitable, and more resilient than their foreign counterparts in recent economic cycles.

Seventh, there clearly is an effort afoot, pending Basel II's adoption, to abolish the leverage ratio as inconsistent with the principles of Basel II. Congress and U.S. regulators must not weaken our country's important regulatory protections such as the leverage ratio and prompt corrective action regulations to emulate the questionable supervisory oversight abroad.

Although some at the Federal Reserve have provided assurances that the leverage ratio will be maintained under Basel II, some have left that question open. And powerful institutional and lobbying forces have already voiced their preference for capital regulations based exclusively on risk based credit models, and have called for the elimination of the leverage ratio.

This cannot be allowed. Among other things, the leverage ratio ensures that regardless of the risk-based models used by banks, there is at least a base level of protection in the event of a crisis, rather than relying primarily on an insurance fund or taxpayer bailout.

In sum, decades as a legislator have convinced me that the most effective regulations are those that are easy to understand, can be applied objectively and consistently, are not subject to manipulation, and can be monitored effectively by supervisors, managements, and market participants. This is particularly the case when dealing with issues affecting the stability of our domestic and global financial systems.

With some reasonable updating, the existing Basel I approach can continue to meet these goals and ensure that sufficient capital is available as a cushion against mistakes or unanticipated crises. Basel II would take us in a dangerous direction toward subjective self-assessments of capital and a dependence on complex theoretical models that are subject to manipulation and incapable of being effectively monitored.

I see no consideration of safety and soundness at all in the Basel II debate, and no recognition of the danger of adopting a new capital regulation that goes in the exact opposite direction from the recent reforms concerning corporate governance, regulatory oversight, and internal controls.

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF TERRY LAZAR

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Terry Lazar. Through his daily actions, Terry truly upholds the tradition of service to both the family and community.

In each of his business endeavors, Terry remains faithful to his commitment of service—service with a unique combination of care and compassion. Terry's work in Lazar Sanders, LLP, Wealth Advisors Ltd. and Knowledge Partners has strengthened healthcare in our communities and has contributed to the world of financial services.

Terry has parlayed his expertise in health care to serve as an outspoken advocate for women's rights and women's health care. He has been an active supporter of the Ambulatory Surgery Center of Brooklyn, LLC, a state of the art facility serving women's health needs, and has developed a program for people living with HIV/AIDS which has been recognized by the State of New York and the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations.

Terry's service also greatly impacts the Jewish community. He serves as Vice President of the Long Island chapter of the American Jewish Committee, a Capital Club member of the American Israeli Policy Affairs Committee and President of the Long Island Executive Board of the Jewish National Fund. Terry has applied his knowledge and passion for Israel toward issues affecting the international community. He is a board member of the American Friends of Rambarn Medical Center in Haifa, Israel, the cochair of the American Friends of Tzohar, Galil, Israel (a premier school serving children with disabilities), and is a member of the Board of Directors for the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security—a Washington think tank seeking to reduce America's reliance on Middle Eastern oil.

Finally, Terry is a loving husband to Phyllis, proud father of Damon, Danielle and Ginger and doting grandfather to Cory and Jordan.

Terry's commitment to service has strengthened our community and enriched the lives of many. He is a great friend to Long Island and I thank Terry Lazar for all of his hard work.

HONORING WILLIAM ''BILL'' BELL

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor posthumously William ''Bill'' Bell of Madera, CA. Exuding a strong entrepreneurial spirit, Mr. Bell worked to enhance the way of life for many in his community. Mr. Bell's life will be celebrated in a special edition of his former newspaper, The Ranchos Independent.

In the late 1880's, Mr. Bell's family migrated from Kansas to California in search of new opportunities. After settling in Madera, CA, Bill's parents relocated the family to Southern California where he attended elementary and high school.

As a young adult, Bill capitalized on the post-WWII housing boom by opening an upholstery business to serve Southern California's growing furniture industry. Later, Bill went to work for an independent insurance agency where he taught insurance classes to agents for Century 21. In the early 1980's, Bill returned to Madera to work in the real estate industry where he gained great success and eventually opened his own Century 21 franchise.

Mr. Bell was involved in various organizations. He was a proud member of the Ontario Motor Speedway and Riverside Speedway Booster Clubs. In addition, he was a charter member of the Madera Ranchos Kiwanis Club and helped to organize the widely-popular Flatlander's Day Parade. Bill was a charter member of the Golden Valley Chamber of Commerce and is the former Owner, Editor, and Publisher of The Ranchos Independent, a newspaper dedicated to serving the Madera Ranchos community.

Bill is survived by his wife Pat, and their two children James and Jerri.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor posthumously Mr. William Bell for his service and dedication to his community. I urge my colleagues to join me in remembering and celebrating the life of William ''Bill'' Bell.

CHIEU LE AND LEE'S SANDWICHES—COMMITMENT TO OUR COMMUNITY

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Chieu Le, founder and chief executive officer of Lee's Sandwiches in Orange County, California.

An immigrant and a business leader, Mr. Le was recognized by the Asian Business Association of Orange County in 2003 for his entrepreneurial spirit and commitment to the communities his company serves.

In 1981, one year after immigrating to the United States from Vietnam, Mr. Le and his family bought their first catering truck and began serving sandwiches in the community.

Twenty years later, they opened the first Lee's Sandwich Shop in Garden Grove, California. The idea of a fast-food style restaurant

serving Vietnamese sandwiches came from Mr. Le's late son, Minh.

Today, Lee's Sandwiches is the fastest-growing restaurant chain in the West, with 35 stores in operation or development.

Mr. Le and his family also believe in giving back to the community. In response to the tragedies of the 9–11 attacks and the Tsunami in South Asia, Lee's Sandwiches raised nearly $200,000 in total for the victims of these disasters.

The Le family is as an example of a successful business in California that continues to give back to its community. I believe that Mr. Le and Lee's Sandwiches will continue to expand the commitment to the communities they serve.

TRIBUTE TO ERNEST W. ASCHERMANN—85TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Ernest W. Aschermann on the occasion of his 85th birthday. Mr. Aschermann, who was born of German immigrant parents who passed through Ellis Island at the turn of the century, turns 85 on April 18th. We honor Mr. Aschermann for having been a great football star at Ossining High School in Ossining, New York, earning him a full scholarship to Syracuse University. Upon graduation, Aschermann returned to his alma mater to teach, coach, and be a mentor to many over 37 years. Aschermann still holds the distinction for having the only undefeated baseball team in Ossining history.

He was the husband of Vivian Bernice Ottaviano and the father to Ernest and Kurt. At a celebration in Ossining on April 9th, over 40 family members will travel from across the country to celebrate this great American's birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to Mr. Aschermann as he achieves this momentous milestone, and I invite my colleagues to join me in extending our most sincere best wishes for many more to come.

IN MEMORY OF SPECIALIST FRANCISCO G. MARTINEZ

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give remembrance to Specialist Francisco G. Martinez, from the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for serving our country during Iraqi Freedom. Spec. Martinez suffered a fatal wound to the hip when his unit made contact with small arms fire from the insurgents. Spec. Martinez was assigned to 1st Battalion, 9th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Infantry Division, Camp Hovey, Korea. He was 20 years old.

I would like to recognize and celebrate Spec. Martinez's life today. SPC Martinez grew up with a military background. His father, Francisco Thomas Martinez, served in the United States military from 1981–1991. SPC Martinez swore off the military in high school believing he had enough during his up bringing, but his father later explained to SPC Martinez how the military could help him through college and reach his dream of becoming a graphics designer.

Although SPC Martinez did not always agree with political philosophies surrounding Iraqi Freedom, he did believe that what he and his fellow soldiers were doing in Iraq was the right thing to do. SPC Martinez worked to keep in touch with his father as much as possible while stationed in Korea. Even though the e-mails became more sporadic after leaving for Iraq, SPC Martinez's father said that his son was clear on his sense of duty, wanted to protect his fellow soldiers and help rebuild Iraq.

It was my honor to represent Specialist Francisco G. Martinez. I extend my deepest sympathies to his family and friends. He will be deeply missed and his service was greatly appreciated.

HONORING THE LIVES OF WARREN AND FERN WOLAVER

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of Warren and Fern Wolaver. They are literally a walking history book of Larimer County, Colorado, and I would like to share with my colleagues a little about their lives in my district.

October 4, 2004 marked the 65-year wedding anniversary of Fern and Warren Wolaver. Their lives together have been spent in service to their community and family. They have lived for 35 years in their present home, located in a dry lakebed, with the road leading to their home being the dry streambed. Warren was born on the bluff that overlooks their current home.

Warren's great great grandfather traveled on a covered wagon and settled on Milner Mountain, close to the current Wolaver home. His grandfather was a sheriff and a State Representative.

Big Thompson School has played a large role in the lives of Fern and Warren since they attended as children. Four generations of Wolavers have attended this school including their children, grandchildren and great grandchildren. They have gone to Big Thompson School for many chili suppers, Parent Teacher Organization meetings, Christmas concerts and other programs. There was only one year that Fern and Warren missed a function at the Big Thompson School and that was in 1984 when there was four feet of snow on the ground.

Fern and Warren have had some interesting careers as farmers and ranchers. Through their farm, Wolaver Cherry Company, they have grown massive amounts of cherries including one year in 1960 when they were able to harvest 100 tons of cherries. They've also grown wheat, barley and corn, and raised turkeys and steers.

Fern worked in the family factory, Wolaver Packing, and served as a trustee. Fern was also a congressional aide to former Colorado Senator Hank Brown for ten years, and worked for Congressman Wayne Allard for five years. She worked as the clerk at their church, Buckhorn Presbyterian, for twelve years.

In addition to farming their cherry orchard and other crops, Warren has an extensive history in public policy. He was appointed to the "100 Man Committee on Local Government" in 1963 and starting in 1970, he spent eight years on the state board of Social Services. In 1976 he served as vice chair of the Big Thompson Flood Recovery Committee, as well as serving two terms on the Big Thompson School Board. He was also a Larimer County Commissioner from 1960 to 1976.

Looking at the lives of Fern and Warren, one cannot help but be amazed at their experiences. I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring the Wolaver's and to wish them the best in health and prosperity for years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO REVEREND WILLIAM F. WRIGHT, JR.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Reverend William F. Wright, Jr. who has been a leader in his community and is celebrating his 25th Pastoral Anniversary at New Zion Missionary Baptist Church.

Reverend Wright was born in Aiken, South Carolina to William Frank Wright and Willie Weaver Wright. He was reared in Nash County, North Carolina and graduated from Nash Central High School and North AT&T State University, where he obtained a Bachelor of Arts Degree. In 1979, he received a Master of Divinity Degree from Shaw Divinity School in Raleigh, North Carolina.

Rev. Wright was called to the gospel ministry in 1975 and was licensed to preach by the East White Oak Baptist Church that same year. In 1977, Rev. Wright was ordained by the Guilford Association. His pastorate was at West End Baptist Church in Reidsville, North Carolina. Under his leadership, West End extensively renovated the sanctuary. After nineteen years with Lorillard Corporation, Rev. Wright retired as a manager to become the full-time pastor of New Zion Missionary Baptist Church in Greensboro, North Carolina. He is a past member of the Board of Directors of the Lorillard Credit Union.

As a gospel preacher and community servant, Rev. Wright has served with and led many community and interfaith coalitions and groups. Under his leadership, the Greensboro Pulpit Forum undertook some of its most challenging work, including the community buying and stewardship program, which led to a decent labor contract between the K-Mart workers and Unite, their labor union. From the helm of the Pulpit Forum, he has served his fellow preachers as motivator, leader, and

confidant. Rev. Wright has served on the Board of Directors for Greensboro Urban Ministries, the Greensboro Housing Resource Board, the Greensboro Fair Housing Board, the Greensboro Human Relations Commission, the Greensboro 100, and the NAACP.

His honors and awards are many. Under his leadership, New Zion has been named "Church of the Year" by the NAACP more than five times. Rev. Wright, himself, has been named "NAACP Man of the Year" for 1995. He was recently honored at the NAACP National Meeting with a community service award for his role in the K-Mart struggle.

Rev. Wright's leadership in the church is matched by his leadership in the community. Five years before it became fashionable, Wright had the Pulpit Forum release a thirty-two (32) page position paper in which the church was challenged to enter into the business of confronting the problem of youth and drugs in the community. This work included workshops, direct contact actions, and visits into the communities where our youth suffer. In the spring of 1993, there was a daylong event where thirty young men admitted to gang involvement and being members of rival gangs. Everyone joined together in a joint statement declaring an end to his gang rivalries.

On a personal level, this Pastor is known in the Greensboro community as a "Pastor's Pastor," a mentor, and a friend to all. His ready demeanor makes him readily available to pastors for counseling and friendship. He is often called upon for advice by struggling congregations and has more than once been called upon to present leadership training to churches and deacons.

Rev. Wright is married to Narcissus Hargrove Wright of Henderson, North Carolina and the proud father of four children: Billy, Wendi, Nicole and Ashley. The Wrights presently make their home in Greensboro, North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend William F. Wright, Jr. has used his position as a spiritual and community leader to improve the lives of those around him, and his 25th Pastoral Anniversary is yet another reminder of all of the good work he has accomplished. As such, he is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today. Thus, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

HONORING PALMYRA MACEDON BOYS' BASKETBALL CLASS B STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to the Palmyra Macedon Red Raiders, the varsity boys' basketball team that won their first Class B State Title. The 57–47 victory was well earned after trailing to the Carle Place Frogs for the majority of the game.

Junior shooting guard Anthony Hall scored a game-high 26 points, and helped the Red Raiders get back into the lead in the final quarter. Coach Chip Tatro and the rest of this outstanding team deserve congratulations after their third attempt, and consequent victory, in winning the championship.

Coach Chip Tatro, Christopher Milke, Jared Boisvert, Mike Beck, Anthony Hall, Todd Piccola, Dan Gorman, Tim Patchett, Jonathon Denniston, Adam Husk, Andy Weaver, Jason Clair, Sean McGinn, Chris Timbs are all equal contributors to the outstanding 2005 season.

I commend the Palmyra Macedon Red Raiders for their enthusiasm and hard work in reaching their goal. Congratulations and good luck on future seasons.

HONORING THE VAN VANDALS

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor the Van Vandals boys' basketball team who won the Texas 3A championship on March 11, 2005. In their first trip to the state finals in sixty-three years, the Vandals beat Graham High School to return home with the state championship trophy. This is an accomplishment that the young men on the team will remember for the rest of their lives. As the congressional representative of the members, coaches, and supporters of the Van Vandals, it is my pleasure to recognize their outstanding accomplishment today on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

SUN CHRONICLE HAILS APPOINTMENT OF ATTLEBORO NATIVE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since 1982, my Congressional activities have been covered by the Sun Chronicle, which provides news for the Greater Attleboro, Massachusetts area. It is a newspaper which understands the importance of solid and thoughtful coverage of events that happen within its area. At the same time, it pays due attention to national issues, and it has also been an important advocate for fair treatment for that part of Massachusetts in which it circulates.

Its interest in all three of these elements came together on March 18 when the Sun Chronicle published a gracious and thoughtful editorial about the appointment of an Attleboro native, Joe Solmonese, to be the head of the Human Rights Campaign. The Human Rights Campaign is a major voice for fair treatment for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people, and I am among those who was very pleased that Mr. Solmonese was selected, given the combination of skill and talent that he brings to the job.

As the Sun Chronicle noted, "Attleboro is honored by the appointment of a city native to head the Human Rights Campaign" and it is also honored and fortunate to have a newspaper with the generosity of spirit to editorialize as well as it did on this subject. I ask that this editorial be printed here.

[From the Sun Chronicle, March 18, 2005]

ACTIVIST EYES TOUGH FIGHT

(By David Crary)

NEW YORK.—After 12 years advocating for abortion rights, Attleboro native Joe Solmonese might have opted for a less divisive field of work. Instead, he is taking over leadership of the largest national gay-rights group at a time when the same-sex marriage debate rivals abortion for volatility and virulence.

"My challenge is to talk about why the equality we seek is not just important to our community, but should be important to everyone," Solmonese said. "I have to believe in the optimism and fair-mindedness of the American people."

Solmonese was named last week as the new president of the Washington-based Human Rights Campaign and will formally assume the post April 11.

He plans to start his tenure by traveling around the country, meeting with state and local activists.

Since 1993, Solmonese has been a strategist for EMILY's List, a political action committee supporting state and federal candidacies of Democratic women who favor abortion rights. He was its chief executive for the past 2½ years, helping break fundraising records but also seeing candidates his group endorsed lose 2004 Senate races in Florida, South Carolina and Missouri.

Solmonese, 40, graduated from Boston University with a degree in communications after growing up in Attleboro. One of his role models was the local congressman, BARNEY FRANK—who disclosed his homosexuality in 1987 when openly gay politicians were almost unheard of.

"Barney Frank is an incredibly heroic person, but also someone who is absolutely in touch with his constituency," Solmonese said in a telephone interview. "He's a man who values family more than anyone I know."

Solmonese came out as gay in his early 20s; he recalls attending a Human Rights Campaign dinner when he was 22. Before joining EMILY's List, he was an aide to former Massachusetts Gov. Michael Dukakis and a fund-raiser for Frank.

He credits his parents, both schoolteachers, with inspiring him to pursue a career of political activism. Solmonese Elementary School in Norton is named after his father, Joseph.

"After a decade in the reproductive rights movement, I see myself having been in the fight for a progressive America," he said. "Groups like the HRC are very much at the forefront of that fight."

Another common denominator for the abortion-rights and gay rights movements is their determined and politically well-connected opposition. Conservative leaders who focus on those two issues have claimed credit for the Republicans' strong showing in the 2004 election.

"The American people fear a whole range of things right now, from terrorism to their economic future," Solmonese said. "Our opposition has been pretty crafty at capitalizing on that fear, using whatever means necessary to make political gains."

Many conservative groups are now waging a two-pronged fight against gay marriage. They are lobbying Congress to approve a federal constitutional amendment defining marriage as the union of a man and a woman; they also hope many more states

will join the 17 that already have amended their constitutions to ban gay marriage.

The Human Rights Campaign was among numerous gay-rights organizations participating earlier this month in a strategy session aimed at competing effectively in upcommg state ballot campaigns regarding gay marriage.

Solmonese says he hopes Massachusetts will demonstrate to Americans nationwide that its pioneering legalization of same-sex marriage has positive, not negative, results. ''Massachusetts is still there, with loving, committed families going on with their lives and experiencing the same rights and responsibilities that all Americans do,'' he said. ''We want to shine a light on what happened in Massachusetts, and tell the American people who we truly are.''

He replaces another Massachusetts political activist, former state Sen. Cheryl Jacques, who stepped down as HRC president late last year, citing differences with its board.

Her departure coincided with speculation in the gay media, and elsewhere, about discord among the HRC and some other major gay-rights groups. Solmonese said he has detected no serious rifts since his hiring was announced.

[From the Sun Chronicle, Mar. 18, 2005]

ATTLEBORO HONORED BY ANOTHER ACTIVIST

Attleboro is honored by the appointment of a city native to head the Human Rights Campaign—the nation's largest gay civil rights group—and just days prior to a welcome loosening on the West Coast of the bans on same-sex marriage.

Joe Solmonese, 40, who is gay, brings to his new role a history of activism that began when he became student council vice president while a junior at Attleboro High School in the early 1980s.

He later held an internship at the Statehouse while attending Boston University, then worked on successful reelection campaigns, first for Gov. Michael Dukakis and then U.S. Rep. Barney Frank, D-Newton. He worked on a Senate campaign in Oregon, as well.

Solmonese succeeds former Sen. Cheryl Jacques, who stepped down from her Attleboro-area district to lead the Human Rights Campaign in January 2004. She resigned Nov. 30.

Solmonese, whose mother and sister live in Attleboro, took the helm just days before a trial court judge in California ruled on March 14 against that state's same-sex marriage ban, calling it unconstitutional and comparing it to archaic segregation laws.

It's a ruling that resonates in Massachusetts, which has been in the vanguard of the struggle for equality.

It was the first in the nation, in November 2003, to give gay men and lesbians the same access to marriage licenses as heterosexual couples.

Solmonese' predecessor, Jacques, married her longtime partner in August in Boston, days after she addressed the Democratic National Convention calling for ''marriage equality.'' The couple were wed under Massachusetts' high court historic decision, a decision that was long overdue here and continues to be elsewhere.

Appeals are certain in California. But each step forward brings closer what surely will be the eventual right of gays and lesbians across the country to attain equal footing in the eyes of the law.

We congratulate Joe Solmonese, whose father, Joseph, was principal of Norton High School for several years until his death, as he sets out across the country to carry his message.

''We seek the same rights and responsibilities as all other Americans,'' Solmonese said, upon his appointment. ''Our job is to educate the American people as to what equality means.''

HONORING THE AMERICAN AIR POWER MUSEUM IN FARMINGDALE, NEW YORK

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of the American Airpower Museum in Farmingdale, New York to the commemoration of the 60th anniversary of the liberation of American POWs at the end of World War II.

Sixty years ago this spring, over 100,000 American and Allied POWs were liberated by Soviet troops as they swept aside enemy forces in Eastern Europe. This liberation marked the end of forced marches, stinging cold, constant hunger and the everpresent threat of summary execution by a collapsing Nazi regime. Simultaneously, advancing Allied forces also discovered Hitler's death camps and their wretched legacy of inhumanity.

As we observe this anniversary, I am truly proud to have the American Airpower Museum at the Republic Airport in Farmingdale in my congressional district. The museum has established a new permanent tribute to honor those who endured the POW ''stalags'' and to solemnly mark the liberation of the death camps built by the Third Reich for the purpose of murdering millions of European Jews.

The museum's tribute includes a recreated watch tower and barracks, a detailed diorama of a German ''stalag,'' the names of those New Yorkers who were POWs during World War II and a tribute to American POWs in other conflicts. This will mark the first permanent museum tribute to American POWs in the New York region.

It is vital that we continue to remember the horrors of the Holocaust and pay tribute to both the victims and the brave soldiers who contributed to the liberation of Europe from Nazi rule. I strongly commend the leadership that the American Airpower Museum of Farmingdale has taken on this issue and urge other museums to follow suit.

RECOGNIZING FLOWER MOUND HIGH SCHOOL'S NAMING TO THE GRAMMY SIGNATURE SCHOOL GOLD LIST

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Flower Mound High School, located in the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for its recognition on the Gold List of Grammy Signature Schools.

I congratulate Flower Mound High School's performing arts department, under the leadership of Danna Rothlisberger, Lewisville ISD director of performing arts, and Mark Rohwer, chair of the performing arts department, for their outstanding achievement. Flower Mound High School was only one of seven schools in the nation promoted to the Gold List from their original recognition as a Grammy Signature School.

Flower Mound High School received $7,000 cash reward for its performing arts department as part of their promotion. Mr. Rohwer has promised to spend a portion of the money to hiring composers to write specific pieces for the band, orchestra and choir, and to buy new equipment.

Flower Mound High School's performing arts department is a stellar example from which Texas schools should model their performing arts departments. Their commitment to educating students through the arts is to be admired and replicated.

I am proud of the education system in Texas; especially our involved parents and teachers at Flower Mound High School who commit their lives and time to fostering growth in their students.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM ''SLIM'' SOMERVELL

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Willis ''Slim'' Somervell, who has dedicated his life to God, his family, and the United States of America.

Slim has said, ''You need to be true to yourself and you need to have beliefs and a value system. Without those, what are we?'' These are wise words. As I learned about the life of service that Mr. Somervell has led, I am inspired by his beliefs and his values.

Service to America is one value Slim holds dear. He entered the United States Navy in 1941. In 1944, Slim was commissioned as a gunnery and navigation officer for the USS *Landing Ship Medium* 142.

In addition to having command of the *Landing Ship Medium*, he also commanded *Patrol Craft* 1262, which conducted air and sea rescues in the Caribbean. He was also Executive Officer of the *Patrol Craft Escort* 877.

Slim worked in the Fleet Weather Center in Washington, DC and conducted Navy weather research in Norfolk, Virginia. He served on the *Forrestal,* CVA–59. He was also the staff meteorologist for the commander of the U.S. Second Fleet, later for the Western Pacific 7th Fleet and ultimately commanded the Navy Research Facility in Norfolk, Virginia.

Devotion to family is another value that is important to Slim. While on assignment in Monterey, California, he met his wife Mary. They married in 1949 in Kerrville, Texas. They had five children, four girls and one boy. Slim and Mary are now grandparents of thirteen.

Slim will often tell you, ''What more can a person ask for than children and grandchildren who turn out to be good citizens.'' As you can tell, Slim is quite proud of his family.

After 30 years of faithful service to our country, Slim retired. But this did not slow him down. Slim took a job with the Bureau of Reclamation in their cloud seeding program. Later, Slim worked for the Department of Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University. Slim spent 15 years in that department as a manager, researcher and also a teacher.

In addition to service to family and service to our country, Slim also strongly believes in service to God. Slim and Mary attend Saint Joseph's Catholic Church in Fort Collins, Colorado. There, Slim serves as a lector and a communion minister.

Slim has been truly blessed with a great career and a great family. I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Somervell. May God continue to bless the Somervells for years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO MAE CATHERINE GREENE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Mae Catherine Greene in recognition for her dedication to her community.

Mae Catherine Greene fondly known as "Cat" by family and close friends is almost a life long resident of the east New York community of which she has been an integral and staunchly loyal advocate. She was born in Chadbourn, NC in March of 1957, the ninth of ten children of a proud and independent working mother.

Mae obtained her education in the neighborhood she so greatly loves and admires. She attended P.S. 149, I.S. 292 and William H. Maxwell High School in east New York. Mae, who has been married for almost 27 years to her childhood sweetheart, Richard Greene, is the proud mother of six children who still live in east New York as well.

Having six children in the public school system and being a concerned, loving and dedicated parent, Mae took a strong interest in the neighborhood's public school system. She was very involved and an active presence in many different capacities. She served as President and Secretary on Community Board 19 and President of the P.T.A. at P.S. 213, I.S. 171 and I.S. 292. Additionally, she was Chapter 1 Chairperson for the District for both P.S. 213 and I.S. 171 as well as P.A.C. President for the Board for two day care centers, Georgia-Livonia and Einstein in East NY.

Mae is not only an advocate for education, but she is also very involved in community and politically based issues and activities. She has been a longtime advocate for senior citizen, immigrant and housing rights. Mae has served as Secretary to the Tenants' Advisory Board and Property Manager at Elva McZeal Housing Development and as a Community Advisor at Beekman Houses in the Bronx, NY. She also set up a parents' rights advocacy for immigrant parents at P.S. 213, was a community liaison for Health Plus, and an advocate for the senior citizens at Elva McZeal Houses.

Mr. Speaker, Mae Catherine Greene has strengthened her community through her numerous volunteer efforts with the PTA, the Community Board, and local housing associations. As such, she is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

HONORING MSGT ROBERT F. GREEN, JR.

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of MSGT Robert F. Green. Master Sergeant Green, a resident of Ontario, New York is retiring from the United States Air Force after years of dedicated service.

His retirement allows for reflection on what can only be considered a sterling career. He has admirably served his country without question or reservation. His fellow soldiers will attest that Master Sergeant Green sets the standard regarding attributes such as honor, respect, duty and country.

On behalf of my colleagues, and myself, I extend my gratitude, great appreciation and well wishes for prosperous retirement years. Thank you for your service to our country.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS. ANNE DORA MOORE HALL

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like honor the life of Mrs. Anne Dora Moore Hall, 4 passed away on March 16, 2005. Mrs. Hall was born in Cherokee County, Texas to Miles Cleveland and Madge Edwards Moore. She lived most of her life in Dallas and had a long, successful career as an insurance executive.

A mother to two children, Robert and Steven, and wife to Bergen Hall, Mrs. Hall was also very active in her community. She was an officer in the Pierce Brooks Gospel Foundation, served on the Texas Safety Council, and worked with the Crippled Children's Foundation of America. She was also engaged in politics as a longtime member of the White Rock Women's Republican Club, the Public Affairs Luncheon Club, and working at her local precinct during elections.

As a mother, a wife, a businesswoman, and a community leader, Mrs. Anne Dora Moore Hall's life has embodied the values of family, community, and hard work that lie at the core of American society. As her representative in Congress, it is my distinct pleasure to honor her today on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

JEFF JACOBY SHOWS INTEGRITY ON TORTURE ISSUE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest aspects of our current political dialogue is that partisanship has extended into the intellectual sphere. That is, I very much agree that people should pick one party or the other as being more representative of their views than the alternative and generally support that party. That is legitimate partisanship. Excessive partisanship comes when people are never willing to admit that "their side" ever makes mistakes, or that the "other side" ever has any virtues.

It is for this reason, as well as the substance of his well-reasoned articles, that I was very gratified to read Boston Globe Columnist Jeff Jacoby's two-part series on torture. Mr. Jacoby is a strong, outspoken conservative who supports the war in Iraq. But unlike many, he does not let his general ideological position in this set of issues make him an apologist for specific actions which go counter to the very moral values that the war in Iraq is supposed to be vindicating.

In a forceful two-part series in the Boston Globe, Mr. Jacoby makes a principled, thoughtful, fact-based case against the use of torture by Americans, even in the service of our entirely justified fight against terrorism.

Mr. Jacoby puts it eloquently in his first article: "Better intelligence means more lives saved, more atrocities prevented and a more likely victory in the war against radical Islamist fascism. Those are crucial ends and they justify tough means. But they don't justify means that betray core American values. Interrogation techniques that flirt with torture, to say nothing of those that end in death, cross the moral line that separates us from the enemy we are trying to defeat."

In his second article, Mr. Jacoby argues that the case against torture is not only a moral one but also a pragmatic one, noting, among other things, "torture is never limited to just the guilty."

Mr. Speaker, I salute Jeff Jacoby both for the force of his arguments and for the intellectual integrity he has shown in making them. No issue confronting our Nation is more important than how we deal with this set of questions and I therefore ask that Mr. Jacoby's very significant contribution be printed here.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 2005]

WHERE'S THE OUTRAGE ON TORTURE?

(By Jeff Jacoby)

In August 2003, when he was commander of the military base at Guantanamo Bay, Major General Geoffrey Miller visited Baghdad with some advice for US interrogators at Abu Ghraib prison. As Brigadier General Janis Karpinski, the military police commander in Iraq, later recalled it, Miller's bottom line was blunt: Abu Ghraib should be "Gitmo-ized." Iraqi detainees should be exposed to the same aggressive techniques being used to extract information from prisoners in Guantanamo.

"You have to have full control," Karpinski quoted Miller as saying. There can be "no

mistake about who's in charge. You have to treat these detainees like dogs.''

Whether or not Miller actually spoke those words, it is clear that harsh techniques authorized for a time in Guantanamo forced nudity, hooding, shackling men in ''stress positions,'' the use of dogs were taken up in Afghanistan and Iraq, where they sometimes degenerated into outright viciousness and even torture. Did the injunction to ''treat these detainees like dogs'' give rise to a prison culture that winked at barbarism? Should Miller be held responsible for what Abu Ghraib became?

The latest Pentagon report on the abuse of captives, delivered to Congress last week by Vice Admiral Albert Church III, doesn't point a finger of blame at Miller or any other high-ranking official. It concludes that while detainees in Iraq, Guantanamo, and elsewhere were brutalized by military or CIA interrogators, there was no formal policy authorizing such abuse. (On occasion it was even condemned in December 2002, for example, some Navy officials denounced the Guantanamo techniques as ''unlawful and unworthy of the military services.'')

But surely, Church was asked at a congressional hearing, someone should be held accountable for the scores of abuses that even the government admits to? ''Not in my charter,'' the admiral replied.

So the buck stops nowhere. And fresh revelations of horror keep seeping out.

Afghanistan, 2002: A detainee in the ''Salt Pit'' a secret, CIA-funded prison north of Kabul is stripped naked, dragged across a concrete floor, then chained in a cell and left overnight. By morning, he has frozen to death. According to The Washington Post, which sourced the story to four US government officials, the dead man was buried in an unmarked grave, and his family was never notified. What had the Afghan done to merit such lethal handling? ''He was probably associated with people who were associated with Al Qaeda,'' a US official told the Post.

Iraq, 2003: Manadel al-Jamadi, arrested after a terrorist bombing in Baghdad, is brought in handcuffs to a shower room in Abu Ghraib. Shackles are connected from his cuffs to a barred window, hoisting his arms painfully behind his back a position so unnatural,

Sergeant Jeffrey Frost later tells investigators, that he is surprised the man's arms ''didn't pop out of their sockets.'' Frost and other guards are summoned when an interrogator complains that al-Jamadi isn't cooperating. They find him slumped forward, motionless. When they remove the chains and attempt to stand him on his feet, blood gushes from his mouth. His ribs are broken. He is dead.

Then there is the government's use of ''extraordinary rendition,'' a euphemism for sending terror suspects to be interrogated by other countries including some where respect for human rights is nonexistent and interrogation can involve beatings, electric shock, and other torture. The CIA says it always gets an assurance in advance that a prisoner will be treated humanely. But of what value are such assurances when they come from places like Syria and Saudi Arabia?

Of course the United States must hunt down terrorists and find out what they know. Better intelligence means more lives saved, more atrocities prevented, and a more likely victory in the war against radical Islamist fascism. Those are crucial ends, and they justify tough means. But they don't justify means that betray core American values. Interrogation techniques that flirt with torture to say nothing of those that end in death cross the moral line that separates us from the enemy we are trying to defeat.

The Bush administration and the military insist that any abuse of detainees is a violation of policy and that abusers are being punished. If so, why does it refuse to allow a genuinely independent commission to investigate without fear or favor? Why do Republican leaders on Capitol Hill refuse to launch a proper congressional investigation? And why do my fellow conservatives—those who support the war for all the right reasons—continue to keep silent about a scandal that should have them up in arms?

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Mar. 20, 2005]

Why Not Torture Terrorists?

(By Jeff Jacoby)

(Second of two columns)

The Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which the United States ratified in 1994, prohibits the torture of any person for any reason by any government at any time. It states explicitly that torture is never justified—''no exceptional circumstances whatsoever . . . may be invoked as a justification for torture'' Unlike the Geneva Convention, which protects legitimate prisoners of war, the Convention Against Torture applies to everyone—even terrorists and enemy combatants. And it cannot be evaded by ''outsourcing'' a prisoner to a country where he is apt to be tortured during interrogation.

In short, the international ban on torture—a ban incorporated into US law—is absolute. And before Sept. 11, 2001, few Americans would have argued that it should be anything else.

But in post-9/11 America, the unthinkable is not only being thought, but openly considered. And not only by hawks on the right, but by even by critics in the center and on the left.

''In this autumn of anger,'' Jonathan Alter commented in Newsweek not long after the terrorist attacks, ''a liberal can find his thoughts turning to—torture.'' Maybe cattle prods and rubber hoses should remain off limits, he Wrote, but ''some torture clearly works,'' and Americans had to ''keep an open mind'' about using unconventional measures—including ''transferring some suspects to our less squeamish allies.''

In March 2003, a few days after arch-terrorist Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was captured in Pakistan, Stuart Taylor Jr. acknowledged that he was probably being made to feel some pain. ''And if that's the best chance of making him talk, it's OK by me,'' he wrote in his National Journal column. In principle, interrogators should not cross the line into outright torture. But, Taylor continued, ''my answer might be different in extreme circumstances.''

By ''extreme circumstances'' he meant what is often called the ''ticking-bomb'' scenario: A deadly terror attack is looming, and you can prevent it only by getting the information your prisoner refuses to divulge. Torture might force him to talk, thereby saving thousands of innocent lives. May he be tortured?

Many Americans would say yes without hesitating. Some would argue that torturing a terrorist is not nearly as wrong as refusing to do so and thereby allowing another 9/11 to occur. Others would insist that monsters of Mohammed's ilk deserve no decency.

As an indignant reader (one of many) wrote to me after last week's column on the cruel abuse of some U.S. detainees, ''The terrorists . . . would cut your heart out and stuff it into the throat they would proudly slash open.'' So why not torture detainees, if it will produce the information we need?

Here's why:

First, because torture, as noted, is unambiguously illegal—illegal under a covenant the United States ratified, illegal under Federal law, and illegal under protocols of civilization dating back to the Magna Carta.

Second, because torture is notoriously unreliable. Many people will say anything to make the pain stop, while some will refuse to yield no matter what is done to them. Yes, sometimes torture produces vital information. But it can also produce false leads and desperate fictions. In the ticking-bomb case, bad information is every bit as deadly as no information.

Third, because torture is never limited to just the guilty. The case for razors and electric shock rests on the premise that the prisoner is a knowledgeable terrorist like Mohammed or Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. But most of the inmates in military prisons are nothing of the kind. Commanders in Guantanamo acknowledge that hundreds of their prisoners pose no danger and have no useful information. How much of the hideous abuse reported to date involved men who were guilty only of being in the wrong place at the wrong time?

And fourth, because torture is a dangerously slippery slope. Electric shocks and beatings are justified if they can prevent, another 9/11? But what if the shocks and beating don't produce the needed information? Is it OK to break a finger? To cut off a hand? To save 3,000 lives, can a terrorist's eyes be gouged out? How about gouging out his son's eyes? Or raping his daughter in his presence? If that's what it will take to make him talk, to defuse the ticking bomb, isn't it worth it?

No. Torture is never worth it. Some things we don't do, not because they never work, not because they aren't ''deserved;' but because our very right to call ourselves decent human beings depends in part on our not doing them. Torture is in that category. We can win our war against the barbarians without becoming barbaric in the process.

RECOGNIZING ERIN ROBNETT, WINNER OF TEXAS VALUES VISUAL ARTS COMPETITION

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Erin Robnett, an eighth grader at Crownover Middle School of Cornith, located in the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for being one of the three winners of the Texas Values Arts Competition.

This is truly an outstanding accomplishment for Erin. More than 250 students from Plano, Denton, Lewisville and surrounding communities entered the contest. Over Time is the name of Erin's piece which represents changes that have occurred during Texas' history. With Erin's win, she received a savings bond from Huffines Auto Dealerships.

Erin's piece had the pecan tree, mocking bird and the bluebonnet. It also features the Alamo and a soldier standing where the head piece would be. The head piece is half complete representing Texas' past and present.

Erin Robnett's talents are not only a testament to her artistic skill but also a stellar example of how parents and teachers efforts are rewarded when combining a core curriculum with study in the arts. I am proud of the education system in Texas, especially our students, and involved parents and teachers at Crownover Middle School, who commit their lives and time to fostering growth of our communities. And I wanted to extend a special thank you to Huffines Automotive for their generous contribution to these aspiring students.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JEAN ALLARD

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Jean Allard, a lifelong servant to the agricultural industry and to Larimer County, Colorado.

Jean was born in Alamosa, Colorado. She came to Fort Collins at the age of five where she grew up on a farm and graduated from Fort Collins High School in 1938. She attended the Colorado State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, (today it would be known as Colorado State University). She studied home economics and was a textile major. Jean was active in sports such as basketball, field hockey, softball and swimming. She graduated in 1942.

Jean made all of her own clothes during high school and college, which is evidence of her creativity and willingness to work hard. She comes from a family with a strong work ethic. Her grandparents, James and Jane Ross, homesteaded in Fort Collins when they came from Scotland in 1887. Jean's family grew grain, hay, and raised purebred Hereford cattle. Their original homestead remained on 1600 Horsetooth Road through the 1980's.

Jean met Amos Allard at Fort Collins High School and they married on July 18, 1941. Their time together as a newlywed couple was short-lived as Amos was soon drafted into the Navy during World War II in 1944.

After Jean graduated from Colorado A&M, they moved to the Allard family ranch in Jackson County, Colorado where they raised Hereford cattle. In 1962 they sold their ranch and moved back to Larimer County.

The Allards bought a 297–acre farm in Loveland, west of the current Hewlett-Packard facility.

On their property, Walt Clark Middle School was built, 3 churches, a private park and a public park, as well as 830 homes in Loch-Lon (Lake Meadow Land). Jean was instrument in the development of Big Thompson senior housing in Loveland. She also sold the lots at Loch-Lon, dealt with builders and typed warranty papers. Amos was active with the Board of Realtors where he served as a legislative liaison.

Through hard work, the Allards have been quite successful in Larimer County. They have two sons, current U.S. Senator WAYNE ALLARD and Kermit Allard, both living in Larimer County. They have four granddaughters and 6 great grandchildren.

Jean Allard has witnessed much change in Larimer County. The timeless value of hard work has truly been demonstrated by Jean. I wish the best for the Allard's and hope that their legacy will continue for many years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO THE COUNCIL OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS OF FLATBUSH

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a distinguished organization the Council of Jewish Organizations of Flatbush. It is an honor to represent the Council of Jewish Organizations of Flatbush in the House of Representatives and it behooves us to pay tribute to their selfless endeavors of more than a quarter century.

Mr. Speaker, the Council of Jewish Organizations of Flatbush, was founded twenty six years ago to assist families in need in the greater Brooklyn area. Over the course of its many years of dedication to the Brooklyn community The Council of Jewish Organizations of Flatbush has truly emerged as a premier organization committed to assisting those who have nowhere else to turn.

Under the leadership of their Executive Director, Rabbi Yechezkel Pikus, The Council of Jewish Organizations of Flatbush has established itself as Brooklyn's central address for social services, immigration services and many forms of crucial emergency assistance.

The Council of Jewish Organizations of Flatbush has been instrumental in creating successful employment programs and developing Small Business services. Through the Leader Family Employment Center and the South Brooklyn Business Outreach Center they have empowered people with the tools to succeed in their professional endeavors. Additionally, they are renowned for providing vital outreach to the elderly and homebound with particular attention and sensitivity to Holocaust survivors. They have also developed a scholarship fund to send children from disadvantaged families to summer camp.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the achievements of the Council of Jewish Organizations of Flatbush. Their uncompromising commitment to Jewish ideals and ethics is an inspiration for us all.

Mr. Speaker, may our country continue to benefit from the civic actions of the Council of Jewish Organizations of Flat bush and community groups similar to them.

RECOGNIZING FIRE CAPTAIN BUTCH FLANAGAN AND HIS YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Captain Butch Flanagan of the Lewisville Fire Department, located in the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for his long career serving the public.

Captain Flanagan, who has spent the last 34 years with the Lewisville Fire Department, will retire April 5, 2005. He has been the city's longest current employee and was named ''Firefighter of the County'' in 2004 by the ''Heroes of Denton County.'' Captain Flanagan worked his way up through the ranks and has been highly dedicated throughout his career. He once said, ''I can't ever see myself doing anything different.''

Captain Flanagan was born and raised in Lewisville, graduated from Lewisville High School, and now lives in Graham. He was one of the first full-time Lewisville firefighters and rose through the ranks to become captain. Captain Flanagan has been described as role model in the department and at home. Both his peers and superiors think of Captain Flanagan as a mentor. One Lewisville fire chief said ''He'll getcha outta trouble in a hurry'' and ''you know no one's going to get hurt'' when Captain Flanagan is in charge. The Chief also said that the Lewisville Fire Department ''was blessed'' to have such a man serve with them.

I am proud to represent Captain Butch Flanagan and the Lewisville Fire Department. Captain Flanagan has committed his life and time to protect and serve our community at any time, anywhere.

RECOGNIZING THE GADDAR MOVEMENT

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Gaddar Movement and the brave individuals who contributed to the Indian Independence Movement. An event to commemorate the memories of the Gaddar Movement will occur in Fresno, CA, on April 3, 2005. In spite of the trials and hardships, the goal of India's independence was achieved and the Indian people now live in a sovereign nation filled with hope and opportunity.

It is important to honor the sacrifices that so many have made for the cause of freedom. Just as the early Americans were guided by the doctrine of liberty embodied in the Declaration of Independence, the members of the Gaddar movement also understood the importance of autonomy for the Indian people. Many of these immigrants endured loss of life and property, but they persevered and have made major contributions to the U.S., both socially and economically.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the courageous efforts of those brave individuals who contributed to the Gaddar Movement. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing their courage and commitment to freedom.

IN MEMORY OF CONNIE SKIPWORTH

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary American, Connie Skipworth, who died on March 17, 2005, at the age of eighty-four.

Connie was a joy to know. Lively, humorous, and filled with the spirit of life, she dedicated much of her time to making everyone feel like part of the family. Connie was born on February 18, 1921 in San Bernardino, California.

By the late 1930s, Connie was married to Skip Skipworth and returned to California, spending those first years working as a riveter for McDonnell Douglas in Long Beach during World War II.

Connie has spent much of her years participating in the life of the community. Connie and her sister, Irene, opened their first restaurant in 1945, The Old Mexico Cafe in Long Beach. Seven years later, Connie opened the Zarape Cafe in Las Vegas, later returning to The Old Mexico Cafe a year later, where she worked as a manager, saving up enough money to build The Azteca in Garden Grove in 1957.

Connie was very devoted to her family, and encouraged them to reach for greatness and to realize their potential. The Azteca was a success, and the business brought in money to the family, and joy to the community. She was a great woman making everyone feel comfortable by flashing a quick smile, and by greeting everyone by their first names.

Mr. Speaker, Connie Skipworth dedicated herself to making our town a wonderful community to live in. Connie is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of this truly remarkable person.

TRIBUTE TO MOTHER ANN PARROTT ON HER 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to recognize a highly valued citizen of my home city of Newark, New Jersey. Mother Ann Parrott celebrates her 80th Birthday on May 6, 2005. She is the mother to six wonderful children and grandmother to fourteen. She has dedicated her life, for almost five decades, to the social and spiritual improvement of her community.

Active in her church, she wears a myriad of hats ranging from Sunday school teacher to choir member. One of her most honorable contributions, however, has been the establishment of the Lighthouse Temple Community Services in Newark, New Jersey.

Founded in 1989 as an addition to the Lighthouse Temple, Community Services modestly began as a soup kitchen where she served homemade soup and cornbread to the homeless in Newark. It now functions as one of the great providers of comprehensive care to the homeless and less fortunate in the state of New Jersey by offering emergency shelter, food, clothing and job placement to many in the Newark area.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues here in the House of Representatives would join me in honoring Mother Ann Parrott, who becomes 80 years young on May 6, 2005, for her tireless work for the Newark community. She is a paragon of true virtue through her selfless dedication to the betterment of others. I am proud to have her in my Congressional district and wish her never-ending success in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING DEPUTY GREG TAYLOR AND INVESTIGATOR SHANE NORIE FOR THEIR FIGHT AGAINST DRUGS

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Deputy Greg Taylor and Investigator Shane Norie of the Cooke County Sheriffs Office, located in the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for their recognition from the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) of the United States Attorney's Office in Sherman.

Deputy Greg Taylor and Investigator Shane Norie have been involved in numerous drug busts. Year after year they have been responsible for collecting information that would lead to keeping drugs out of our communities and schools. Now, Investigator Norie has been selected to go to the DEA School located in Virginia.

Sheriff Mike Compton of the Cooke County Sheriffs Office says that officers like Taylor and Norie have made an impact on the war against drugs. Compton also praises the whole department's efforts to keep drugs off the streets and continuing to build and foster a strong relationship with the DEA.

I am proud of Cooke County Sheriffs Office and leaders like Deputy Greg Taylor and Investigator Shane Norie who help keep our community safe and clean. Thanks to those who commit their lives and time to protect and serve our community at any time, any where. Through their efforts, we can all lead better lives.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF BILL MARTIN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of my district who will be receiving special recognition soon for a lifetime of service to his community.

William C. "Bill" Martin is best known for his leadership as Director of Intercollegiate Athletics for the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. But his work in the Washtenaw County community goes far beyond his work in the field of sports.

Whether creating First Martin Corporation for real estate development, founding the Bank of Ann Arbor, creating a three-on-three basketball tournament to raise money for the public schools or helping rebuild Isle Royale's ranger station on Lake Superior, Bill Martin has been a community leader whose work has benefited thousands of his fellow citizens.

On several occasions, Bill has been asked to step in and help turn around troubled programs, including both the UM Athletic Department and the U.S. Olympic Committee. In both cases, his hard work and leadership helped right the ship and get things moving forward. That metaphor is quite appropriate, since Bill also has had a very successful competitive career in sailing and has contributed time and energy to the sport, both nationally and internationally.

He also has served with distinction on the board of his alma mater, Wittenberg University and also spent many years on the Washtenaw Land Conservancy Board, including ten years as president. He also has been a member of the advisory board for the University of Michigan Center for the Education of Women.

On May 2, 2005 the Jewish Federation of Washtenaw County will present Bill with its Humanitarian Award, an honor bestowed every other year to an outstanding citizen of the community. Bill Martin is truly one of those deserving citizens, and I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on this upcoming award and thanking him for his outstanding leadership in Michigan and around the nation.

IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. In 1987, Congress passed a resolution designating the month of March as Women's History Month and a time to honor, "American women of every race, class and ethnic background [who] have made historic contributions to the growth and strength of our Nation in countless recorded and unrecorded ways."

For 2005, the theme of Women's History Month is "Women Change America." In celebration of this month, I would like to focus on two women from Wisconsin's history and honor their contributions to society.

First, I would like to recognize Cordelia Julia Grace Wales. Wisconsin resident Julia Grace Wales made her mark in Wisconsin as a peace activist, scholar, an English instructor at University of Wisconsin-Madison, and a dedicated Christian. In 1914, in light of WWI, Wales decided to write her famous Wisconsin peace plan, a plan that she believed would end WWI. Wales made a genuine contribution to women's history in Wisconsin and America's tradition of peace movements.

Born in Portage, Wisconsin, Margery Latimer was a social movement activist and an

accomplished novelist. Latimer became well-known in the literary world after writing three highly acclaimed novels dealing greatly with the romanticism era. She once said, ''There's only one possession that's worth having and that is the capacity to feel that life is a privilege and that each person in it is unique and will never appear again.''

The third woman I would like to honor is Zona Gale. Also born in Portage, Wisconsin, Zona Gale was a great novelist and short-story writer. Gale's biggest success was her novel, Miss Lulu Bett. This novel was adapted as a play in 1920 and was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for Drama in 1921. As an activist for women's rights and the creation of the Wisconsin Equal Rights Law, prohibiting the discrimination of women, many of Gale's feminist politics were expressed in her novels and then plays. Zona Gale passed away in 1938 in Portage, Wisconsin, but her voice will live on through her novels and efforts for women's rights in Wisconsin and around the country.

These three women, along with so many others, inspired hope and possibility not only in Wisconsin, but across the United States. Whether in art or literature, activism or teaching, they deserve our remembrance, not only during the month of March, but throughout the rest of the year as well.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF BRIAN J. SMITH

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the work of an outstanding public servant, Mr. Brian Smith, newly appointed Chief of the Waterfront Police Commission of New York & New Jersey, who was sworn into office on Friday, March 25, 2005.

It is only fitting that he be honored in this, the permanent record of the greatest freely elected body on Earth, for he has a long history of leadership, creativity, and commitment to his noble profession.

After attending Saint Francis College, located in Brooklyn, New York, Brian joined the National Park Service as a U.S. Park Ranger. He eventually ascended to the rank of Supervisory U.S. Park Ranger within the Law Enforcement Division. During his tenure with the National Park Service Brian's talents and stellar reputation earned him a membership with the elite U.S. Park Ranger Special Events Team. Brian also attained a multitude of special licensures ranging from a certified K–9 handler to a RED Card Wild Fire Fighter.

In 1980, Mr. Smith decided to become an officer with the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. Brian was assigned to oversee operations at the various Port Authority facilities such as, the Holland Tunnel and Newark International Airport. After three years of service, Brian felt compelled to make a career change and opted to leave his position with the esteemed Port Authority.

Brian decided to pursue a career with the U.S. Customs Service in the Tactical Enforcement Division; this would prove to be an eighteen year venture. Initially, Brian entered the bureau as a Special Agent with the Office of Investigations and Internal Affairs and quickly flourished. He received a promotion soon after he began with the agency and subsequently served a term at the U.S. Customs Service Headquarters in Washington, D.C. Over the years, Brian had countless praiseworthy assignments that he fulfilled but two of his most notable duties include: Supervisor of the Dignitary Protection JUMP TEAM and Internal Affairs Desk Officer for the West and Southwest Regions, respectively.

Brian was then appointed to his current position, Special Agent in Charge of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Investigations for Region II in 1999. As Special Agent in Charge, he is responsible for enforcing a myriad of Federal Laws and managing the Dignitary Protection efforts throughout the States of New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands (Region II).

Mr. Smith's spirit of service to our great nation and his unwavering commitment to his fellow man is obvious to all those who know him. His military service has spanned two branches of the Armed Services, including a six year tour of duty in the U. S. Coast Guard Reserve. Additionally, Brian currently serves as a Major with the New York Guard, Civil Affairs Unit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, the members of the Smith family, and myself in recognizing Chief Brian J. Smith for his outstanding service to the residents of New York and New Jersey.

COMMENDING VILLAGE OF ORCHARD PARK MAYOR PATRICIA A. DICKMAN FOR EXEMPLARY SERVICE TO HER COMMUNITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call your attention to Patricia A. Dickman, a woman who after years of dedicated public service, will retire from her position as the Village of Orchard Park Mayor in Erie County, New York.

Mayor Dickman's devotion to developing a better future for her community was evident early, as she chose to dedicate 12 years to the teaching profession, educating young people.

Over the last 30 years Mayor Dickman expanded her dedication from working with youth to working with the community as a whole.

Mayor Dickman's government service is extensive. Prior to her election to the seat of Mayor, Ms. Dickman worked for 6 years on the Village of Orchard Park Planning Board, including 4 years as Chair. She also served as a Village of Orchard Park Trustee for 6 years and has led the Beautify Orchard Park Committee for over 24 years.

Throughout her tenure as Mayor, Ms. Dickman has sat on several local boards and organizations including: the Erie County Sewer District III, the Southtown's Sewer Agency, the Village Officials Association and the Erie County Governments Association.

Though her accomplishments are too numbered to mention here today, some of the highlights of her service consist of contributions to local economic development through the ''Façade'' program and facilitation of infrastructure projects including reconstruction of Route 240/277. At the same time, through the duration of her term, the Mayor has been successful in maintaining the lowest tax rate in Erie County.

It is with great pride and gratitude I stand here today to recognize Village of Orchard Park Mayor Patricia Dickman, a genuine public servant and faithful community advocate, may her life in retirement be met with the many triumphs achieved in her years as Mayor.

TRIBUTE TO LANSDOWNE CHRISTIAN CHURCH OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to the Lansdowne Christian Church of Baltimore County marking its 100th year of celebrating Memorial Day Services. The Church, which was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1977 by the U.S. Department of Interior, is the only Church in the United States built to honor the men of the Grand Army of the Republic and the sacrifices they made to preserve the Union.

On May 14, 1905, the first annual Memorial Service for the Grand Army was held at the Lansdowne Christian Church. Memorial Day was established in the wake of the Civil War to remember and pay homage to all those who had died in service to our nation. The Service on the last Sunday in May continues today. This year's service will be held on May 29, 2005, continuing a tradition for which Church members and the community should be very proud.

Today, we are engaged in armed conflict in Iraq and in Afghanistan. Many of our soldiers have made the ultimate sacrifice, and it is important that we honor their commitment to freedom and democracy.

I hope my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in saluting the Lansdowne Christian Church for making duty, service and dedication to our nation a central focus of church life.

RECOGNIZING KEN SLAVENS OF SAINT HELENA, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my dear friend, Ken Slavens, of Saint Helena, California, for his 21 years of public service. His outstanding leadership and commitment have helped to make

my hometown the incredible community that it is today.

Born and raised in Saint Helena, Ken's appreciation, love, and devotion to protecting and preserving this small, unique community are obvious from his many years of dedicated service. With an innate knowledge of his community and unyielding compassion, Ken was elected to the office of City Council in 1994. His energy, drive, and undeniable hard work are only a few of the many reasons that he was appointed as Vice Mayor in 1997. Shortly thereafter in 1999, Ken was elected Mayor of Saint Helena.

Mr. Speaker, during his tenure on the City Council and as Mayor, Ken has been a strong advocate for Saint Helena on numerous boards throughout Napa County and California. These include the Long Range Water Task Force, Napa County Cities Mayors Council, the Association of Bay Area Government, and the North Bay League of California Cities just to name a few. As Mayor, he tackled important and complicated issues ranging from job training and employment for the disadvantaged, to flood control and improving local water supplies. He also worked arduously with the Napa County Flood Control District to protect Saint Helena from dangerous and destructive winter flooding. He is also recognized for spearheading the creation of the new Saint Helena First Station.

Mr. Speaker, Ken has even risked his own life on multiple occasions in order to protect his fellow citizens. From 1976 to 1978 he served as Captain of the Saint Helena Police Reserves. After his time with the Police Department, he selflessly devoted the next seven years to the Saint Helena Volunteer Fire Department. During his time there, his passion for protecting and serving the community earned him overwhelming respect and praise from his fellow fire fighters. As a result, he has been recognized as an Honorary Member of the Fire Department.

When not working with the Native Sons of the Golden West, the Sierra Club, or other local organizations Ken and his wife Barbie look forward to cruising through the Napa Valley on their Screaming Eagle Harley Davidson.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we thank and honor Ken Slavens for his passion, dedication, and numerous contributions to this community. We wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the loss of Mrs. Terri Schiavo.

On March 21, 2005, S. 686 passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 203–58. This was rollcall vote number 90. Unfortunately, I was out of the country on official Congressional business and unable to return for this emergency session. However, had I been present I would have voted in support of this legislation.

HONORING THE LATE MR. JAMES McDOWELL

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Mr. James McDowell.

Mr. McDowell was a World War II B–17 pilot who flew 31 missions over Germany. On January 13, 1945, on his second mission over Mannheim, Germany, Mr. McDowell's aircraft was hit by enemy fire. The heavy flak hit the cockpit floor and sent a piece of schrapnel through his clothing into his right calf.

The severely damaged plane was unable to return to the base, and was forced to land at Manston England Air Base. Mr. McDowell was taken by the medics to the hospital, treated and released with a cane. The B–17 was so damaged that it never returned to action.

Last year, Mr. McDowell and his family approached me about getting his long overdue Purple Heart. Unfortunately, before I was able to present the Purple Heart to him, Mr. McDowell passed away.

Mr. Speaker, while it is unfortunate that Mr. McDowell is not alive to receive his Purple Heart, I know that his family will cherish the medal and his memory for the rest of their lives. Mr. McDowell's story is emblematic of many who served in World War II and surely places him as a member of the "greatest generation."

HONORING UNDERSHERIFF CURTIS L. WATSON

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. STARK and I rise today to honor the extraordinary contributions of Undersheriff Curtis L. Watson to the Alameda County Sheriff's Department over the past 34 years. Curtis joined the department in 1970 and steadily climbed its ranks to become the undersheriff in 1993, providing excellent service throughout his tenure.

In 1970, Curtis had just completed a tour in the United States Air Force. On the advice of his brother, he applied for the Alameda County Sheriff's Department, where he was hired as a sheriff's deputy and assigned to work at Santa Rita Jail.

Curtis had worked his way up to the position of lieutenant at Santa Rita when he first made the acquaintance of Charles Plummer, the Alameda County Sheriff, in 1987. Curtis's competence and confidence made a positive impression on the sheriff, who would remember him when their paths crossed again a few years later.

After advancing to captain and becoming the commanding officer of the North County Jail in Oakland, Curtis took the commander's examination in April 1992, finishing with the highest score of any candidate and again catching the attention of Sheriff Plummer. By that time, Curtis had made such an impression that when the undersheriff position came open in 1993, Sheriff Plummer tapped him to fill it.

With his promotion to undersheriff, Curtis became not only the highest-ranking African American in the Alameda County Sheriff Department's 152-year history but also the highest-ranking black sheriff's official in the state of California.

Curtis served as undersheriff from 1993 until his retirement on March 24, 2005. Only one other undersheriff in the entire history of the Alameda County Sheriff's Department served longer than Curtis's 12 years in the position.

On the occasion of Curtis Watson's retirement, we would like to honor his contributions to law and order in Alameda County over the past 34 years. He has served with distinction and dedication, breaking down barriers and forging new paths. We salute him for his commitment to justice and equality in our society, and we are certain that others will draw inspiration from his accomplishments for generations to come.

THE INVESTMENT TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2005

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, our position as the world's leading economy is founded on the principle of entrepreneurship. This spirit inspires us to seek new and innovative products and services which enhance Americans' lives by exploring bold business ventures.

After two failed attempts to start an automobile manufacturing company, in 1903, Henry Ford and 11 business associates raised $28,000 (nearly $600,000 in today's dollars) to establish the Ford Motor Company, ushering in the age of modern transportation. This venture not only enhanced the free flow of products and people across the nation, but also spawned a revolutionary assembly-line production process, increasing manufacturing productivity and lowering prices for commercial and consumer goods for the American people. In the process, millions of new jobs were created in other new fields, such as part manufacturers, service repair technicians, salesmen, and customer service representatives.

Venture capital also played a significant role in the boom of entrepreneurship that contributed to the unprecedented economic growth of the 1990s. According to the National Venture Capital Association (NVCA), venture capitalists raised over $250 billion between 1994 and 2000 for investment in start-up companies. This frenzied business activity helped spur Initial Public Offerings (IPOs) over the same period worth over $84 billion, boosting the value of financial markets. One major product of this tremendous financing activity was the commercialization of the Internet, which continues to have a significant impact on the U.S. economy. The Internet allows people to connect from all over the world, enhancing the free flow of products, services and most importantly, information. This technological revolution also created hundreds of thousands of

American jobs, such as software developers, information technology technicians, salesmen and customer service representatives, many of which did not exist before.

The start-up capital raised by these entrepreneurs made innovations such as the automobile and the Internet possible and played a key role in transforming the U.S. economic and social landscape. So what's next on the horizon? What new industry will revolutionize the U.S. economy?

If we ever intend to find out, it is imperative that we continue to encourage greater investment spending in the economy. In 2003, President Bush and the Congress took an important step forward by reducing the capital gains tax rate for individuals to 15 percent. Since then, the economy has grown at an average a rate of 4.5 percent, business investment has increased by $230 billion, financial markets are up $2 trillion and over 3 million new jobs have been created. However, this rate is scheduled to expire in just four short years.

Unfortunately, the complex, confusing and temporary capital gains tax rates create a lock-in effect, a barrier which discourages investment and entrepreneurship, stifling job creation. That is why I am introducing the Investment Tax Simplification Act (ITSA) of 2005, which would help to knock down this barrier and enhance the free flow of investment capital in the economy by establishing a permanent and simplified maximum 15 percent capital gains tax for individuals and corporations. In addition, the capital gains tax would be eliminated for individuals in the 10 and 15 percent tax brackets.

Entrepreneurial small businesses, the driving force of growth in our economy, rely on access to capital to innovate and expand. According to the NVCA, there is over $70 billion in venture capital funds sitting on the sidelines waiting for investment opportunities. Establishing a simplified 15 percent capital gains tax rate for individuals and corporations will help get that capital into the economy, turn innovative ideas into reality, create new jobs for American workers and produce new goods and services for all consumers. The NVCA estimates that between 2000 and 2003, venture capital funded companies created more than 600,000 new jobs for American workers. Many of these new, high paying jobs are in innovative, cutting edge industries, such as biomedical and information technologies that rely on private investing and financing.

Enacting a permanent and simplified capital gains tax for individuals and corporations would also have an appreciable impact on the Investor Class, the more than 50 percent of Americans who own assets dependent on financial markets. The ITSA would bolster the investment holdings of the Investor Class, helping them pay for their children's education, buy their first home or plan for retirement. And eliminating the capital gains tax for lower income Americans would provide them with greater opportunities to attain financial stability and build wealth.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office, in its February 2005 "Budget Options" publication, recognizes the importance of making the 15 percent capital gains tax rate permanent. It states "Because the lower rates expire at the end of 2008, investments made after that time will not benefit from them at all, and investments made between 2003 and 2008 will benefit only partially because some of their returns will be earned after 2008. Hence many of the gains in efficiency that would result from the effects of the lower rates on the allocation of investment will not be realized unless [the rates] are perceived to be permanent."

Reducing the capital gains tax is also a proven winner at increasing revenues to the Federal Treasury. After the 1997 capital gains tax cut from 28 percent to 20 percent, increased economic activity resulted in an increase in capital gains revenues, from $54 billion in 1996 to $118 billion in 2000, a gain of nearly 120 percent. And as a result of the 2003 capital gains tax cut and other tax relief provisions, last year the Federal Treasury realized $109 billion in unanticipated revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support the Investment Tax Simplification Act of 2005. Enhancing the free flow of capital in the economy will stimulate innovation and entrepreneurship, providing enormous benefit for the American people.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT LAFAYETTE RAJIN' CAJUNS

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of an extraordinary group of gentlemen from the 7th Congressional District of Louisiana. The Men's Basketball team of the University of Louisiana at Lafayette brought spirit and pride to my hometown with a Sunbelt Conference Tournament Championship and qualification for the 2005 NCAA Basketball Tournament. First year Head Coach Robert Lee demonstrated he has the character and leadership qualities to mold these young men into not only great athletes, but into respected members of our community.

I am very proud to acknowledge the effort and achievement of Head Coach Robert Lee, Assistant Coaches Rennie Bailey, Carlin Hartman and Jason Kennemer. I also want to congratulate the players on their achievements in the 2004–05 season—Orien Green, Brian Hamilton, Chris Cameron, Dwayne Mitchell, Tiras Wade, Spencer Ford, Ross Mouton, Adam James, Derek Gray, Cletis Fobbs, Anthony Rhodman, and Alphonso Williams. Finally, it is important to recognize the Rajin' Cajuns staff—Trainer Travis Soileau, and Managers Chase Mancuso, Will Keliner and Khadim Kandji.

The 2004–05 season was a great success and these young men and their coaches should be proud of their achievements. I want to thank them for bringing enthusiasm and excitement to the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and the Southwest Louisiana community.

Geaux Cajuns!

HONORING JOHN M. HARPOLE FOR 50 YEARS OF SERVICE AT LOCKHEED MARTIN

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor John M. Harpole for his 50 years of service with Lockheed Martin Missiles and Fire Control. During his tenure with Missiles and Fire Control, he has served in the areas of Database Design, Facility Operations, Information Technology, and Manufacturing. We thank John for his dedication not only to the defense industry and the company, but also to the country we serve.

HONORING SPC. GERRIT KOBES FOR EARNING A SILVER STAR

HON. CATHY McMORRIS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Miss McMORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Specialist Gerrit Kobes for being awarded a Silver Star for his bravery and heroism while serving in Iraq. Kobes, a member of Washington's Army National Guard, saved the lives of Iraqi National Guard soldiers who were attacked by enemy fire. Kobes was presented with the medal in February by Major General Peter Chiarelli, commander of the 1st Cavalry Division.

Kobes, 23 years old, was a medical specialist assigned to a unit that provided security support for the 1st Cavalry Division special unit. His convoy was assigned to move Iraqi soldiers and equipment from Baghdad to Fallujah. On November 3rd, a rocket-propelled grenade hit one of the trucks carrying Iraqi National Guard Members. According to Army accounts, Kobes ran 500 meters through enemy fire to get to four wounded Iraqi soldiers. He treated the soldiers and was again exposed to insurgent fire as he loaded the soldiers onto vehicles.

Kobes is from Kettle Falls, Washington. He is married to wife, Erica, and has two sons, Tyson, 3, and P.J., 10 months.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Specialist Gerrit Kobes for fearlessly sacrificing his own safety in order to save the lives of wounded Iraqi soldiers. I invite my colleagues to join me in thanking Specialist Kobes for his service to our country and Iraq, and congratulate him on earning a Silver Star.

TRIBUTE TO TULARE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, Representative JIM COSTA, to pay tribute to Tulare County Superior Court

Judge William Silveira who has faithfully served as judge for more than 25 years.

His career is distinguished by his innovative efforts to improve juvenile justice, involve parents in the rehabilitation of their delinquent children, and bring together a comprehensive approach to the disparate factors that influence this unique area of law.

Judge Silveira was instrumental in building support for the construction of a new juvenile detention center in the county, along with probation offices and a new juvenile court complex.

He has also helped create a 100-bed juvenile boot camp and one of the first juvenile drug courts in the country, which has gone on to receive national acclaim.

During his time on the bench, he has traveled the country speaking as a leader in juvenile justice and has helped other communities establish their own programs.

At home, he is widely involved in many community activities and boards apart from his work on the bench, and he remains the loving husband of Marylin with children Matthew and Amy.

Once again, Representative COSTA and I encourage you to join us in applauding his many years of dedication as a judge, whose thoughtful approach to the administration of justice has forever changed the legal landscape of Tulare County. He leaves a legacy of hard work, compassion, and justice that stands as an example for us all.

TRIBUTE TO INTRADO INC. OF LONGMONT, COLORADO

HON. BOB BEAUPREZ

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my appreciation for the services provided by the men and women of Intrado Inc., headquartered in Longmont, Colorado.

For over two decades, telecommunications providers, public safety organizations and government agencies have turned to Intrado for their communications needs. As North America's leader in 9–1–1 infrastructure and services, Intrado's business was founded with the objective of improving public safety and we continue to have a tradition of giving back to the community. Intrado's corporate culture is built around employee involvement in causes that are both local and national in scope. From Intrado' s core business of 9–1–1 to the widely participated employee volunteer activities, Intrado aims to make a positive contribution to society.

Intrado's ongoing mission is to continually improve the quality of the 9–1–1 data available to first responders, e.g. police, fire and emergency medical personnel. Since the first 9–1–1 call was made, Intrado has played a key role in defining, building and maintaining the complex emergency communications infrastructure. In 2004, Intrado products, services and systems supported nearly 200 million calls to 9–1–1, and the volume continues to grow.

Intrado emphasis on corporate citizenship is reflected in numerous activities. For the past two years Intrado has partnered with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to assist cities and towns across the US to deploy the Intrado IntelliCast® target notification system as a tool to help win the fight against time in locating missing children. Operating like 9–1–1 in reverse, the IntelliCast system automatically delivers a telephone message about a missing child to thousands of targeted homes and businesses within minutes, helping ensure the most efficient dissemination of relevant information to safely and quickly recover missing children. Intrado waives the fees for launching missing children alerts in an effort to support a community's need for quick action in those situations.

Intrado's encouragement of community involvement and volunteerism has resulted in support for local food drives, assistance with armed forces care packages, and financial donations to a number of charitable efforts around the country. In addition, in 2004 Intrado began support of the 911 For Kids program in Denver and surrounding cities. 911 For Kids provides 9–1–1 education for children in elementary schools to ensure they know how to call for help in an emergency.

Finally, Intrado is actively working to design and build the next generation emergency services network to address and support the changing communications requirements. Intrado's extensive intellectual property in emergency communications management and fundamental 9–1–1 operations—combined with the world's largest pool of experienced personnel in these areas—makes Intrado the clear leader for this task.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the fine men and women of Intrado, Inc. for working to make our communities safer and better places to live. They represent some of our country's best, and I hope they continue to call Colorado home for years to come.

CINCINNATI MUSEUM CENTER HONORS INTERNATIONALLY KNOWN WILDLIFE ARTIST JOHN A. RUTHVEN FOR RECEIVING THE 2004 NATIONAL MEDAL OF THE ARTS

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend and Brown County, Ohio constituent, John A. Ruthven, who will be honored on April 21, 2005 by the Cincinnati Museum Center in the regional recognition for his selection by President Bush to receive the 2004 National Medal of the Arts. The National Medal of the Arts is the highest award presented to an artist or patron in the United States, and John is the first wildlife artist to receive this prestigious award. I was honored to join John and his wife, Judy, and members of their family at the White House for the medal presentation by President Bush on November 17, 2004.

One of our nation's most talented artists, John is an author, lecturer, naturalist, and internationally acknowledged master of wildlife art. His paintings have been shown at the White House; the Hermitage Museum in Russia; the Ohio State Capitol's Rotunda; and many other prestigious venues around the world.

John will be honored by the Museum Center for his career in art and his many connections to the Museum Center. I am told that, over the years, he has used actual specimens from the research collections of the Museum Center and one of its predecessor museums, the Cincinnati Museum of Natural History, as models for his original paintings. A special exhibit of selected Ruthven works at the Museum Center will open to the public on April 23, 2005—Earth Day. In the exhibit, several of Audubon's prints, including the Carolina parakeet, Henslow's sparrow, and Passenger pigeon, will be displayed with John's paintings of the same subjects, and the actual specimens from the Museum Center's collection. Three days later—April 26, 2005—is the 220th anniversary of John James Audubon's birth.

The coincidence of Audubon's birthday is underscored by the fact that Audubon, too, had many connections to the Cincinnati Museum of Natural History. He was the Museum's first employee, hired as a taxidermist and to create exhibits. Audubon supplemented his Museum income by drawing portraits, teaching art, and even opened his own art academy. While in Cincinnati, Audubon created five paintings of local birds that were among the first contributions to his acclaimed Birds of North America.

There can be no doubt that John Ruthven is our Audubon, and a true American treasure. John has said, ''I believe art is as necessary to our heritage as the history books. Both record past and present in the effort to educate and enrich the lives of people today and in the near future. It is my desire, through my paintings, to record for later generations some of the beauty of nature that exists in my lifetime.''

John's wife, Judy, is also accomplished. She was project manager and co-chair of the Historic Georgetown Project to restore the Georgetown, Ohio courthouse square buildings. With John, she painstakingly restored the brick Brown County homestead of President Ulysses S. Grant, who grew up in picturesque Georgetown. Judy is a Grant scholar, and she spent a tremendous amount of energy to ensure that the building was historically accurate. The Ruthvens later donated the structure, which is on the National Register of Historic Places, to the State of Ohio. In addition, Judy has supported numerous other organizations, including the Ohio Humanities Council.

All of us in Southern Ohio congratulate John on receiving the National Medal of the Arts, being honored by the Museum Center, and his life as an acclaimed artist, and we wish him luck in the many projects to come.

HONORING TUTT BRADFORD

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor one of the finest men I have ever

known and a long-time family friend, Tutt Bradford.

Tutt served as publisher of The Daily Times in Maryville, Tennessee, from 1955 until 1985. He was a highly respected voice for Blount County and an advocate for its residents throughout those three decades and continues to contribute to the paper's opinion pages on a regular basis.

Tutt's peers long ago recognized him as one of East Tennessee's greatest journalists. They rewarded him with a coveted spot on the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Board from 1968 until 1970 and then elevated him to President of the Tennessee Press Association in 1974.

In addition to tremendous achievements in the field of journalism, Tutt can also claim many accomplishments within his community. Among other endeavors, he has served on the boards of countless charitable organizations, promoted higher education, and worked to improve the quality of life among all East Tennesseans.

Tutt's contributions to his community have been recognized on numerous occasions. The United Way of Blount County recently named its endowment program in his honor, and he is a past recipient of the University of Tennessee's Volunteer of the Year Award. The National Society of Fund-Raising Executives even named Tutt its Outstanding Philanthropist of the Year in 1991.

The complete list of Tutt's awards could fill several pages in the RECORD, so I will not attempt to list them all. Needless to say, however, he is a man of strong character and great compassion who represents the values of Blount County remarkably well.

The East Tennessee Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists will pay tribute to Tutt June 18 when he serves as the honoree at this year's Front Page Follies. The annual event provides funding for communications scholarships by inviting local elected officials, journalists, and other community leaders to roast a guest of honor.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to a recent Daily Times article regarding the 2005 Front Page Follies and a true Blount County treasure, Tutt Bradford.

JOURNALISTS TO HONOR BRADFORD

[From the Daily Times, Feb. 16, 2005]

The 2005 Front Page Follies will honor Tutt Bradford, retired publisher of The Daily Times and a community leader who led and supported many causes in the area.

Bradford was publisher of The Daily Times from 1955 to 1985. Prior to that, he was publisher of the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier and the Cleveland Daily Banner. He was a member of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Board from 1968 to 1970 and was president of the Tennessee Press Association in 1974.

''The East Tennessee Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists is very proud to honor Tutt Bradford for his many accomplishments in the field of journalism,'' said Chapter President Dorothy Bowles. ''Equally impressive is the dedicated service that Tutt has given and continues to give to Tennesseans.''

Bradford was a member of the University of Tennessee Development Council from 1980 to 1983 and served on the board of Maryville College from 1974 to 1979 and from 1981 to 2003.

He served on the boards of the Knoxville Symphony Orchestra, Knoxville Museum of Art, Thompson Cancer Survival Center, Lakeshore Mental Hospital, the Tennessee Technology Foundation, the Boys Club Foundation, the Blount Hearing and Speech Foundation, and the Blount Library Foundation. He was president of the Blount County Industrial Development Board from 1970 to 1972.

Bradford has received many honors and awards. He was recipient of the Distinguished Service Award of the Bristol Junior Chamber of Commerce, and he received the Sequoyah Literacy Award from the Tennessee Historical Commission. Junior Achievement named him to the East Tennessee Business Hall of Fame in 1990. In 1994, the University of Tennessee named him Volunteer of the Year.

The National Society of Fund-Raising Executives named Bradford Outstanding Philanthropist of the Year in 1991. He was president of the Blount County Chamber of Commerce in 1960 and president of the Kiwanis Club in Maryville in 1967.

The Follies are scheduled for 6 p.m., Saturday, June 18, at the Knoxville Convention Center.

The annual roast of newsmakers is sponsored by the East Tennessee Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists and raises funds for communications scholarships at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville and Pellissippi State Technical Community College.

This year's skits and songs will feature Vols football coach Phillip Fulmer in ''The People's Court,'' state Sen. Tim Burchett and his ''shadow,'' ''Hysteric Preservation'' highlighting Cherokee Country Club, and a legal battle royal with Knox County Mayor Mike Ragsdale, Sheriff Tim Hutchison, and Commissioner Wanda Moody.

Local TV anchors and meteorologists will add their special brand of fun to the event.

HONORING THE DEDICATION OF FIREFIGHTER NEIL LARIBEE

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the lifelong dedication of Firefighter Neil Laribee, who after 52 years of service has retired from the Southington Volunteer Fire Department.

The son of a fireman, Neil Laribee first volunteered to fight fire for the town of Southington in 1952. A dedicated public servant, Neil has protected the Southington community for over fifty faithful years. Known around the Plantsville Engine Company #2 firehouse as ''Deke,'' he has been instrumental in shaping the Department throughout the years. Neil has been a loyal friend and source of fire and rescue information to both new and veteran fireman at Company #2. As one of Southington's most experienced firefighters, he has held leadership positions including Company Secretary and a Company Trustee. Neil Laribee has spent his life protecting lives and serving his community and his presence in the Southington Volunteer Fire Department will be certainly missed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me today to recognize the lifelong dedication of Fireman Neil Laribee and thank him for his years of service to the town of Southington.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK COLLINS

HON. DON SHERWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor in Congress, former Representative Joseph M. McDade, who served in the House for 36 years, has informed me of the passing on February 18 of Frank Collins, a prominent attorney from Ardmore, Pennsylvania, and former Scranton native.

Mr. Collins graduated in 1948 from Scranton Preparatory School, where he was a classmate of Congressman McDade. Collins attended St. Francis College and graduated in 1952 from the University of Scranton. He later received his Jurist Doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania in 1955.

Collins worked for several banks during his distinguished legal career and most recently worked at the law firm of Collins, Johnson and Markey in Media, Pennsylvania. He is survived by his wife of 48 years, Katharine, and seven children and six grandchildren.

Those who knew Collins best pay high tribute to his intellect, integrity and character. Congressman McDade said of Collins, ''His life is a testament to the joy of intellectual pursuit and the use of the Socratic method to attain dependable decisions. Our heartfelt sympathy goes to his lovely wife, Katie, and their children.''

In a moving and eloquent memorial delivered by a fellow attorney and close personal friend, Henry B. FitzPatrick, Collins was remembered for his many friendships, sense of humor, athletic achievements in basketball and golf, enduring and loving marriage, and professional and personal integrity.

''Frank Collins chose to be a lawyer,'' FitzPatrick eulogized. ''It doesn't take long until that profession separates the upright from the rest. It asks questions which can only be answered by those who are serious about being honest, those who can interrogate the depth of their soul to see if there is further will to be summoned for the finding of the right answer. Frank had that quality of honesty—otherwise he would not have had the trust, as he did, of his clients and fellow lawyers.

''But, we all know that professional honesty might not accompany a person home. The fearlessly scrupulous judge or lawyer might with wife or husband be disingenuous and deceitful; few of us are honest all of the time; Frank Collins was one of that few. He was unable to put a knife in the crack between the levels of integrity demanded of him in his personal and professional lives. For there was no crack, but only the seamless cloth of honesty.''

Those are high words of praise for a truly remarkable individual. I want to thank Congressman McDade for bringing the exemplary life on Frank Collins to my attention so that I could bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

IN MEMORY OF LANCE CPL. NAZARIO SERRANO, USMC

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Lance Cpl. Nazario Serrano, USMC who was killed by enemy action on January 30 in Anbar province, Iraq. He was killed as a result of being struck in the chest by small-arms fire.

Lance Cpl. Serrano, 20, from Irving, Texas was expected to return home from Iraq in only two weeks to meet his newly born son Landon Heath and marry his highschool sweetheart, Amanda Story. Serrano had never seen his son, but only saw pictures of his new son by e-mail. I grieve with the Serrano friends and family over their loss. He gave the ultimate sacrifice to his country and the United States Marine Corps.

Lance Cpl. Serrano was a 2003 graduate of Irving High School, which is also where his two surviving brothers, Javier and Daniel, now attend. Previously, he attended Austin Middle School in Irving, and enjoyed basketball, hunting, and riding his motorcycle. May God bless the memory of Lance Cpl. Serrano and comfort his family during this difficult time. I will be keeping his memory, and his family in my thoughts and prayers.

BASKETBALL CATAMOUNTS—STANDOUTS ON THE COURT AND IN THE CLASSROOM

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, like all of us who live in Vermont, and many millions across the nation, I was thrilled when the underdog Catamounts of the University of Vermont defeated Syracuse in the opening round of the 2005 NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament. Syracuse was a national power; the nucleus of its team won the national championship two years earlier. Its players were accomplished, well-coached and a credit to college basketball.

But the University of Vermont team rose to the challenge, coming from behind in the final minutes of both regulation play and overtime. Led by the greatest basketball player to come out of Vermont, Taylor Coppenrath of West Barnet, Vermont the Catamounts showed how teamwork and a tenacious defense could elevate a team to national prominence. During the regular season Coppenrath was the second leading Division I scorer in the nation with 25.7 points per game, and for the third straight year he was the player of the year in the America East conference. He was joined on the team by T. J. Sorrentine, a sharp-shooting point guard (fifth in the nation with 3.6 three-point field goals per game) whose passion and precision shooting define the Catamounts. He too has been an America East player of the year and has three first-team selections to his credit. The international contingent made up of Germain Mopa Njila of Cameroon, whose career scoring high of 20 points on 9 of 10 shooting was the mainstay of the Catamount offense against Syracuse; Martin Klimes of the Czech Republic, whose smothering defense held All-American Hakim Warrick in check, and Canadian David Hehn, who selflessly threw himself into the Cats' tight defense and patient and exceptionally effective passing game.

It was talent and tenacity. All five Vermont starters played at least 40 minutes, and Klimes and Coppenrath never had a rest on the bench at all. The Catamounts stuck with a game plan devised by Coach Tom Brennan and Associate Head Coach Jesse Agel, which called for ball control, constant passing and careful work against Syracuse's famed 2–3 zone until a shot opened up.

No one should be surprised that they show poised intelligence on the hardwood. The UVM basketball team had a 3.09 grade point average (GPA) for the fall semester. The starting five has a cumulative GPA, including all the courses the players have taken in their time at UVM, above 3.0. This is an exceptionally high and rare statistic for basketball teams that play at the highest level, some of which graduate less than half their teams members. Martin Klimes, majoring in business, has a 3.82 GPA, one of the highest averages in his entire college. Geramin Mopa Njila, a computer science and information systems major, has a GPA of 3.21. Sociology major T.J. Sorrentine averages 2.75, while David Hehn has a stellar 3.57 GPA in business. Wooden Award finalist Taylor Coppenrath averaged 2.80 in secondary education and competed at the elite level in basketball, while student teaching in the math department at Colchester High School.

Their academic performance is exceptional for UVM athletes. The state university is as dedicated to graduating student athletes as it is to fielding fine teams (its men's hockey team recently played in the ECAC Final Four, and its ski team was second in the nation at the NCAA national championships). The overall GPA for student athletes is 3.08, which is higher than the GPA for the student body as a whole.

The Catamounts captured the attention and the heart of the entire nation. To the wonderful, inspired members of that team, and their dedicated coaches, the state of Vermont sends its salutations. Perhaps no one can say it better than their retiring coach, Tom Brennan, who said these words after losing to Michigan State in the second round, "We can't thank everyone enough on what the support has meant to us. We gave more back than what we took and what we did this weekend was the thrill of a lifetime. It was the greatest ride that I could ever, ever have had. You know you're in a very special place when your realities outweigh your dreams. And that's where I am." For all of us in Vermont, for one special night, reality did outweigh dreams. Thanks, Catamounts.

CONGRATULATING RABBI MERLE E. SINGER ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROBERT WEXLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I am both honored and privileged to congratulate Rabbi Merle E. Singer on the occasion of his retirement.

Rabbi Singer has been at Temple Beth El of Boca Raton for 26 years. Before that, he served at Beth Or in Philadelphia and Temple Sinai in Washington, D.C. He has a Bachelors of Arts in Sociology from the University of Cincinnati, and a Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters from the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. Rabbi Singer was ordained as a Reform Rabbi in June 1966.

Rabbi Singer is one of the warmest, most charitable and caring people I know. I have personally seen the extraordinary kindness, determination and virtue that Rabbi Singer demonstrates everyday in all aspects of his life. As those of us privileged to know him can attest, Rabbi Singer is deeply devoted to his family, congregants and community. For the past 26 years he has been a religious guide and educator to his congregants serving them in every aspect of synagogue life. Under his leadership, Temple Beth El has grown to be one of the largest Reform synagogues, where the congregation maintains an unwavering commitment to Jewish values and the importance of a Jewish identity.

Beyond the synagogue, Rabbi Singer is one of the most respected people in the community, promoting the highest form of tzedakah by bringing people of different faiths together to help those who need it most. He has started programs like Shared Care, which connects impaired seniors with members in the community—and in the process has become a true community leader. His civic involvement in everything from the United Way to the Boca Raton Community Hospital, exemplifies the principle of tikkun olam. Rabbi Singer's legacy in South Florida already extends far beyond Temple Beth El and will endure for many years.

I wish Rabbi Singer much continued success and good health.

HONORING JANICE GRUENDEL AS SHE IS RECOGNIZED BY THE ACES EDUCATION FOUNDATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

MS. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the ACES Education Foundation as they recognize the outstanding contributions of a dedicated member of our community and my good friend, Dr. Janice Gruendel. Janice has spent a lifetime working with children, focusing much of her time and effort on early childhood education.

A psychologist by training, Janice has dedicated her professional career to improving the

environment in which our children learn and grow. After receiving her Ph.D. from Yale University, Janice served as Deputy Commissioner with the Connecticut Department of Children and Youth Services, the Department of Mental Retardation, and the Department of Public Health. She moved on to become the Vice President of Education and Technology at Rabbit Ears Productions, Inc. and was co-executive producer of the Emmy-nominated public broadcast documentary, ''Mommy, Who'll Take Care of Me?''

In 1995, Janice, along with Shelly Geballe, Judy Soloman, and Nancy Lustman, embarked on a very special project founding Connecticut Voices for Children. CT Voices is a research-based public education and advocacy organization that works statewide to promote the well-being of Connecticut's children, youth and families. Janice and the co-founders of CT Voices have built this very special organization around a staff with education and experience in education, law, health, business, government and the non-profit sector. With such comprehensive vision and talented staff, CT Voices has been able to provide new and unique insights into the impact of policy and issues on today's youth and families. In fact, in just under a decade, CT Voices has become a leading voice in public policy with political leaders, the media, other advocacy groups and others regularly turning to them for public and budget analysis. The outstanding success of CT Voices allows this organization to have a real impact on public policy—a reflection of the remarkable efforts of Janice and her co-founders.

Currently serving as the Senior Advisor on Early Childhood for Connecticut's Governor M. Jodi Rell, Janice's expertise in early childhood education is recognized throughout the state. In addition to this role, she also continues as a lecturer at the Yale University Child Study Center and acts as a part-time senior consulting fellow at Connecticut Voices for Children. The multitude of work that Janice has done on behalf of our youngest citizens has gone a long way in increasing public awareness of the importance of early childhood education and its positive impact on our children.

I am proud to stand today to join her husband, Herb; her three sons and daughters-in-law, David and Liz, Darren and Yoya, and Stephen and Amy; her grandchildren, Alisia, Elena, Vivian, and Mateo, as well as all of the family, friends, and colleagues who have gathered in congratulating my dear friend, Dr. Janice Gruendel as she is honored by the ACES Education Foundation. Her many years of dedication and commitment has left an indelible mark on the State of Connecticut and a legacy that will continue to make a difference in the lives of our young people for generations to come.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR THE LIFE AND WORK OF POPE JOHN PAUL II

HON. MARK E. SOUDER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my profound sympathy for the passing of Pope John Paul II, a man whom I'm certain will go down in history as one of history's greatest leaders.

This Pope's remarkable life—a tremendous intellect, limitless compassion and deep spirituality—was the foundation of his forceful teaching about the inherent dignity of every human being. Shaped by his experiences under Nazi and Communist regimes, the Pope taught us that this dignity is the first principle from which all others derive, calling on us to respond to the cry of the poor and to protect the weakest among us.

Pope John Paul II taught us, by his words and example, that we should have the ''love of preference for the poor,'' that requires us to respond to the needs of the weakest among us. As he wrote in ''Sollicitudo Rei Socialis'' in 1987, ''[T]his love of the preference for the poor, and the decisions which it inspires in us, cannot but embrace the immense multitudes of the hungry, the needy, the homeless, those without medical care and, above all, those without hope of a better future.''

Human dignity, he also reminded us, should never be eclipsed by oppressive political systems, which deny the individuality of the person. Nor should the dignity of the human person be destroyed using tools of what he so appropriately called the ''Culture of Death,'' such as legalized abortion or physician-assisted suicide.

Pope John Paul II spoke to the world about the importance of every human person, and he specially addressed the responsibility of our nation during his visit to the United States in 1995. I am submitting this statement for the RECORD, in which the Pope so eloquently called on us to live up to our democratic responsibilities, reminding us that, ''[d]emocracy stands or falls with the truths and values which it embodies and promotes. Democracy serves what is true and right when it safeguards the dignity of every human person, when it respects inviolable and inalienable human rights, when it makes the common good the end and criterion regulating all public and social life.''

The freedom of this country can only be understood within context of the moral responsibilities of our democracy. As we mark the passing of this tremendous man, I believe we should remember his exhortation to the United States: ''At the center of the moral vision of your founding documents is the recognition of the rights of the human person, and especially respect for the dignity and sanctity of human life in all conditions and at all stages of development.''

''I say to you again, America, in the light of your own tradition: love life, cherish life, defend life, from conception to natural death.''

May God grant Pope John Paul II eternal light and peace, and may his personal witness to faith, hope and courage remain in our hearts and those of all the world.

STATEMENT OF POPE JOHN PAUL II, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS VISIT TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE UNITED STATES GIVEN ON OCTOBER 8, 1995

Dear Mr. Vice-President, Dear Friends, Dear People of America,

As I take leave of the United States, I wish to express my deep and abiding gratitude to many people.

To you, Mr. Vice-President, for graciously coming here to say goodbye. To the Bishops of the Dioceses I have visited and the many people, who have worked so hard to make this visit a success. To the public authorities, to the police and security personnel, who have ensured efficiency, good order and safety.

To the representatives of the various Churches and Ecclesial Communities, who have received me with great good will; to Americans of all races, colors and creeds, who have followed with interest and attention the events of these days; to the men and women of the communications media, who have labored diligently to bring the words and images of this visit to millions of people; and especially to all those who, personally present or from afar, have supported me with their prayers.

I express to the Catholic community of the United States my heartfelt thanks! In the words of Saint Paul: ''I give thanks to my God every time I think of you—which is constantly in every prayer I utter'' (Phil 1:3).

I say this, too, to the United States of America: today, in our world as it is, many other nations and peoples look to you as the principal model and pattern for their own advancement in democracy. But democracy needs wisdom. Democracy needs virtue, if it is not to turn against everything that it is meant to defend and encourage. Democracy stands or falls with the truths and values which it embodies and promotes. Democracy serves what is true and right when it safeguards the dignity of every human person, when it respects inviolable and inalienable human rights, when it makes the common good the end and criterion regulating all public and social life. But these values themselves must have an objective content. Otherwise they correspond only to the power of the majority, or the wishes of the most vocal. If an attitude of skepticism were to succeed in calling into question even the fundamental principles of the moral law, the democratic system itself would be shaken in its foundations (cf. Evangelium Vitae, 70).

The United States possesses a safeguard, a great bulwark, against this happening. I speak of your founding documents: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. These documents are grounded in and embody unchanging principles of the natural law whose permanent truth and validity can be known by reason, for it is the law written by God in human hearts (cf. Rom 2:25).

At the center of the moral vision of your founding documents is the recognition of the rights of the human person, and especially respect for the dignity and sanctity of human life in all conditions and at all stages of development. I say to you again, America, in the light of your own tradition: love life, cherish life, defend life, from conception to natural death.

At the end of your National Anthem, one finds these words: ''Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just, And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust!' '' America: may your trust always be in God and in none other. And then, ''The star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave''.

Thank you, and God bless you all!

NOMINEES FOR KENTUCKY NEW ERA/ROTARY ACADEMIC ALL STAR TEAM

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize nominees for the Kentucky New Era/Rotary Academic All Star Team from the Pennyroyal region in western Kentucky.

The Academic All-Star program's purpose is to recognize top academic scholars and performers. Students from Caldwell, Christian, Trigg and Todd Counties of Kentucky were nominated based on their academic performance in seven disciplines: English, foreign language, journalism, mathematics, science, social studies and the creative and performing arts. The students judged on their core academic score, the curriculum of the student, their grade point average, academic honors earned, unique accomplishments and achievements, extracurricular activities (both community based and school-related), employment history, and an autobiographical essay.

Mr. Speaker, education is the foundation upon which we reach our human potential. Students in my District are developing their talents, furthering their education and pursuing their aspirations in life through programs like the Academic All-Star program. Encouragement and recognition develop confidence and achievement among young Americans—the future leaders of our country.

The following students have been nominated for their academic excellence:

Griffin Blane, Gregory Kyle Rader, Ralph King Anderson IV, Kody Douglas Carpenter, Dianne Lisette Rousseau, Lauren Whitney Scott, Jennifer Renea Fowler, Samantha Joy White, Chad Darrel Brown, Casey Jo Calhoun, Bryan Hill, David Clayton Blake, Stephanie Leigh Huntsman, Danielle Diane Brown.

Matthew Wyn Lewis, Kristin Averitt Dickinson, Brittany Nichole Goodenough, Haylee Laura Lynne Ortiz, Drew Martin Swain, Sarah Christine Wilson, Marianne Wynn Lassiter, Amy Beth Shemwell, Brandon Bowron, Jerika Nashea Wilson, Melissa Nail, Kathryn Elizabeth Gill, Jonathan Christopher Bass, Zachary Daniel Ferguson, Erika Elaine MacMillan.

Ryan David Mullen, Andrew Christian Chiles, Barry Eli Knoblock, Paul Thomas Latham, Joshua Allen Fitzhugh, Sarah Christine Wilson, William Matthew Suiter, Amy Nicole Adams, Norman Bradley Fox, Juliana Elyse Patterson, Robert Kyle Whitaker, Pretesh Parmar, Nicholas Pickford Thompson, Dustin Glynn Kostalek, Ann Marie Crabtree,

Kellye Lynn Smiley, Meera Ramesh Patel, John Hayes Laster, Emily Scott, Sarah Beth Vied, Alicia Lynn Morris, Ashley Chewning, Brittany S. Hurt, Brittnee Collins, Chelsea Barnett, Corrinna M. Kinnard, Janelle Nichol Gilmer, Megan Gray, Sam Mitchell.

Sherry Cheatham, Wesley Croom, Bree Raquel Hokulani Goodwin, Brooke Davies, Elizabeth Settle, Emily Beatty, Kate Milani, Laura Beth Baggett, Morgan C. Murray, Sarah C. Hazelmyer, Shelley L. Traylor, Taylor Queen, Wendy A. Johnson, Andrew Landreth, Chelsea Musselman, Jacob Kyle Langston, Jonathan A. Chavez, Megan Jones. Melissa Starks, Molly Ware Stuard, Nadeem Ramzi Haroun, Rachel Brown, Sarah Elaine Howell, Sarah Elizabeth Fields, Chelsea Rae Prince, Chris Kirkman, Erin Hamilton Oakley, George W. Barnes, Helen G. Crenshaw, Hunter Carroll, John Paul Bointnott, Kalleb Anderson Greene, Kelsey Fish, Lindsay Elizabeth Gray, Shane Veteto.

Mr. Speaker, these students embody the spirit, commitment and sacrifice that we all should strive for in our daily lives. I am proud to represent them in my District. I extend my thanks to these students for their efforts, and I am proud to bring their accomplishments to the attention of this House.

ACKNOWLEDGING JASON CRAWFORTH'S CONTRIBUTION TO IDAHO

HON. C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of the House to an individual from my district whose initiative and vision might well be paying dividends in Idaho from years to come.

Through hard work and passion, Jason Crawforth gathered support from many medium and large technical institutions throughout my great state in support of a promotional effort in the Wall Street Journal on behalf of Idaho's outstanding business environment.

Companies such as Jason's own Treetop Tech, Micron Technology, Hewlett-Packard, Dell, and Extended Systems are just a few of America's top technology businesses that have chosen to locate large operations in Idaho over the years.

Anyone who spends even a short time in Idaho soon comes to realize the enormous potential of my State and its people, and the great benefits of doing business there.

From the low cost of living and absence of urban congestion to the overall quality of life, Idaho has a lot to offer the technology industry. Jason Crawforth is one of Idaho's greatest advocates, and leaders like him are among our most valuable assets. I hope the House will join me in acknowledging Jason's contribution.

TRIBUTE TO MASTER SGT MICHAEL T. HIESTER

HON. MIKE PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is written if you owe debts, pay debts; if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect.

I rise humbly today to pay a debt of honor and respect to Army National Guard Master Sergeant Mike Hiester of Bluffton, Indiana.

As I saw firsthand last December at Camp Phoenix in Kabul, Afghanistan, Hoosiers have made an extraordinary difference for freedom in Operation Enduring Freedom, and Master Sergeant Mike Hiester was a leader of men in that place. His military awards include the Bronze Star Medal (posthumous), Purple Heart (posthumous), two Meritorious Service Medals, four Army Commendation Medals, two Army Achievement Medals, four Good Conduct Medals, three Reserve Components Achievement Medals, two National Defense Service Medals, Global War on Terrorism expeditionary and Service Medals, Armed Forced Reserve Medal with M device and Bronze Hour Glass device, NATO Medal, NCO Professional Development Ribbon with "3" device, Order of St. George, Pathfinder Badge, Combat Infantryman Badge (posthumous) and the German armed forces Schutzenschnur. His state awards include the Indiana Long Service Medal (2nd award), Indiana Overseas Service Ribbon, and Indiana Outside Continental United States Ribbon (2nd award).

On March 26, 2005, Mike lost his life while fighting to defend America in Afghanistan. His military vehicle, with the 76th Infantry Brigade, Army National Guard, Indianapolis, struck a land mine 30 miles west of Kabul, Afghanistan claiming his life and the lives of three other Indiana Army National Guard.

At his home in Bluffton, Indiana he was known as a loving husband and father. He was a member of the Bluffton Fire Department and he will not soon be forgotten by this grieving community of Bluffton, which will say goodbye to him this week. According to his wife Dawn, "Mike very much believed in the cause for which he gave his life. His entire family and friends have supported him in his endeavors."

I rise to offer my deepest condolences to his wife, Dawn; his two children, Emily and Adam; his parents Thomas and Kay Hiester; his two sisters, Megan and Michele; his nephews Casey, Jesse, Kyle and Jared; his niece Carley; and all those across northeastern Indiana and all of our state who cherish the memory of this hero.

Master Sergeant Michael Hiester is a hero, whose service and sacrifice bolstered the hopes of millions of Americans and Afghanis. The memory of his sacrifice and service will forever be emblazoned on the hearts of two grateful nations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of H. Con. Res. 18 and H. Con. Res. 32.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the sentiments that these resolutions advance. There is no doubt that there must be an end to brutal human rights violations against the Syrian people and that a Syrian-occupied Lebanon poses a threat to the stability of the Middle East.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am firm in my belief that we must find a peaceful, nonmilitary solution to foster peace in the Middle East.

These resolutions, while overwhelmingly approved by the House, must not be cited as tacit approval for any future preemptive military action against Syria.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROTARY INTERNATIONAL

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to express my unqualified support for House Resolution 55, reprinted below and of which I am a proud cosponsor, recognizing the 100th anniversary of Rotary International, and in doing so to acknowledge the truly inspiring work of generations and millions of Rotarians over the last century.

Mr. Speaker, can there be a better example of selfless public service than that of Rotary International? From humble beginnings in Chicago in 1905, the world's first service club now claims 1.2 million Rotarians in some 31,000 Rotary clubs in 166 countries. And it has found a special home in my own great State of Hawaii, with 41 clubs operating in all four counties, from Hanalei Bay to Hilo Bay.

The secret of Rotary International's success is that it evokes our innermost desire to give back to our worldwide community, as captured in its motto: Service Above Self. Its now famous Four-Way Test—Is it the truth? Is it fair to all concerned? Will it build goodwill and better friendships? Will it be beneficial to all concerned?—is a lighthouse not only for its own efforts but for those of all of us.

One hundred years of individual, community, statewide and countrywide projects have solidified Rotary International's reputation and collectively earned it widespread recognition. But no project better exemplifies the spirit, success and potential of Rotary International than PolioPlus, its partnership with the World Health Organization, United Nations Children's Fund, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to eradicate the scourge of polio from the face of our earth.

Most of us of adult age in our country remember the polio scares and tragedies of decades past, but we do not regard polio as a credible threat to our own children due to widespread immunization and other advances. That is not true universally: polio still exists and strikes randomly, especially in South Asia and Africa.

In 1985, Rotary International undertook a truly breathtaking endeavor: to eliminate polio through universal immunization. And with its partners in the U.S. Agency for International Development's Polio Eradication Initiative—and funding from many governments including $260 million since 1996 of our own—it has brought polio to its knees: 1988's 350,000 cases internationally are today's couple hundred.

But we all know that the last few steps of any marathon are often the hardest, and so it is with polio. I certainly saw the challenges in my trip last year to Afghanistan—one of just six countries where polio is still endemic—where the challenges in simply reaching some of the most remote and isolated communities in our world are staggering.

Yet with the end so near Rotary International's efforts have been redoubled, and I want to tell you about just one inspiring contribution: that of Rotarian Bob ''Motorcycle Bob'' Mutchler and his wife, Patti. For the last seven years Bob, himself a victim of polio, and Patti have undertaken several marathon motorcycle rides across our country and world to highlight PolioPlus and raise funds for polio's endgame.

Bob and Patti recently kicked off their last PolioPlus Ride, the ''Centennial Ride'', in our Hawaii, aiming to cover all fifty states ending in Alaska this summer. On Tuesday, March 15th, they and local Rotarians and other well-wishers started their engines in my hometown of Hilo and set off on the first leg of their latest adventure, a trip around my Big Island, followed by rides around Maui and Kauai and capped by a journey around Oahu on Saturday, March 26th, which I was honored to start. They're now off riding the Mainland, taking our aloha with them; you can follow their journey at www.polioplusride.org. where Patti's keeping a journal.

Bob and Patti Mutchler exemplify the spirit of Rotary International, as did Mike Nelson, President of the Rotary Club of Volcano on the Island of Hawaii. Mike embraced the Mutchlers' efforts and chaired their Centennial Ride in Hawaii. Tragically, he lost his life in an auto accident on February 23rd; the ride was dedicated to him, and we remember him with the deepest appreciation and admiration as representing the true essence of Rotary.

Mr. Speaker, what an incredible century Rotary International has had, epitomizing the very best of our country, our world and our human race. We pause, in House Resolution 55, for a brief moment to recognize and honor Rotary's achievements, but I know that Rotarians everywhere, while appreciating our actions on behalf of all of our citizens, would have us move beyond as soon as possible to the remaining and urgent tasks at hand.

Mahalo, and aloha!

TRIBUTE TO SAUL STERN

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Saul Stern who will receive the Project Interchange Am Yisrael Chai Award on May 25, 2005. Saul Stern has worked tirelessly on behalf of Project Interchange to provide American political and civic leaders with a first-hand look at the vibrant democracy of Israel. His efforts have increased the understanding of many American leaders of the special bond shared by the United States and the State of Israel.

Saul has made involvement with international, national and local Jewish and secular communal affairs a lifetime commitment. Over the years, Saul has accompanied many political and military leaders to Israel to help educate them about the complex issues affecting Israel. A passionate supporter of Project Interchange, he believes that the most effective way to help people understand the value of the U.S.-Israeli relationship is by becoming a true eyewitness to life in Israel.

I hope my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in saluting Saul Stern for his commitment and dedication to fostering understanding between the United States and Israel.

FREEDOM FOR RICARDO SILVA GUAL

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Ricardo Silva Gual, a political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

Dr. Silva Gual is a Medical Doctor and member of the Christian Liberation Movement. He believes that the men and women of Cuba deserve freedom, democracy, and basic human rights. Dr. Silva Gaul is dedicated to bringing liberty to Cuba and ending the nightmare that is the Castro regime.

Because of his belief in the non-negotiable rights of all people to freedom, democracy and human rights, Dr. Silva Gaul was arrested by the dictatorship on March 18, 2003. This heinous arrest was a part of the regime's March 2003, deplorable, island-wide crackdown on peaceful pro-democracy activists. In a sham trial, Dr. Silva Gaul was sentenced to 10 years in the totalitarian gulag.

According to cubapp.info, while imprisoned in a repugnant dungeon Dr. Silva Gual declared a hunger strike to protest the inhuman treatment of political prisoners in Castro's gulag. It has also been reported that Dr. Silva Gual has been transferred to a maximum security section where the conditions are even harsher.

Dr. Silva Gual, despite being imprisoned, despite facing even more severe maltreatment in the inhuman gulag, continues to advocate for liberty. Dr. Silva Gual is a brilliant example of the heroism of the Cuban people. No matter how intense the repression, no matter how horrifically brutal the consequences of a dignified struggle for liberty, the totalitarian gulags are full of men and women of all backgrounds and ages who represent the best of the Cuban nation.

Mr. Speaker, we must speak out and act against this abominable disregard for human rights, human dignity, and human freedom just 90 miles from our shore. My Colleagues, we must demand the immediate and unconditional release of Ricardo Silva Gual and every political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SAUL RAMIREZ

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Saul Ramirez for his commitment to serving the citizens of Laredo, Texas.

Saul Ramirez began his career as a Laredo City Council Member in 1982. He has held a number of positions in local government, and

his contributions to town and country have helped transform Laredo into an international center of commerce.

As the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, he handled major federal neighborhood revitalization, economic development, and homelessness programs within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. As Assistant Secretary he oversaw rehabilitation programs such as Community Block Grant, Hope for Ownership of Single Family Homes, Home Investment Partnership, and various other programs that establish funding for housing and support services.

Among other accomplishments in his distinguished career, Mr. Ramirez created the Laredo Affordable Housing Finance Corporation in 1990. He has worked hard to help some of Laredo's poorest neighborhoods. Working to improve housing in the Laredo community, Saul Ramirez's tireless efforts ensure that our citizens have a decent place to live.

A former mayor of Laredo, Mr. Ramirez is no stranger to the unique needs of his community. Serving at a time of great community growth, he has helped to provide guidance and leadership for our changing city.

Saul Ramirez is the recipient of numerous honors and awards, including Newsweek Magazine's ''25 Most Dynamic Mayors'' in 1996. He has served as Director of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, as a Board Member of the U.S. Council of Mayors, and with the Texas Municipal League.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to recognize the important contributions of Saul Ramirez. His hard work and community dedication have helped to transform Laredo into the city it is today.

HONORING NEAL McBRIDE

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Neal McBride for being recognized as 2005 Citizen of the Year by the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations. This special honor is truly well-deserved.

Mr. McBride has been an active member of the community within the South County region since the late 1980s. He has served as the chair or coordinator for numerous civic groups including the South Run Coalition, South County Schools Alliance, the Laurel Hill Development and Arts Center and the Cold War Museum. In addition, McBride has also served as an officer with the Federation of Lorton Communities and Newington Forest Community Association. He is director-at-large of the Occoquan Watershed Coalition, a member of the Lorton Heritage Society, a Lorton Arts Foundation Advisory panelist and a member of the Laurel Hill Planning Task Force.

In 2003, Mr. McBride was honored by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors with the title of ''Lord Fairfax.'' Mr. McBride, a retired health care management specialist with the U.S. Department of Veterans' Affairs, has lived in South Springfield since 1981.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to express my gratitude to Neal McBride for all of his efforts on behalf of the Mount Vernon area. He has served his community well, truly meriting recognition. I call upon my colleagues to join me in applauding Mr. McBride's past accomplishments and in wishing him the best of luck in all future endeavors.

HONORING LANCE CORPORAL NICHOLAS DAVID LARSON

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Marine Lance Corporal Nicholas David Larson of Wheaton, Illinois. Corporal Larson was killed on November 9, 2004 when his unit took fire from terrorists in the Al Anbar Province, Iraq. Nick was killed in the ensuing firefight. He had been serving in Iraq since mid June 2004 and his tour was set to end in January 2005.

Lance Corporal Larson was 14 years old when he did more than 100 push-ups for a recruiter. Nicholas told his mother after 9/11 that he joined the Marines because ''I just want to make a difference.''

He began his service after graduating from Wheaton North High School in 2003. He was assigned to Company L, 3rd Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, Regimental Combat Team 1, 1st Marine Division, Camp Pendleton, CA. Corporal Larson followed in the footsteps of his father, who served in the Navy.

Teachers and administrators at Wheaton North High School described Nicholas as quiet and focused and an intense student. And always knowing he wanted to be a Marine.

Lance Corporal Larson was a young man of only 19 when he made the ultimate sacrifice in service to his country. Our deepest sympathies to his beloved family: David and Anne Larson, and his sister Katie Larson. The entire community joins in mourning Nicholas's loss.

We honor the memory of Lance Corporal Nicholas David Larson and the dedication and bravery with which he served our nation and the people of Iraq.

IN HONOR OF MR. BENJAMIN DE LA SELVA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Benjamin ''Ben'' De La Selva. Ben was born in Somoto, Nicaragua, in 1939. He immigrated to the United States in 1961, subsequently serving in the U.S. Army for six and a half years. In the mid 1960s he studied French and Polish at the Defense Language Institute, DLI, and then served a year in Vietnam (1966–67) with the 173rd Airborne as Prisoner of War interrogator and French linguist. Ben was in Dakto, Central Highlands, at the onset of one of the Vietnam War's bloodiest battles. After leaving the military and getting a college education through the GI Bill, Ben was hired at DLI, where he occupied numerous positions from 1972 to 2005.

During his rise from teacher to dean at DLI, Ben trained thousands of military linguists, guided several generations of language teachers, and mentored many supervisors and managers who now occupy leadership positions. Moreover, he supervised every DLI language program and participated in the development of much needed Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic curricula. During the last 20 consecutive years, Ben served as dean of every DLI resident school, a credit to his solid leadership qualities. As a dean, he participated in several pioneering initiatives including Team Teaching, the Faculty Personnel System, and the introduction of up-to-date teaching methods. Likewise, Ben was at the forefront of DLI's giant leap to modem-day technology. Ben retired on January 3rd, 2005, but is still associated with the U.S. government in his capacity as President of the DLI Alumni Association, a non-profit organization he founded in November 2001.

Mr. Speaker, Ben is an excellent example of the immigrant young man who arrives in the USA with a high school diploma, serves in the military, gets an education through the GI Bill, pursues and flourishes in a governmental career, and 40 years later retires with an impeccable and distinguished record. Ben truly believes he has achieved the American dream. He exemplifies the highest aspirations of this nation. I am proud to honor him today.

TRIBUTE TO MR. WILLIAM SOLOMON

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk today about a remarkable, courageous man who has dedicated himself for the betterment of Texas, and the lives of those around him. Mr. William Solomon is a fine member of my home community of Dallas, Texas and I am proud to announce that he has been recognized for his outstanding work as the latest recipient of the Linz Award, Dallas County's oldest award for recognizing exceptional community and humanitarian volunteer efforts.

Bill Solomon began working in 1967 at the company that his grandfather founded in 1918, Austin Industries, Incorporated, the largest commercial and industrial contractor in Dallas. In 1970, Bill was named president of the company, and he continues to serve as chairman of Austin Industries today.

Mr. Solomon is also a renowned civic leader, a member of the Dallas Citizens Council, the World Presidents' Organization, and the Northaven United Methodist Church. He serves on the boards of the A. H. Belo Corporation, the Southwestern Medical Foundation Board of Trustees, and the Hoblitzelle Foundation. In addition to this, he has been the recipient of numerous awards and honors.

Mr. Speaker, our communities and our country have always relied on the contributions of those individuals who have the ability to rise above and beyond the call of duty to make a difference in the lives of others, both personally and professionally. Bill Solomon has demonstrated an unfailing and tireless commitment to the betterment of Dallas County, the State of Texas, and the entire Nation. With his steady guidance and strong leadership, in 1991, he founded the Dallas Together Forum, were he has potentially made his greatest impact. This multi-racial group of approximately 30 Dallas business leaders met monthly to discuss ways to reduce racial tension and improve minority economic opportunities. The Dallas Together Forum helped defuse racial tensions in the '80s and early '90s, and its impact on racial harmony is still felt today.

Bill Solomon is a dedicated community servant, activist, and leader. He is a credit to Dallas, and through his tireless work, my home town has become a better place to live. I am proud to join his family, his colleagues, Zale Corp. and The Dallas Morning News in congratulating Bill Solomon on a job well done.

IN HONOR OF THE HISPANIC ORGANIZATION OF STUDENTS IN TECHNOLOGY/SOCIETY OF HISPANIC PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AT THE NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Hispanic Organization of Students in Technology (HOST), the New Jersey Institute of Technology's student chapter of the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers (SHPE). HOST/SHPE was honored for its outstanding achievements at the Region IV Student Leadership Conference (RSLC) Gala Banquet on March 19, 2005.

The Hispanic Organization of Students in Technology/Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers represents a group of extremely talented and dedicated students who, at a young age, have already shown amazing promise and success. The HOST/SHPE RSLC offers new members the opportunity to share valuable knowledge and learn from other SHPE leaders. The goal of RSLC is to provide students with the leadership skills necessary for success in the business world, as well as the organizational, managerial, and technical skills essential for developing and enhancing the infrastructure of their respective SHPE student chapters and pre-college programs. In addition, students learn how to interact and network with SHPE corporate officials, which can lead to long-lasting, professional relationships. Under the strong leadership of Daniel Lozano, the conference has been organized to assemble more than 200 students from across the eastern United States, including Puerto Rico.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the achievements of the students in HOST/SHPE, as well as the strong commitment on the part of the RSLC Committee and Daniel Loranzo to organize this worthwhile event. I applaud the students' dedication and their success, and wish them the best as they head towards an already bright future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 17, 2005, I was unable to vote on a motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 18, Expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the continuing gross violations of human rights and civil liberties of the Syrian and Lebanese people by the government of the Syrian Arab Republic (rollcall 89). Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING DAVID HANNON, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF SOUTH SHORE HOSPITAL ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute David Hannon who is being honored today for his outstanding work as President and Chief Executive Officer of the South Shore Hospital in Weymouth, Massachusetts.

Since Mr. Hannon's tenure as President and CEO began in 1986, South Shore Hospital has experienced considerable growth and development, adding programs consistent with the highest quality of medical care in the region, and bringing to the community a level of excellence that was once the domain of prestigious academic medical centers in major cities. In addition, David has promoted sustained investments in hospital infrastructure, including new medical technologies and health care equipment.

These initiatives have enabled the hospital to grow from a small community facility to a regional medical center offering highly complex and sophisticated care—from acute and outpatient services to home health and hospice care—to more than 650,000 residents in southeastern Massachusetts.

In addition to caring for the medical needs of the community, he has also taken an equally strong interest in the outstanding work of the 3,000 employees who are the very heart and soul of South Shore Hospital. Through their collective efforts, South Shore Hospital has become a leading health care provider in the state of Massachusetts, with a record of clinical excellence and superb patient care. That is reflected in the hospital being the first in the Commonwealth to earn maximum recognition with commendation from the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations for three consecutive review periods.

On behalf of a deeply grateful community, I want to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in thanking David Hannon on a job well done.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF COUNTY SHERIFF OF ATASCOSA TOMMY WILLIAMS

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Atascosa County Sheriff Tommy Williams.

Tommy Williams is an excellent example of a Sheriff who understands the needs of his community. Sheriff Williams has been serving his community since 1973, when he first became sheriff of Atascosa.

Sheriff Williams is a man who believes in the value of community involvement and intervention. He has been the recipient of numerous awards, including the Master Peace Officer certificate. Williams has also served as President of the Sheriff's Association of Texas. He is a member of the National Sheriff's Association, Sheriff's Association of Texas, the Poteet VFW Post and the American Legion Post.

Sheriff Williams believes that an informed public is better equipped for preventing crime in our streets and neighborhoods. As part of his duties and responsibilities, Sheriff Williams provides security for the operation of county and district courts as well as enforcing county ordinances and other state laws.

Sheriff Williams is a major resource for his county and sets a great example for his law enforcement community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the past and future accomplishments of Atascosa County Sheriff Tommy Williams.

HONORING THE OCCOQUAN WATERSHED COALITION

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Occoquan Watershed Coalition (OWC) of Fairfax County, Virginia.

Established in 1994, the Occoquan Watershed Coalition is a nonpartisan, broad-based citizens group that works to improve communication and expand dialogue regarding major issues concerning the Springfield District portion of this environmentally sensitive region.

The coalition actively works with the Virginia General Assembly, the Virginia Department of Transportation, and citizen and homeowner associations to protect and improve both the environment and the quality of life of the area's residents. Specific examples of the OWC's efforts include their involvement in the closure of the Lorton Prison Complex and subsequent redevelopment of the area. The coalition also closely monitored numerous transportation decisions including the refurbishment of the Yates Ford Bridge and paving of Yates Ford Road.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank the Occoquan Watershed Coalition for 10 years of dedicated service to its community. I call upon my colleagues to join me in applauding the OWC's past accomplishments and in wishing the program continued success in the many years to come.

HONORING CORPORAL JOHN T. OLSON

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to U.S. Marine Corporal John T. Olson of Elk Grove Village, Illinois. Corporal Olson was killed by enemy action while conducting combat operations on 21 February in Nassir Wa Al Salam, Iraq. It was Corporal Olson's third tour of duty in Iraq.

He graduated from boot camp from the San Diego Marine Corps Depot in 2002 and was deployed to Iraq in January 2003 for his first tour. His third tour of duty was with the Alpha Truck Company, Headquarters Battalion, 2nd Marine Division.

John Olson was a graduate of the Elk Grove High School, Class of 2001, graduating six months early. He was a student at Harper Community College when 9/11 changed his life, he enlisted shortly afterward and was deployed to his first tour in Iraq. At the time of his death, he was driving a truck just outside his base when a bomb exploded. He died while medics tried to save him.

Corporal Olson was a young man of 21 when he made the ultimate sacrifice in service to his country. Our deepest sympathies go to his beloved family—his mother Diana, his father John R, and his sister Courtney—as well as to his other family and friends. The entire community joins in mourning John's loss.

We honor the memory of Corporal John T. Olson and the dedication and bravery with which he served our Nation and the people of Iraq.

IN HONOR OF THE WORK OF PROFESSOR JOHN MONTGOMERY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished work of Professor John J. Montgomery, a native Californian who was a pioneer of early aeronautics from 1882 until 1911.

Professor Montgomery made many distinguished advances in the field of aerodynamics and fluid mechanics. In 1883, he designed, constructed, and flew a glider 600 feet at Otay Mesa, California, achieving the very first controlled flight of heavier-than-air, fixed winged craft in history. This was quite a remarkable feat, as Professor Montgomery relied only upon his superb knowledge of fluid mechanics and his scientific observations of birds.

In 1893, after many more years of exploration and reflection, Professor Montgomery attended several conferences where he was able to share his findings with the world. Audiences were captivated by his writings describing fluid mechanics and his initial flight experiments. His original manuscript, aptly titled ''Soaring Flight,'' contained some of the world's earliest understanding of fluid dynamics and is now proudly displayed at the Smithsonian Institute in Washington DC.

As Professor Montgomery's interest and knowledge in fluid mechanics grew, he continued to explore the abilities of larger aircraft. Professor Montgomery was exhilarated by these larger models, and when inspired to fly, he retreated to the beautiful Leonard Ranch in Aptos, California, here in the 17th district.

In 1903 Professor Montgomery reached a breakthrough and built a full-scale version of his tandem wing design. He quickly began testing the abilities of his new machine by flying it like a kite, performing load carrying tests, practicing vertical drop launch, and equilibrium and control tests. He continued to conduct these tests and manned flight experiments in the spring and summer of 1904.

In the winter of 1904–1905, Montgomery was ready to display the skills of his new craft in a spectacular new way. Montgomery hoisted his craft high into the air with the aid of a hot air balloon. Montgomery then trained a circus acrobat and a professional parachutist, Daniel J. Maloney, the delicate skills required to steer the aircraft. In March, 1905 in Aptos, the hot air balloon hoisted the glider and Mr. Maloney, high into the air. Audiences then were treated to the show of a lifetime. Mr. Maloney darted upward and downward, carving circles and figure eights. The new aircraft was an absolute sensation, with the longest flight lasting an astonishing eighteen minutes and covering a distance greater than two miles. Truly this was the very first flight of its kind, and Montgomery's ''aeroplane'' set lasting altitude and endurance tests that served as a testament to Professor Montgomery's genius.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the achievement of this fine gentleman on this day, March 19, 2005, the Centennial Celebration of his ''Soaring Flight''. Professor Montgomery will always be remembered for his ceaseless devotion to aerospace science and his many contributions to the Santa Cruz County community in the 20th century. Though no longer with us, it is my honor and pleasure to recognize such a unique and fascinating individual.

TRIBUTE TO THE TURTLE CREEK CHORALE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the 25th anniversary of the Turtle Creek Chorale, of Dallas, Texas. The TCC held their first performance in April of 1980 with only 70 members. Through the idea of ''the power of harmony,'' their commitment to the community and the leadership skills of Artistic Directors like Dr. Timothy Seelig, the chorale has exploded to over 200 singing members.

The TCC performs an annual series in Dallas at the Meyerson Symphony Hall, along with traveling around the United States, Canada, and many locations in Europe. In addition to more than 100,000 hours of rehearsal, and over 50 yearly benefit performances, the TCC also participates in numerous community service projects.

The TCC has many accomplishments, such as their collaboration with the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation with the creation of the much respected Sing for the Cure: A Proclamation of Hope, narrated by Maya Angelou. In addition, they produced and performed the world premier of Song of Wisdom from Old Turtle that was based on the award winning book Old Turtle. A portion of all the recording proceeds benefited St. Jude Children's Research Hospital. The TCC has also performed for the inaugurations of Dallas Mayor Ron Kirk and Texas Governor Ann Richards.

The dedicated members of TCC have excelled in their mission to entertain, educate, unite, and uplift audiences through music distinguished for its innovation, diversity and artistic excellence.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in acknowledging the honorable works of Turtle Creek Chorale for their 25th Anniversary.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SEGUIN MAYOR BETTY ANN MATTHIES

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize distinguished civic service of Seguin Mayor Betty Ann Matthies.

Betty Ann Matthies is a native of Guadalupe County. She graduated from Seguin High School, and attended the University of Texas at Austin. She graduated from the Steton School of Nursing in Austin in 1976, and received her Certificate in Heath Care Administration from Trinity University in 1978.

Ms. Matthies has been a strong advocate for health care in Guadalupe County. She has been involved in nursing for almost 30 years, and is a member of the American Nurses Association, the Texas Nurses Association, the Texas Organization of Nurse Executives, and the American Organization of Nurse Executives.

Betty Ann Matthies entered public service in 2000, as Seguin District 7 City Council Member. In 2004, she was elected Mayor of Seguin. In addition to her executive responsibilities, she finds time to give to a variety of volunteer organizations. She is a member of Seguin Senior Citizens, the Seguin Area Chamber of Commerce, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and she is director of the Pecan Museum.

Betty Ann Matthies has done a great deal for the people of Guadalupe County, both as

a nurse and a public official. Her energy and spirit of volunteerism serve as a wonderful example to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this opportunity to recognize the many achievements of Seguin Mayor Betty Ann Matthies.

HONORING REVEREND KENNY SMITH

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Reverend Kenny Smith for his exceptional work in the Northern Virginia community as pastor of the First Baptist Church in Vienna, Virginia, and president of the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP.

A native of Atlanta, Georgia, Reverend Smith received a bachelor's degree from the University of Nebraska-Omaha. He continued on to Virginia Union University's School of Theology, where he graduated magna cum laude with a master of divinity degree. Reverend Smith also holds a doctor of ministry degree from Virginia Union University's School of Theology.

Reverend Smith serves as pastor of the First Baptist Church of Vienna and as an adjunct professor at the Howard University School of Theology. He is also the immediate former moderator of the Northern Virginia Baptist Association and was elected in June 2003 as Vice President of the Baptist General Convention of Virginia.

During his time as pastor of the First Baptist Church, Reverend Smith has been a model of positive influence in the community. His congregation has partnered extensively with Habitat for Humanity and built several houses for needy families, contributing both labor and funds for materials. Through Reverend Smith's leadership, the church adopted Shelter House, a shelter located in Falls Church, Virginia for homeless families. First Baptist Church has provided Shelter House with toys, gifts, funding and other resources for the residents since 1990.

Reverend Smith's dedication to his community has been recognized by many awards including the Dean's Pastor's Award from the Howard University School of Theology, the Outstanding Achievement in Religion Award from the Howard University Alumni Club of Northern Virginia, the Religious Affairs Award from the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP, and the Outstanding Leadership Award from the Northern Virginia Baptist Association. He has also been honored by Horizon Community Outreach Group, Fairfax County Public Schools, Old Dominion Bar Association, and the Fairfax County Human Rights Commission.

Reverend Smith has been an invaluable asset to the Northern Virginia community. He deserves to be commended for his work in the community and on his time as president of the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to express my gratitude to Reverend Kenny Smith for all of his efforts on behalf of Northern Virginia. He has served his community well, truly meriting recognition. I call upon my colleagues to join me in applauding Reverend Kenny Smith's accomplishments and in wishing him the best of luck in all future endeavors.

HONORING SPECIALIST ADRIANA N. SALEM

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to U.S. Army Specialist Adriana N. Salem, of Elk Grove Village, Illinois. Specialist Salem was killed on March 4, 2005 when the vehicle in which she was riding turned over near Tikrit, Iraq. She had been serving in Iraq since February 14, 2005. Her prior service had been in Afghanistan for much of 2003.

Specialist Salem was a 2001 graduate of Elk Grove High School, where she played violin for 4 years in the school orchestra. Her future goal following high school was to position herself to join a Police Force, and following 9/11 Adriana enlisted in the Army to further that goal. At Elk Grove High School she is remembered as a student who loved learning, arrived early and was a leader in class and athletics.

Specialist Salem was assigned to the Fort Stewart, GA based 3rd Infantry Division, 3rd Forward Support Battalion, Division Support Command.

Specialist Adriana Salem was a young woman of 21 when she made the ultimate sacrifice in service to her country. Our deepest sympathies go to her beloved family—her mother Sandra, her father Shamshoum "Sam," and her sisters Christina, Sabrina, Alexandria, and Larissa—as well as to her other family and friends. The entire community joins in mourning Adriana's loss.

We honor the memory of U.S. Army Specialist Adriana N. Salem and the dedication and bravery with which she served our Nation and the people of Iraq.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Dudley Knox Library staff of the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California, located in my Congressional District. The Naval Postgraduate School is an academic institution focused on graduate and research programs relevant to the Navy's interests. For the second consecutive year, staff members from the Dudley Knox Library will be honored by the Librarian of Congress.

Dudley Knox is recognized nationally as a leading library in government and defense information. The library has been selected from among more than 2,000 libraries operated by the federal government to receive the 2004 Federal Library/Information Center of the Year award in the competitive library/information center category.

The Federal Library of the Year Award applauds the library's exemplary achievements throughout the past year. The award is based upon customer satisfaction and innovative services and resources. During the past year the Knox Library has created several new services, including a virtual reference service, an active instruction program that has attracted more than 2,300 users, and an added wireless internet service. The Library also provided foreign language keyboard support in response to requests from International students who comprise 25 percent of the student body.

In addition, the library added a Homeland Security Digital Library, a state-of-the-art digital library to serve the needs of a particular user group. It is cited by others as a model for its use of emerging technologies with other agencies and groups.

The Dudley Knox Library owes its success to its dedicated and skilled staff of 34. Throughout the year the entire staff has consistently made sure that library members obtain accurate information for their academic and research endeavors. It is not uncommon to find more than 10 percent of the resident student population in the Library at any one time during the day.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Dudley Knox Library staff for their exceptional dedication and creativity in their jobs and their continual pursuit in developing an outstanding library. Out of more than 2,000 libraries and informational centers operated by the federal government, the Dudley Knox Library has deservedly earned the 2004 Federal Library/Information Center of the Year award.

IN HONOR OF DR. JACK SMITH

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Jack Smith for his outstanding courage and important service abroad as a physician in Afghanistan.

After being called to duty in October 2004, Dr. Smith was sent to serve in the 325th medical combat unit of the United States Army. While in Afghanistan, he spent much of his time in platoon hospitals, often near dangerous combat operations. The situation required that Dr. Smith utilize his strong skills both as a physician and as a soldier.

Dr. Smith recently returned to the United States to resume his private practice and has been welcomed with enthusiasm and admiration by family, friends, and coworkers. Born and raised in Bayonne, Dr. Smith works at the Bayonne Medical Center.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Jack Smith for his brave work in Afghanistan. We are grateful for his courage in the face of danger and his service to our country in the name of freedom.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF SAN MARCOS CITY COUNCILMAN DANIEL GUERRERO

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the important achievements of San Marcos Councilman Daniel Guerrero, of my Congressional District.

Daniel Guerrero is a native of San Marcos, and graduated from San Marcos High School in 1995. He decided to further his education and earned his Bachelors Degree in Mass Communication/Public Relations in 2000 from Texas State University.

Mr. Guerrero was elected to the San Marcos City Council in 2004. He is actively involved in the community, giving his time to a variety of organizations that work for the public good. He has worked as City Councilman to improve city planning and the city's quality of life.

Daniel Guerrero served as President of LULAC No. 654, and was appointed by the City Council to serve on the Arts Commission. He is an inspiration for his public service, and believes deeply in the role of the community in supporting and encouraging strong families.

Daniel currently works as a national recruiter and professional development specialist with Inroads, Inc. He is a member of the Austin Chapter of the Society of Mexican American Engineers and Scientists, the Texas State University Alumni Association, and Omega Delta Phi Alumni Association.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Guerrero's career as a public servant has done credit to the city of San Marcos, and I am proud to have the opportunity to thank him.

HONORING DELEGATE JAMES H. DILLARD

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Delegate James H. Dillard for over 21 years of dedicated service to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Delegate Dillard has served as Delegate to the Virginia General Assembly from 1972–1977 and then again from 1980–2005. Delegate Dillard represents the 41st District in central Fairfax County. He served in the United States Navy from 1955 to 1957 and received a B.A. from The College of William and Mary and a M.A. in Political Science from The American University.

Delegate Dillard previously served as a Fairfax County teacher and principal and began his political career as a member of the Fairfax Education Association by working to establish a living wage for teachers in the 1960's. His strong interest in education led him to be one of the original architects of the Virginia Standards of Learning. Additionally, he was chief sponsor of legislation placing a guidance counselor in every elementary school, and has been recognized as National Legislator of the Year by the Guidance Counselors Association.

As Chairman of the Natural Resources subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, Delegate Dillard initiated the largest growth in parks and conservation activities in Virginia's history. Delegate Dillard was the author and chief sponsor of the Virginia Soil and Siltation Act which protects streams and waterways from pollutants. He has also worked behind the scenes to ensure the development of the Leesylvania State Park sailing marina, one of the finest facilities of its kind on the Potomac River and has been recognized as Legislator of the Year by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to extend my best wishes to Delegate Dillard on his retirement from the General Assembly. Through his long and distinguished career Delegate Dillard has touched the lives of countless Virginians. While I know that he will be greatly missed, his retirement is well deserved. I call upon my colleagues to join me in honoring Delegate Dillard and in wishing him the best of luck in all future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 21, 2005 I was unable to return to Washington from California for consideration of and the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 90.

COMMENDING SEA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION STUDENTS WHO AIDED IN RESCUING 49 HAITIAN REFUGEES

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, very few of life's important lessons come from a book. That is the educational philosophy of the Sea Education Association, a unique program based on Cape Cod to teach hands-on seafaring skills to young men and women. SEA offers college students a rigorous semester "overseas" that challenges them intellectually and physically by combining study of the deep ocean with the sailing adventure of a lifetime.

After extensive classroom training, 22 SEA students and a crew of 11 launched from Key West aboard the *Corwith Cramer*, a 134-foot sailing research vessel under the command of Captain Steve Tarrant. Five weeks later, the students were deploying oceanographic sampling equipment near Jamaica when they spotted a small disabled vessel brimming with Haitian nationals, including many children. With search-and-rescue assets nowhere nearby, and with life and limb literally at stake, the students showed more than academic and navigational prowess. They acted from deep in their hearts.

What followed was a dramatic story of courage and compassion—a life-changing, hands-across-the-sea experience for rescuer and refugee alike. John Bullard, SEA president, summed it up in five eloquent words: "We're all in the same boat."

The enormity of the ocean has inspired for thousands of years. These students learned first-hand that men and women are also part of the natural rhythm of the sea, and resolved immediately to remain a part of the lives of the Haitians they encountered so far from home. All who follow in future SEA voyages can sail with deep pride in a mission that anticipates serious challenge—but that also embraces deep responsibility.

I commend to my House colleagues the following news account, one of dozens in the wake of this remarkable sequence of events:

[From MSNBC, Mar. 10, 2005]

U.S. STUDENTS AID RESCUE OF HAITIANS ADRIFT AT SEA

(By Kari Huus)

For 22 U.S. college students on a voyage in the Caribbean, the six-week trip would have been an adventure to remember in any case, but their encounter with a boat full of Haitians adrift at sea made it a life-changing event.

The students, studying oceanography in a program called Sea Semester at Woods Hole, Mass., were about 45 miles north of Jamaica on Wednesday deploying some research equipment from their vessel, the SSV *Corwith Cramer*, when one student spotted what turned out to be a 25-foot open boat packed with 49 Haitians, including 14 children and infants. The Haitians had been heading for Jamaica, but were adrift after their boat lost its mast and rudder. Passengers on the distressed boat said they had been at sea for five days.

What to do was decided over the course of the next five hours. Through calls to the U.S. Coast Guard and Jamaican authorities, the students learned that the *Corwith*, a 135-foot sail-powered research vessel, was the only boat within reasonable range to rescue the Haitians. Jamaican authorities said they could not rescue the group of Haitians but would receive them.

But there were risks to be considered, said John Bullard, president of Sea Semester: "Piracy is one of them. Exposure to disease is another."

On the other hand, he said, if the research vessel "had just sailed away from 49 people . . . our students would have been scarred in other ways."

ASSESSING THE RISKS

Under the direction of the vessel's captain, Steve Tarrent, who leads an 11-person professional crew, calls went out to search-and-rescue experts and medical experts.

The decision was made to bring the Haitians aboard before the sun set. "We thought if we towed the vessel it might not survive that. We would end up fishing people out of the water," said Bullard. "We felt the safest action was to bring them aboard during the daylight when we could control some things."

As the Haitians gathered in a sheltered spot above deck on the research vessel, the crew cut the smaller boat loose after marking it with fluorescent paint to avoid sparking unnecessary search-and-rescue efforts if

it were spotted later. A meal of rice and beans was prepared for the unexpected passengers.

'WE'RE ALL IN THE SAME BOAT'

An escort boat met the *Corwith* off the coast of Jamaica, and delivered the Haitians safely to Port Antonio early Thursday morning. The ship's crew and students were resting in port before finishing off their sailing semester in Key West, Fla., on March 19.

The captain and students were not immediately available for comment, but Bullard said parents who were contacted expressed great pride in their children's role in the rescue.

''What we have in our planned curriculum is the study of oceanography, and the history and literature of the sea and skills like navigation and weather forecasting,'' said Bullard. ''One thing you learn that is not in the curriculum is that we're all in the same boat.

''This group of students got a chance to learn this literally.''

Waves of unrest and poverty have driven thousands of Haitians to seek refuge outside their country over the past decade. One common destination is Jamaica. Many Haitians are denied refugee status and forced to return home.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF REVEREND L.A. WILLIAMS, JR.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend L.A. Williams for his service to the Wheatley Heights First Baptist Church and to the San Antonio community.

Reverend L.A. Williams is a native Texan whose ministry reaches far beyond the walls of the Wheatley Heights First Baptist Church and into the San Antonio community. Currently serving as the Moderator of the Guadalupe District Missionary Baptist Association, College, Incorporated, and other organizations such as the Baptist Minister's Union of San Antonio and Vicinity, Reverend Williams is always trying to reach out to the community to offer a helping hand.

Born in Houston, Texas, Reverend Williams attended E.L. Furr High School, and upon graduating studied at Southwestern Business College and the Union Baptist Bible College and Seminary. His awe-inspiring dedication to spreading the Word of God officially started when he delivered his first sermon on the third Sunday of July 1973 at the Greater Mount Olive Baptist Church. He went on to serve many churches across the state of Texas, but since 1984 he has found himself at Wheatley Heights First Baptist Church.

It is here in San Antonio that Reverend L.A. Williams has touched the lives of many and helped them realize that there is always much to hope for. Whether he is rebuilding the Church itself due to a flood or helping a kid in need, the Reverend always is serving his fellow man and woman to the greatest degree.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had the privilege and opportunity to recognize this man of faith, Reverend L.A. Williams.

TRIBUTE TO HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE MEN'S AND WOMEN'S BASKETBALL PROGRAM

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Hostos Community College Men's and Women's basketball programs for bringing championship trophies home to the Bronx. I am proud of this dedicated group of students for showing excellence on and off the court.

Under the leadership of Coach Renee Bostic the Hostos women's basketball team set goals for themselves before the start of the season. Their relentless dedication and hard work paid off as they were the winners of the 2005 CUNY Athletic Conference Edison Basketball Championships for the second year in a row. Not to be outdone, the men's team led by Coach Robert Holford captured the 2005 NJCAA Men's Division III National Championship. This marks the first national basketball title won by a CUNY school since the 1950 CCNY men's basketball team captured both the NCAA and NIT titles. Like the women's program the men set early goals and followed through with their incredible work ethic.

These two programs have done surprisingly well despite the fact that they have been in existence for no more than three years. It is a great compliment to this institution that only in its third year of existence the men's team has won a National Championship and that only in its second year of existence the women's team has already repeated as CUNYAC regular season and Tournament champions.

The success that these two programs enjoyed on the court is much more than a reflection of their skills with a basketball but a reflection of their character. To reach the level of competition that these young people have achieved one must acquire certain qualities that will not only aid him/her in sport but in life as well; qualities such as discipline, patience and perseverance. I am proud to say these athletes have carried these qualities over to the classroom and are all top tier students.

Vince Lombardi once stated that ''excellence is not a sometime thing.'' With their performance on and off the court, I think the men and women's basketball teams of Hostos Community College have demonstrated that these are words they live by.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that if these young men and women continue to exert themselves on and off the court they will be victorious in the game of life. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the outstanding student athletes of Hostos Community College in the Bronx.

CELEBRATING THE TEXAS LYCEUM'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Texas Lyceum on their 25th Anniversary. The Texas Lyceum, a non-profit, non-partisan organization, is the foremost incubator of leaders in Texas.

The original Lyceum was a grove of trees in ancient Athens where Aristotle educated the leaders of the day on issues critical to the time. Key issues were debated and focused through the lens of enlightenment and character. So, in 1980 when a group of young leaders recently named ''Rising Stars of Texas'' by Texas Business magazine, began exploring the idea of establishing a leadership confederation based on providing solutions to problems in Texas, Aristotle's Lyceum seemed an appropriate model.

Tieman H. ''Skipper'' Dippel and an impressive group of founders including: Bud Shivers, Mike Hopkins, Ann Quirk, Jim Windham, John Connally, III, Rob Mosbacher, Ken George, Scott Bennett, and others too numerous to mention teamed with Texas Business magazine and George Kozmetsky to establish this forum which represents the diversity of the state and emphasizes constructive responses to issues critical to Texas.

The Lyceum has always endeavored to bring out the best in people and enlighten the next generation to the power of ideas. It teaches leaders to focus on where they are alike rather than how they are different while still valuing the rich diversity of Texas. To accomplish these purposes, the Lyceum conducts quarterly meetings to educate its Directors and other policy makers on the important issues of our times and sends its members back into the community armed with the most up to date information available.

The Lyceum also publishes the Journal of the Texas Lyceum, a mainstay for policymakers looking for insightful and thoughtful solutions. Each issue is edited to be in keeping with the Lyceum's philosophy of valuing differing opinions from our state's leaders. This document was invaluable to me and my colleagues when I served in the Texas Legislature.

Twenty-five years later, the Texas Lyceum boasts over 600 alumni and 96 current directors. Judging from where Lyceum alumni can now be found it is obvious that the Lyceum has successfully met its goal of educating the next generation of leaders in Texas. The Lyceum should be extremely proud of its accomplishments.

From the courtroom to the board room, from farms and ranches to the world of high tech, from medical centers to the oil fields, from education intuitions to houses of worship, and from city councils to the halls of Congress and even the White House, Lyceum alumni are woven through the leadership structures of the state of Texas and this nation. Numerous state legislators, Members of Congress, a sitting U.S. Senator, the current Governor and even the current President of the United States are all Lyceum Alumni.

The Texas Lyceum membership reflects the rich diversity of Texas and succeeds because it seeks to identify and prominently promote the unique values of our state that bring us all together as Texans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in saluting the over 600 men and women who have participated in the Texas Lyceum since its inception in 1980. For a quarter century now the

Texas Lyceum has been committed to promoting the stewardship of the values, traditions, resources and diversity that is Texas.

HONORING LEE LEONARD FOR A DISTINGUISHED CAREER IN JOURNALISM

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, a most distinguished career in journalism is coming to an end with the retirement of Columbus Dispatch statehouse reporter Lee Leonard. The dean of the Ohio Capitol press corps, Lee's career has spanned five decades, with most of that time spent covering state government and politics in Columbus.

Lee began his journalism career with United Press International in Boise, Idaho in 1962 and spent six years with UPI in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania covering state government. He moved to Columbus in 1969 and became manager of UPI's Statehouse bureau. Lee has covered 11 national political conventions, interviewed former presidents Eisenhower and Carter and was voted one of UPI's 20 most respected bylines in a national survey of subscribing newspaper editors. Among his many awards and honors is a first place prize from the Press Club of Cleveland in 2001 for politics and government writing.

For the last 15 years, Lee has reported for the Columbus Dispatch. He is a living Statehouse encyclopedia who is widely respected and admired, both by his journalistic peers and those in state government. It's not surprising that ''Just call Lee'' has become a common refrain at the Dispatch offices whenever a question has arisen about state government.

As a former state legislator who has enjoyed many dealings with Lee over the years, I am glad to join his family, friends and colleagues in wishing him a long and active retirement.

HONORING THE DEDICATION OF REVEREND EDWARD L. HAYES

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the important contributions of the Reverend Edward L. Hayes.

Reverend Hayes, who was born in 1948, is a long-time Texan. He attended school in the San Antonio area and later became a graduate of the Guadalupe Seminary. In 1982 Reverend Hayes was ordained to the ministry at Shiloh. He served as Pastor at St. Frederick Baptist Church for nine years before moving to St. Stephen Baptist Church in October of 1994.

A dedicated and passionate member of our local community, Reverend Hayes has worked tirelessly as the MLK Commission Chairman for San Antonio and has been instrumental in the Meals on Wheels for Christian Senior Services program. His dedicated community service has helped those who need it the most.

It is important to recognize the good work of spiritual leaders in our community. The service and leadership of people like Reverend Hayes is important, especially for the elderly or less fortunate among us. Reverend Hayes spends his days providing not only community guidance, but also leading by his good example.

Reverend Edward Hayes and his wife Rice have three children and one grandchild. Rice Hayes is a local teacher at the Judson School District.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to recognize the contributions of Reverend Edward L. Hayes.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES PROTECTION ACT

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to introduce the Federal Employees with Disabilities Protection Act.

The Federal Employees with Disabilities Protection Act (FEDPA) simply states that in cases where federal jobs are contracted out, a federal employee should not lose his or her job if that employee is an individual with a significant physical or developmental disability and had been hired under a program designed for individuals with such disabilities.

The FEDPA was drafted to respond to a particular situation that occurred at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland. In the fall of 2003 I visited the Hospital, which has developed an innovative and successful program hiring developmentally disabled individuals from our local community to work in its kitchen and cafeteria. Many of these individuals have worked there for more than twenty years. They are hard-working, reliable, and beloved by the naval officers and staff. I was shocked to learn that the Administration had selected these positions to be subject to competitive sourcing. In other words, these hard-working disabled employees, who had been hired under a federal program designed specifically to hire the severely disabled, would be forced to compete for their own jobs against people who were not disabled, leaving them on the verge of losing their jobs. I wrote the President about this injustice and am pleased that as a result of our timely intervention, plans to compete these jobs have been withdrawn and these individuals have been able to keep their jobs and the sense of dignity that comes with them.

But it is unconscionable that other severely disabled federal workers might have to suffer through the same thing. The FEDPA will protect federal employees with severe disabilities from losing their federal jobs as a result of contracting out. The bill does allow for jobs to continue to be contracted out to organizations like NISH (formerly known as the National Institute for the Severely Handicapped) and the National Industries for the Blind covered under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (JWOD). JWOD established specific programs to hire the severely disabled; it is not the intention of the FEDPA to interfere with JWOD.

The FEDPA is supported by many advocates for the disabled, including ANCOR (The American Network of Community Options and Resources), The Public Policy Collaboration of United Cerebral Palsy and the Arc of the United States. Federal employee unions supporting FEDPA include the National Association of Government Employees (NAGE) and the Service Employees International Union (SEIU). The FEDPA also has the support of the Professional Services Council, one of the principal organizations representing government contractors, because they agree that supporting employment opportunities for the disabled is important.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that everyone in this body wants to protect employment opportunities for the severely disabled. I urge my colleagues to support and cosponsor the Federal Employees with Disabilities Protection Act.

I am submitting for the RECORD an article that was published by The Washington Post on October 14, 2003 that describes the situation involving the scullery workers at the National Naval Medical Center.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 14, 2003]

IN BETHESDA, HIRING POLICY, 'COMPETITIVE SOURCING' CLASH

NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER CONSIDERS REPLACING DISABLED WORKERS

(By Christopher Lee)

President Bush's efforts to make government run more like a business collided this month with the reality that, in many ways, government is not a business.

For the 2 two years, the Navy, as part of the Bush administration's initiative, has been studying whether a private contractor should take over the custodial and food services provided by 21 federal employees at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda.

It is just one small example of Bush's ''competitive sourcing'' initiative, which requires hundreds of thousands of civil servants across the government to prove they can do their work better and more cheaply than a private contractor, or risk seeing the work outsourced.

But in one important way the 21 workers in the hospital scullery are different: All are mentally retarded, beneficiaries of federal policies that promote the employment of people with disabilities.

To their supporters, the administration's requirement that they compete for their jobs misses the point that government employment has always been about more than the bottom line. Through various policies and laws, federal agencies for decades have gone out of their way to hire members of certain populations, from veterans to disabled people to welfare mothers and students.

''There are different goals of the federal government, and one of those goals is to get different people into real jobs,'' said Representative Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.), who met last month with the scullery workers at the hospital, which is in his district. ''And this [policy] will undercut that goal.''

Bush has strongly defended ''competitive sourcing,'' calling it one of his most important management initiatives. He says forcing government workers to compete with

private contractors for their jobs promotes government efficiency and saves taxpayer dollars—even if the jobs stay in-house. An Oct. 3 report by the Office of Management and Budget said federal agencies have identified 434,820 jobs that are ripe for such competition, of which 103,412 are being evaluated for possible contracting out.

''We are confident that the savings and service benefits expected from this effort will soon follow,'' Clay Johnson III, OMB's deputy director for management, said that day.

That provides scant comfort to employees such as Devorah Shapiro, 30, who has worked at the hospital scullery for 10 years and worries what will happen if she loses her job.

''I like working here,'' Shapiro said the other day while taking a break from the first half of her eight-hour shift. ''I work on the belt. I help push carts upstairs sometimes. I wash plates, pick silverware—I do everything.''

Shapiro landed the job after interning at the hospital while a student at Rock Terrace School, a public campus in Rockville that serves 112 special-needs children in grades 6 through 12. ''I live in a group home and I have to pay the rent there,'' said Shapiro, her dark curls tucked neatly under a hairnet. ''And I have to work, or else they'll ask me to leave. I don't want to leave my friends. I don't want to leave my house. It's too nice.''

The work isn't easy. The employees, clad in blue uniforms and white plastic aprons, remove trash and utensils from used trays as they navigate across a water-slicked red tile floor. Many wear earplugs to block out the drone of the industrial dishwasher that cleans the dishes and trays that pass through it on a conveyer belt before the workers retrieve and stack them in neat piles. Shifts begin at 5:30 a.m. and finish as late as 7 p.m.

James Eastridge, 38, another former Rock Terrace student, has worked in the kitchen for 22 years. That is long enough for him to earn several promotions and enough money to buy a house in Hagerstown, where he lives with his parents.

''I started out when I was 16 years old and just kept on working; the years just flew by,'' he said. ''I hope we get to keep the jobs. When I was in school, I was pretty wild. They got me in the job . . . and I've been doing good ever since I've been here.''

Randy Severt, a teacher at Rock Terrace, said more than 300 students have interned or worked at the hospital since the school formed a partnership with the institution in 1979. The Navy got reliable, long-serving employees for hard-to-fill positions. The students, who earn between $9.42 and $12.80 an hour, were given an opportunity to work, learn about money management and become more self-sufficient.

Providing such opportunities is a longstanding goal of the federal government. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 banned discrimination against disabled people in federal hiring and required agencies to develop affirmative action plans to hire more people with disabilities.

Most of the scullery workers joined the hospital under a federal hiring authority that allows agencies to take on people with mental retardation as provisional employees, then convert them to permanent status after two years of satisfactory service. The government employed 1,734 mentally retarded workers in 2000, about one-tenth of 1 percent of the 1.8 million-strong federal civilian workforce, according to the Office of Personnel Management. (Overall, more than 120,000 disabled people worked for the government that year, more than 7 percent of the federal workforce.)

If the hospital scullery work goes to a private contractor, it will mean a big adjustment for a group of workers who, due to circumstances and disability, do not cope well with change, Severt said.

''They have problems finding jobs on their own. They don't advocate well for themselves and they don't have a lot of skills,'' Severt said. ''Some of them can speak well. Some of them have very good social skills. But they are retarded, and they need help every step of the way. They just don't adapt.''

Hospital officials say the quality of the work isn't at issue. ''They're very loyal employees,'' said Cmdr. Martie Slaughter, the hospital's nutrition manager. ''I've only been here for two years and they are like my family.''

In similar competitions across the government, the in-house bid has triumphed more than half the time, according to the OMB. Even in the cases where the private sector has won, the employees often have gone to work for the contractor. But the scullery employees are at a decided disadvantage.

''If you are special needs, you have a great need for greater supervision,'' Slaughter said. ''And we all know that supervision costs money.''

Jerry Leener, whose son Mike, 27, has worked at the hospital for eight years, said that even a White House focused on the bottom line should realize there is little to be gained by contracting out the work. Displaced employees would turn to government entitlement programs, including federal disability payments, Medicaid and food stamps.

''If our kids lose their jobs, the federal government is still going to have to compensate them,'' Leener said. ''Either way, it's going to be coming out of federal funds. So we haven't had a cost saving as it relates to these kids. What's more, we've displaced them from their passion. They love working here. They love being a part of this.''

Military officials have been sympathetic but unmoved. Slaughter said that early on in the process she asked about getting a waiver for the workers, but none was forthcoming. Over the last year, parents of some workers have written to Navy officials and members of Congress seeking help, but with no concrete results.

As recently as two weeks ago, Navy officials said they were still studying the situation. Parents of the workers grew nervous as a December deadline loomed for the hospital to submit its bid to keep the scullery jobs in-house. They were told that a decision on whether a contractor would take over could come as soon as March.

Then on Oct. 2, 10 days after Van Hollen's visit to the scullery and after inquiries by The Washington Post, Navy officials passed the word internally that they had been directed to temporarily stop working on the job competition. ''The study has not been cancelled, but postponed until further notice,'' an internal e-mail said.

Parents said they were given a vague explanation that the job competition had gone on longer than current law permits. A provision in the recently passed 2004 Defense Appropriations bill blocks new funding for single-function job competitions that have exceeded 24 months, and multifunction competitions that have exceeded 30 months. Navy officials at the hospital did not respond to two requests for more information about the decision.

''I have a suspicion that they were starting to feel political pressure and decided to put it on hold, and that maybe this thing would blow over,'' said Leener, who added that he remains uncertain about whether his son's job is safe. ''We took it as a big victory, believe me, but it's a temporary one.''

Trent Duffy, an OMB spokesman, said agencies may cancel job competitions that jeopardize protected workers, such as veterans or disabled people. ''It is permissible for agencies to make that determination and cancel a competition because these protected populations, these certain people, could potentially lose their livelihoods,'' Duffy said. ''They absolutely have that discretion under the law.'' Van Hollen, who wrote a letter to Bush urging him to halt the study, said he viewed the Navy's decision as little more than political expediency. He still believes competitive sourcing is ''a one-size-fits-all contracting-out policy that does not take into account other important goals of the federal government,'' he said.

''I still think it's an example of their policy run amok,'' Van Hollen said. ''There's no doubt what happened here. You want to applaud the Navy for reversing its decision, but you can't have a member of Congress or a member of the press visit every site where you've got . . . contracting out going on with model programs.''

CONGRATULATIONS TO WESTINGHOUSE WARRIORS CITY BASKETBALL TITLE

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 the young men of George Westinghouse Career Academy High School's basketball team, lead by coach Quitman Dillard, won their fourth City Championship in the last six seasons.

The game was never really in doubt and second place Simeon could never get any closer than eight points in the second half.

By a score of 67–52, Westinghouse clinched their place at the top of the Chicago Public League, according to press reports, one of the Nation's top high school basketball proving grounds.

The 72 team Chicago City league is reportedly used by some college coaches as a benchmark for the success of their recruiting efforts.

The Westinghouse team was powered by DeAndre Thomas, rated by many as the best high school player in Illinois. Thomas scored 29 points, snagged 9 rebounds and had three assists.

However, the victory was definitely a team effort. Westinghouse had 23 assists.

Marquis Johnson scored 14 points and secured 11 rebounds. Kris Harris and Corey Caston each scored nine points. Caston had 7 assists.

Mr. Speaker, Westinghouse Career Academy, which serves the Austin, South Lawndale and West Garfield Communities, is a public school fighting its way to the top in every category.

Eighteen percent of its almost 1400 students are enrolled in honors classes. They

were City champs in the C–CAP culinary arts competition.

Westinghouse students have earned nine medals in Academic Decathlon competition.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I salute Westinghouse Career Academy and Principal Dr. Lona C. Bibbs.

The Westinghouse Warriors are setting an example for the entire school by now setting their sights on the next task: the State finals. All Chicago wishes them the very best.

The Westinghouse Warriors have, through their hard work, their determination and their talent, achieved a remarkable record.

Congratulations to the Westinghouse team, their coach and to each of these outstanding young athletes individually.

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Baylor University Women's Basketball Team on their success during the NCAA Women's Basketball Tournament. With a record of 31–3, the Lady Bears have risen to the challenge and have represented the Big Twelve and the State of Texas with pride. Led by point guard Chelsea Whitaker, the Lady Bears have won their way into the Championship game where they will face Michigan State tonight.

I attended the Lady Bear's 68–57 victory over LSU in the Final Four game on Sunday and was particularly excited for junior forward Sophia Young, who scored 21 points in the game, and was named the Tempe Regionals' MVP earlier in the tournament. As a Member of the House Immigration Subcommittee, I was able to help bring Miss Young's mother, Annie Christopher, from St. Vincent, West Indies to see her daughter play collegiate basketball for the first time. Sophia is a very talented basketball player and I am glad that she was able to take her place as a member of the Baylor basketball team through the U.S. Immigration program. We as a nation embrace talent such as Sophia's athletic gifts and we recognize the value of reuniting families for important moments. After Baylor's latest victory when Sophia was able to hug her mother in the stands, you could see that this is truly the real face of immigration.

I also want to congratulate Coach Kim Mulkey-Robertson on her great achievements at Baylor. Tonight, she has a chance at achieving history; a win over Michigan State would make her the first women's coach to win a championship as a player and coach. She truly deserves all the credit she receives for the job she has done with this talented team. In 2000, she inherited a program that went 7–20 the previous season, in her very first season she guided the Lady Bears to a 21–9 record and last year took Baylor to the Sweet 16. This year the Lady Bears enter the national championship game having won 19 straight games, the longest such streak in college basketball this year.

I am confident that the great fans of Baylor will carry the Lady Bears to victory. They have withstood great challenges, both mental and physical to reach the pinnacle of women's college basketball. I wish the Lady Bears all the luck tonight as they play in the Championship game and hope they are able to finish their great season with a win.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF REVEREND DR. PAUL D. STEVENS, SR.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the important contributions of the Reverend Paul D. Stevens, Sr.

Rev. Stevens was born the third of seven children in Westlake, Louisiana. His father, Willie Stevens Jr., was also a minister. Paul Stevens first came to Texas to study for his Master of Arts degree, which he received from the Houston Graduate School of Theology.

Rev. Stevens has been a minister for over 20 years, and is a certified Pastoral Care Specialist. Under his leadership, the New Covenant Missionary Baptist Church has grown from 188 to over 560 members. He has served the needs of his growing congregation by overseeing the construction of a 1.5 million dollar worship center, and the founding of several new ministry programs.

In addition to his formal duties, Rev. Stevens has found the time to participate in several community organizations. He is a member of the NAACP and Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, a board member of the Community of Churches for Social Action and the Cooperative Ministry for Higher Education, and a member of the Baptist Ministers Union of San Antonio and Vicinity. Reverend Stevens has been married to Belinda Hubbard Stevens for 20 years, and is the father of two teenagers, Paul Jr. and Kayla.

Mr. Speaker, he is a source of tremendous strength for his community and his congregation, and his commitment to serving his fellow man serves as a powerful example. I am proud to have the chance to honor him here today.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT HARRIS

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in tribute to a man with a distinguished career in education. Dr. Robert Harris's vision and hard work have made Sacramento City College one of the preeminent junior colleges in Northern California. The longest tenure of any president since the college was founded in 1916; Dr. Harris will soon retire from the post of President of Sacramento City College after 18 years of wonderful service. As his family, friends, and colleagues gather to celebrate Dr. Harris' great career, I ask all my colleagues to join me in saluting one of Sacramento's most respected and successful educators.

President Harris is well-known for his resolve to foster positive changes, which has resulted in many improvements to the Sacramento City College campus, including the restoration of the Auditorium, renovation of the City Cafe, and construction of a Child Development Center, Center for Physical Excellence, and the Learning Resource Center, ''a grand and gleaming hightech wonder.''

Since the beginning of his presidency, he has had the vision and drive to push for the development of light rail directly to the City College Station; and under his leadership, Associated Student Government students presented a Resolution in Support of Regional Transit to the Los Rios Board of Trustees, which resulted in a student vote of the Universal Transit Pass fee and a Regional Transit Pass that allows students to use all public transit bus and light rail systems in Sacramento, Yolo, Folsom, El Dorado and Elk Grove.

During his presidency, Sacramento City College co-sponsored the annual Martin Luther King, Jr. event. In 1996 inaugurated an annual Capital Shrine Bowl to raise awareness and funding for Shriners Hospitals for children. It was also under Dr. Harris' stewardship that Sacramento City College, in partnership with Sutter Health Sacramento Sierra Region, expanded its Associate Degree Nursing Program and Sutter has committed more than $16 million through 2010 with the goal of educating 450 registered nurses.

Dr. Harris also helped establish Beta Eta Psi, a campus chapter of the Phi Theta Kappa International Honor Society. He helped to create a $7,500 scholarship to pay the induction fee for students who need assistance, and was one of only 24 college presidents honored with the prestigious Shirley B. Gordon Award of Distinction which recognizes college presidents for outstanding efforts in promoting the goals of Phi Theta Kappa at the chapter level. Also, a decade ago, President Harris supported the creation of Susurrus, the college literary journal, which has twice won first place in the national Community College Humanities Association Annual Literary Magazine Competition.

President Harris deserves special recognition for his unwavering support of programs that provide services and encouragement to underrepresented and non-traditional students. It is fair to say that the Sacramento City College Classified Senate would not exist without his encouragement and his support. President Harris' views on participatory governance promoted an unprecedented level of collegiality on campus.

In 2004, directly as a result of Dr. Harris' leadership, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges reaffirmed Sacramento City College accreditation without conditions—the highest level of accreditation a college can receive.

Mr. Speaker, as Dr. Harris' friends, family, and colleagues gather to celebrate his great career, I am honored to pay tribute to one of the Sacramento Region's most successful educators. Dr. Harris' leadership is a true testament to making a positive impact to the lives

of others. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in wishing Dr. Robert Harris continued success in all his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO MS. MARVELLE S. WILSON

HON. ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Ms. Marvelle S. Wilson who will be 75 years young on April 9, 2005. Marvelle was born on April 9, 1930, in Cleveland Ohio. She is the youngest of three girls, born to Charles and Ruth Seaton.

As a neighbor of Carl and Louis Stokes, Marvelle and her sisters worked tirelessly to achieve Carl Stoke's victory as the first black mayor of Cleveland. Marvelle received her degree in Library Science. She worked at the Cleveland Public School as a librarian for over 20 years until retiring to a part-time position as a Librarian with Cuyahoga Community College, a position she currently holds.

Marvelle has two sons, Marvin and Leslie Holmes. Her oldest son was elected to the Maryland State Legislature in 2002 and presently serves on the Environmental Matters Committee as well as other leadership roles within the Maryland House of Delegates.

Marvelle is recognized by her church, friends, and relatives as someone who continues to donate her time and talents to improving the community. I would like to add my wishes to the many friends and admirers. I wish you a happy 75th birthday Ms. Marvelle S. Wilson, and many more.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ANGELINE NAZARETIAN

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Angeline Nazaretian, known by her friends and colleagues as Angie, upon her appointment as Grand Electa for the Order of the Eastern Star in the State of Alabama. Dr. Nazaretian lives in my Congressional District and is a member of the Athens Chapter of the Order of the Eastern Star. The Order of the Eastern Star is the world's largest fraternal organization to which both men and women may belong.

Dr. Nazaretian moved to Athens in 1958 and has demonstrated a deep commitment and strong love for her adopted community ever since. She has done a great deal to help further the quality of life for young and senior individuals in the area.

She retired from Athens State University in 1999, after forty-two years as a Professor of Health and Physical Education and the Director of Alumni Affairs. During her tenure at Athens State, she worked with the faculty and students, local churches, and schools in the Athens-Limestone community to develop physical education programs in elementary and secondary level schools.

Dr. Nazaretian is a board member and volunteer for numerous community organizations. As an instructor for the American Red Cross, she developed numerous programs in First Aid, Water Safety, and C.P.R. She also served as a member of the R.S.V.P. Advisory Board, where she helped organize a Fitness Program for the Elderly, which is now part of the Community Wellness program. Furthermore, Dr. Nazaretian is recognized as one of the first leaders in Alabama to develop the Special Olympics program in the State.

Mr. Speaker, for her hard work and dedication, Dr. Nazaretian is respected by all who know her. On April 2, the Athens community gathered to celebrate and honor her achievements. I rise today, to join in their celebration and to congratulate her on behalf of everyone in North Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO FRED KOREMATSU

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Fred Korematsu, who passed away last week at the age of 86. In his early years, Mr. Korematsu experienced America at its worst, but he did so as an American at his best. Many years later, in large part thanks to Mr. Korematsu and his courageous actions, our country atoned for its mistakes, and took great steps towards fulfilling the promises entailed in our Constitution.

Fred Korematsu was born in Oakland, California on January 30, 1919. An American citizen by birth, Mr. Korematsu was nonetheless among the Americans of Japanese heritage ordered to report to World War II internment camps in May 1942. He defied the order, choosing instead to marry his girlfriend and live the life he believed that, like any other American, he was entitled to. That dream did not materialize; in May 1942 he was caught, arrested and jailed for failing to report as ordered.

Mr. Korematsu maintained that his Constitutional rights had been violated by the forced internment order, given without evidence, specific charges, or a trial. With the help of the American Civil Liberties Union, Mr. Korematsu sued the government and appealed his case to the Supreme Court. He lost the landmark Korematsu v. the United States by a vote of 6 to 3. In the majority opinion, Justice Hugo Black wrote that the internment was based not on "hostility to him or his race" but on "military necessity." In his dissent, Justice Frank Murphy spoke out against the internment in no uncertain terms: it "goes over the very brink of constitutional power and falls into the ugly abyss of racism."

For almost forty years, Fred Korematsu's conviction stood as a black mark of U.S. jurisprudence. In the early 1980's Peter Irons—a professor of Political Science at University of California, San Diego—discovered documents in which government intelligence agencies categorically denied that Japanese Americans posed any security threat whatsoever. For the Supreme Court case, the official reports exculpating Japanese-Americans were suppressed. In the course of his investigation, Irons unearthed other reports describing government claims of Japanese American spying as "intentional falsehoods."

In light of this information, in November 1983 Judge Marilyn Patel of the San Francisco Federal District Court overturned Mr. Korematsu's conviction. Five years later, the specter of state-endorsed racism was finally lifted for all Japanese Americans when federal law provided apologies and payments to those wrongfully relocated during the war.

There is no doubt that Fred's case figured prominently in the quest for justice for those American citizens wrongfully interned during the war. In 1998, President Clinton acknowledged Mr. Korematsu's role by awarding him the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our nation's highest civilian award. Like Rosa Parks, who insists she was just tired when she took her bus seat in Montgomery, Fred Korematsu was not looking to change the world when he refused to be interned. But also just like Rosa Parks, his defiance reverberated throughout our country, and engendered change as profound as his action was simple.

Mr. Korematsu spent his years after the war in California realizing his dream of a simple life; he worked as draftsman and raised a family. He is survived by his wife Kathryn, his son Ken, and his daughter Karen Korematsu-Haigh.

His is a life worth remembering; his defiance a testament to the potential for greatness within every ordinary American; his story a reminder of the progress our country has made, and a beacon keeping us ever hopeful for a better future. In the words of President Clinton, "In the long history of our country's constant search for justice, some names of ordinary citizens stand for millions of souls . . . Plessy, Brown, Parks . . . To that distinguished list, today we add the name of Fred Korematsu."

Mr. Speaker, Fred Korematsu was an American. He saw a wrong and did what he thought was right. With simple courage, he stood up to an entire nation and demanded that it make good on its promises. He should be remembered and honored, and as common men and women not all that different from him, we should strive to walk in his footsteps, fighting for equality and justice wherever their defense is needed.

REMEMBERING MICHELLE BULLOCK MARRS, DEDICATED HEALTH-CARE ADVOCATE

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Michelle Bullock Marrs of Nashville, Tennessee. Michelle Marrs was the Chief Executive Officer of the Matthew Walker Comprehensive Health Center in Nashville. She was a dedicated health-care advocate for

all Tennesseans, especially the poor, uninsured and underserved. The community suffered a great loss when she passed away on Wednesday, March 16, 2005.

Michelle Marrs was born on July 13, 1952 in Louisburg, North Carolina. She attended grade school in Louisburg and Raleigh, and went on to receive a Bachelors Degree from North Carolina Central University and a Masters in Education from Harvard University. Before moving to Nashville, she served as the Chief Executive Officer for the Metrolina Comprehensive Health Center in Charlotte, North Carolina, where she was instrumental in generating significant funding for a Women's Center and Teen Clinic. She also dedicated much of her time to mentoring young women who were beginning their careers in healthcare.

Michelle's numerous public service awards included the 2004 Urban Legend Award for exemplary contributions for empowering communities and changing lives; The Ladies of Distinction Incorporation Award for dedicated service to African American Women in Healthcare in 2004; the Jefferson Street United Merchants Partnership Living Legend Award in 2003; and the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity Public Service Award in 2000. Michelle was an officer on the board of the Greater Nashville Black Chamber of Commerce and she served on the Mayor's Taskforce for Child Development, as well as the Susan G. Komen Foundation.

Her most recent notable achievement was management of the Matthew Walker Comprehensive Health Center's million-dollar building project. Though diagnosed with a terminal illness, Michelle's clarity and resolve to ensure continued community healthcare led to the project's completion. Her leadership resulted in a monumental financial turnaround for the center, and a new state-of-the-art medical, dental and diagnostic facility. She prayed that her life would be extended so she could see the conclusion of this project. After the project's completion in October 2004, she commented that "[The new center] is one of the most significant professional goals that I've ever accomplished . . . we look forward to using this project as a tool to further serve the community." Because of her tremendous resolve, the center is expected to provide health and dental care to more than 20,000 medically underserved Tennesseans each year.

I was fortunate to have been able to work with Michelle over the past few years, and I will truly miss her, as will all of Nashville. She was one of those rare individuals who had a clear and strong vision for what she could accomplish with her life, and she did it. She saw the need in Nashville for a center that could help our community's most vulnerable and she turned the Matthew Walker Comprehensive Health Center into a thriving and vital center that is now recognized nationwide for its excellence. She was a committed, compassionate community leader. And she was a great lady. Her gifts were extraordinary and we are fortunate that her contributions to this community will continue for decades to come.

Michelle Marrs' legacy will live on through her children—Christy and Ivanna—the Matthew Walker Comprehensive Health Center, and the love and compassion she shared with her family, friends and community. On behalf of the Fifth District of Tennessee, I send my deepest condolences to Michelle's family.

TRIBUTE TO MR. EDWARD SWITZER

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I pay tribute today to the life of Mr. Edward Switzer. Mr. Switzer recently passed away, leaving a legacy of community work and commitment to those he loved. He was a magnanimous figure who was dedicated to his family and friends. It gives me no greater pleasure than honoring his memory today.

The life of Mr. Switzer took him from Regent, North Dakota, where he was born and raised, to serving in the Air Force during World War II. He attended a one-room grade school and went on to earn his Master's degree from North Dakota State University. After completing his graduate education, Mr. Switzer settled in San Bernardino, where he became my early supporter for the San Bernardino Valley College Board of Trustees.

To all those who knew Mr. Switzer, he exhibited generosity of spirit, love for his community, and dedication to his work. He constantly challenged the status quo, was never afraid to speak his mind, and undoubtedly left an immeasurable impression.

Mr. Switzer turned to teaching chemistry at San Bernardino Valley College for almost forty years and was a dedicated professor, who demonstrated genuine concern for his students. He realized that many students were having difficulty understanding basic chemistry concepts that were being taught using advanced techniques. Mr. Switzer decided to create a more clear methodology for teaching chemistry by specializing in making the fundamentals of chemistry easier to understand. His passion for the subject that he taught and dedication for teaching led him to become Chair of the Department of Chemistry. In addition to being a remarkable professor, Mr. Switzer celebrated his retirement by serving his community board by setting up after-school programs for teenagers.

I join today with family and friends in paying my respects to Mr. Switzer. He was a generous and humble human being who touched the lives of many and will be deeply missed by all. He has touched my life as a friend and mentor. His inspiration and encouragement have led me to hold office and be who I am today.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF REVEREND HOWARD ANDERSON

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the many contributions that Reverend Howard Anderson has made to his community.

Howard Anderson is a native of New York City. He first came to Texas to attend the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, from which he received his Masters in Divinity.

Reverend Anderson was ordained in 1980 under the authority and order of St. Paul Baptist Church in San Antonio. He served under the leadership of Live Oak Baptist Church in New Braunfels, and began his interim tenure at Coliseum Park Baptist Church in San Antonio in October 1995.

Mr. Anderson has also had a distinguished career in military service. He served for 15 years, winning the Military Excellence Award from the U.S. Navy Senior Enlisted Academy and rising to the highest possible enlisted rank: Chief Master Sergeant.

Finally, Reverend Anderson has been a tireless volunteer and community activist. He is an active Mason, a life member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, and a Golden Heritage Life Member of the NAACP. He serves as President of the Ministers Conference of the American Baptist Convention of Texas, and is an adjunct faculty member at the United Theological Seminary in Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Howard Anderson has proven himself to be an outstanding leader, a committed community activist, and an exceptional spiritual resource for the San Antonio community. He has truly distinguished himself, and I am proud to have the opportunity to thank him.

TRIBUTE TO THE EMPLOYEES OF THE INTEL CORPORATION AND THE INTEL FOUNDATION

HON. DAVID WU

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the employees of the Intel Corporation and the Intel Foundation for their efforts to provide tsunami relief to the Indian Ocean region.

As we all know, on December 26, 2004, a 9.0 earthquake erupted off the coast of Indonesia. Following the earthquake, a major tsunami swept across the region, destroying lives, homes and businesses in Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India, the Maldives, and Thailand.

Along with governments, citizens, businesses, and other private organizations around the world, Intel's employees and the Intel Foundation mobilized and delivered critical supplies and funds that helped save lives and begin the reconstruction process.

I stand here today to applaud Intel and its employees, many of whom live and work in my district in Oregon. Without their good work, many more lives may have been lost because of the Indian Ocean Tsunami.

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT FIRST CLASS PAUL SMITH

HON. JIM DAVIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Sergeant First Class Paul Smith, of Tampa, Florida.

Yesterday, President Bush posthumously awarded Sergeant Smith with our nation's highest military honor—the first Medal of Honor awarded to a soldier since 1993. Sergeant Smith always gave his fellow soldiers, his country and his family his very best. But on April 4, 2003, Sergeant Smith showed extraordinary valor when making the ultimate sacrifice for the soldiers whose lives he saved and the values and ideals that have made this country great.

Sergeant Smith had always wanted to serve our country as a professional soldier, and when he graduated from Tampa Bay Technical High School at 18, he immediately enlisted in the Army. He went on to serve in the Persian Gulf War, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo before serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Sergeant Smith was known for holding his soldiers to high standards, but on April 4, 2003, he held himself to the highest standard of all. Sergeant Smith's unit, B Company of the 11th Engineer Battalion was constructing a prisoner holding area at Baghdad Airport when their compound came under attack by nearly 100 Iraqi soldiers. Sergeant Smith immediately organized the unit's defense and risked his own life to hold back the enemy and help move injured soldiers to safety.

Despite Sergeant Smith and the unit's efforts, the enemy continued to fire on the compound. When faced with the call of having to pull his troops back, Sergeant Smith chose instead to take an exposed position behind a mounted .50-caliber machine gun and fire through three boxes of ammunition before being mortally wounded by enemy fire.

The official medal citation said Sergeant 1st Class Smith's ''courageous actions helped defeat the enemy attack, and resulted in as many as 50 enemy soldiers killed, while allowing the safe withdrawal of numerous wounded soldiers. Sergeant First Class Smith's extraordinary heroism and uncommon valor are in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, the Third Infantry Division 'Rock of the Marne,' and the United States Army.''

Paul Smith was a loving and devoted father, husband, brother and son. While the Medal of Honor will never fill the enormous hole in hearts of Sergeant Smith's family, this honor signifies our nation's deepest appreciation for Sergeant Smith's heroism and sacrifice. His courage and patriotism will never be forgotten.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE MAYOR OF SCHERTZ, HAL BALDWIN

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hal Baldwin, mayor of Schertz, Texas, for his commitment to public service.

Hal Baldwin's life has been fully dedicated towards helping of his fellow citizens ever since he served with the 51st Fighter Interceptor Wing at Naba Air Force Base during the Korean war. He continued to serve with the U.S. Air Force until 1974, when he retired from the military profession as a senior master sergeant.

After the conclusion of his military tenure, Baldwin moved back to Schertz where he served 6 years as the assistant city manager of Schertz. After his tour of duty as the assistant city manager, Baldwin was appointed to the Schertz City Council in 1983. He served his community with distinction in this post until May 1994 when the City Councilman Hal Baldwin became the Mayor Hal Baldwin.

Now, going on 11 years of service to Schertz as Mayor, Hal Baldwin also has spent 48 lovely years with his wife Barbara. They have five children, eight grandchildren, and two great-grand children, all of whom Mayor and Mrs. Baldwin love dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply proud to have been given this opportunity to recognize the Schertz mayor, Hal Baldwin, for his dedicated public service.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF REVEREND LESTER J. GILLESPIE, SR.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the important contributions of the Reverend Lester J. Gillespie, Sr.

Rev. Gillespie is a native of San Antonio, Texas. He comes from a family tradition of spiritual service; he is the son of the late Rev. W.G. Gillespie and the late Sister Vernell Gillespie-Jones. He received his Bachelor and Doctor of Divinity from the Guadalupe Baptist Theological Seminary, as well as a Doctor of Divinity from the American International Theological Seminary.

Lester Gillespie has had a long and distinguished career of community service and religious leadership. He is a former Pastor of the Mount Olive Baptist Church in Crystal City, Texas, the 2nd Vice President of the Ministers Conference of the National Baptist Convention of America, and Moderator of the United Fellowship Baptist District Association. He has worked to reach out to some of our State's most troubled citizens as Chaplain of the Frio County Jail Ministry and Chairman of the Gang Intervention Committee of the Southern Baptist Association of San Antonio.

Currently, Rev. Gillespie serves as the Organizer and Pastor of the Greater Love Missionary Church in San Antonio, and National President of the Ministers United for Ministerial Development. He provides invaluable spiritual leadership to both his San Antonio church and the national Baptist community. Finally, he helps to build a future for the next generation as founder of the Rev. W.G. Gillespie and Vernell Gillespie-Jones Memorial Institute Scholarship Fund.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Gillespie is one of our most accomplished and beloved community leaders, and I am proud and happy to have the chance to honor him here today.